	1
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA) COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
COUNTY OF HAMPTON) CASE NO. 2017-CP-25-00335
RICHARD LIGHTSEY, LeBRIAN CLECKLEY, PHILLIP COOPER, et al., on behalf of themselves and all others situated, Plaintiffs,))))))
·)
V .))
SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY, a Wholly Owned Subsidiary of SCANA, SCANA Corporation, and the State of South Carolina,)))))
Defendants.)
SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF,)))
Intervenor.)
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITI	ON OF GARY JONES
(Taken by Defendants South	Carolina Electric & Gas
Company and SCAN	NA Corporation)
October 5	5, 2018
Reported by: Rebecca L. Arri	son
Court Reporter	
Notary Public	

```
2
    APPEARANCE OF COUNSEL:
2
    FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
         BY: JERRY HUDSON EVANS
         RICHARDSON PATRICK WESTBROOK & BRICKMAN, LLC
         1037 Chuck Dawley Boulevard, Building A
         Mount Pleasant, SC 29464
         (843) 727-6500
5
         BY: TERRY RICHARDSON
6
         RICHARDSON PATRICK WESTBROOK & BRICKMAN, LLC
7
         1730 Jackson Street
         Barnwell, SC 29812
         (803) 541-7850.
8
9
         BY: JESSICA PICKLING
         STROM LAW FIRM
10
         2110 North Beltline Boulevard
         Columbia, SC 29205
         (803) 252-4800
11
    FOR THE SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF:
12
13
         BY: JAMES E. COX, JR.
         BY: STEVE HAMM
14
         WYCHE LAW FIRM
         44 East Camperdown Way
15
         Greenville, SC
                         29601
          (864) 242-8200
16
    FOR DEFENDANTS SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS; SCANA
17
    CORPORATION:
         BY: JOHN R. CHALLY
18
         KATHERINE MARTIN
19
         KING & SPALDING LLP
         1180 Peachtree Street, N.E.
         Atlanta, GA 30309-3521
20
         (404) 572-2780
21
         BY: BRYONY HODGES
22
         SCANA CORPORATION
         1426 Main Street
23
         Columbia, SC 29201
          (803) 217-9000
24
25
```

```
3
         BY: LEAH B. MOODY
         LAW OFFICE OF LEA B. MOODY, LLC
         235 East Main Street, Suite 115
         Rock Hill, SC 29730
3
         (803) 327-4192
4
    FOR DEFENDANT DOMINION ENERGY, INC.:
5
              TIMOTHY D. PATTERSON
         BY:
         MCGUIRE WOODS LLP
         800 East Canal Street
7
         Richmond, VA 23219
         (804) 775-1000
8
9
    FOR DEFENDANT SANTEE COOPER:
         BY: B. RUSH SMITH, III
         NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP
         1320 Main Street, 17th Floor
11
         Columbia, SC 29201
         (803) 799-2000
12
13
14
    FOR DEFENDANTS CENTRAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE; ELECTRIC
    COOPERATIVES OF SOUTH CAROLINA:
15
         BY: FRANK ELLERBE
16
         ROBINSON GRAY STEPP & LAFFITTE, LLC
         1310 Gadsden Street
         Columbia, SC 29211
17
         (803) 929-1400
18
19
    FOR SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE:
20
         BY: T. PARKIN HUNTER
         OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
         STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
21
         Post Office Box 11549
22
         Columbia, SC 29211
         (803) 734-6151
23
24
    Also Present:
25
         Paul Fore, Videographer
```

```
4
1
2
3
           Videotaped deposition of GARY JONES, taken by
4
    the Defendants, at Haynsworth Sinkler Boyd, P.A.,
5
    1201 North Main Street, 22nd Floor, Columbia, South
6
    Carolina, on the 5th day of October, 2018, at
7
    9:39 a.m., before Rebecca L. Arrison, Notary Public
8
9
    and Court Reporter.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

				5
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$			COMMENIA	
3	THE WITNES	S. CARV	CONTENTS JONES EXAMINATION	ī
4		. CHALLY	UONES EXAMINATION	9
5		. EVANS		256
6	BY MR			280
7	DI III	• 0021	INDEX OF EXHIBITS	200
8	Exhibit No	. 1	Mr. Jones' PSC Testimony	10
9	Exhibit No		Email from Mr. Jones to	87
10			Ms. Powell Dated June 6, 2 Potential Companies to Ass Evaluating SCE&G Sensitivi Studies	sist in
12	Exhibit No	3	Email from Margaret Shirk	Felkel88
13	EXIIIDIC NO	. 3	To Abney Smith, et al., da October 22, 2015 Re: Fina October ORS Agenda	ated
14 15	Exhibit No	. 4	Invoice from Jones Partner Ltd. Dated January 4, 2016	-
16	Exhibit No	. 5	Testimony of Stephen A. By on Behalf of SCE&G	yrne 110
17 18	Exhibit. N	0.6	ORS NND Department Request Form Dated May 22, 2015	113
19	Exhibit No	. 7	Letter from Dukes Scott to Kenneth Jackson Dated Marc	
20			2016 Re: Construction of And 3 V.C. Summer	Units 2
21	Exhibit No	. 8	Email from Gary Jones to I	Oukes125
22	0 1.0	-	Scott Dated May 6, 2016 Re Summary of April 26 and 27	:
23			Site Visit	
24				
25				

		6
1	Exhibit No. 9	Email from Gary Jones to Allyn 127 Powell Dated May 11, 2016 Re:
2		Draft of Concerns re. SCE&G Response to ORS AIRs
3	_ , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
4	Exhibit No. 10	Email from Gary Jones to Brittany128 Waring Dated June 27, 2016 Re: Summary Of June 2016 Site Visit
5	Exhibit No. 11	and Recommendations Email from Gary Jones to Brittany133
7		Waring Dated August 2, 2016 Re: Summary and Recommendations from
8		the July 26-28, 2016 Site Visit
9	Exhibit No. 12	Conceptual Draft Settlement Agree-135 ment In Support of SCE&G 2016-EFiling
10	D-1-1-1-1- N- 10	
11	EXHIBIT NO. 13	Email Chain Re: Nuclear Sensitivity140 Study Meeting with ORS 07July2-16.docx
12	Exhibit No. 14	Email from Gary Jones to Dukes Scott143 Dated April 2, 2016 Re: Summary of March 29 & 30, 2016 VCS Visit
14	Evhihit No. 15	Direct Testimony & Exhibit of Gary146
15	EATIDIC NO. 13	C. Jones, P.E., June 24, 2015
16	Exhibit No. 16	Corrected Direct Testimony/Exhibit 153 of Gary C. Jones, P.E.
17 18	Exhibit No. 17	October 14, 2016 Email from Allyn Powell to Anthony163
	Emiliare No. 17	James dated March 2, 2016 Re:
19 20		Final Presentation
21	Certificate of	Reporter 284
22	Witness Attest	ation Sheet 285
23 24 25		

	7
1	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This videotaped
2	deposition is beginning at 9:39 a.m. This is the
3	videotaped deposition of Gary Jones, taken in the
4	case of Richard Lightsey, et al., Plaintiffs,
5	versus South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, et
6	al., Defendants. Cause Number 2017-cp-25-00335,
7	in the Court of Common Pleas for the State of
8	South Carolina, County of Hampton.
9	This deposition is being taken at
10	1201 Main Street, 22nd Floor, Columbia, South
11	Carolina, on Friday, October 5th, 2018. The
12	court reporter is Rebecca Arrison. The video
13	technician is Paul Fore.
14	Will counsel introduce themselves
15	for the record, plaintiffs' attorney first,
16	please.
17	MR. EVANS: Jerry Evans on behalf
18	of the plaintiffs.
19	MR. RICHARDSON: Also Terry
20	Richardson here for the plaintiffs, ratepayers.
21	MR. CHALLY: Let's just go around
22	the room. Jim, do you want to start?
23	MR. COX: Yeah. Jim Cox appearing
24	on behalf of South Carolina Office of Regulatory
25	Staff.

	8
1	MR. HAMM: Steve Hamm appearing on
2	behalf of the Office of Regulatory Staff.
3	MR. PATTERSON: Jim Patterson
4	appearing on behalf of Dominion.
5	MR. SMITH: Rush Smith for Santee
6	Cooper.
7	MR. ELLERBE: Frank Ellerbe for
8	Central Electric Power Cooperative.
9	MR. HUNTER: Parkin Hunter for the
10	South Carolina Attorney General's Office.
11	MS. PICKLING: Jessica Pickling on
12	behalf of the plaintiffs.
13	MS. HODGES: Bryony Hodges,
14	in-house counsel for SCANA.
15	MS. MOODY: Leah Moody, SCANA and
16	SCE&G.
17	MS. MARTIN: Katherine Martin on
18	behalf of SCANA and SCE&G.
19	MR. CHALLY: And I'm Jon Chally,
20	also on behalf of SCANA and SCE&G.
21	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Will the court
22	reporter please swear in the deponent.
23	
24	GARY JONES,
25	being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

	9
1	EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. CHALLY:
3	Q. Mr. Jones, can you state your name for the
4	record, please.
5	A. Gary Conrad Jones.
6	Q. Have you ever given a deposition before?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. So it's fair to say you're familiar with
9	what we're to what we're here to do today, the
10	process for giving a deposition?
11	A. In general, I would say yes.
12	Q. Okay. Let me go through just a couple of
13	ground rules. So we are here to get answers to
14	certain questions that I ask you. I am one of the
15	lawyers representing SCANA and SCE&G in these
16	matters, and we Noticed your deposition.
17	We are taking everything down, the court
18	reporter is here to take everything down, which means
19	you and I have to work together a little bit to make
20	sure the record is as clean as we can get it. And
21	what that means specifically is that I will do my
22	best to let you finish your answers before I begin my
23	next question, and I would appreciate if you would do
24	the same thing; let me finish my question before you
25	begin your answer; we shouldn't talk over each other.

	10
1	We also have to provide oral responses as,
2	you know, uh-huh and huh-uh or nods of the head don't
3	really work well on the written record. So we'll try
4	to police that as best we can throughout the day.
5	We're going to be here for a good chunk of
6	the day. If you need a break at any point in time,
7	just let me know. We're happy to take a break as
8	long as a question isn't pending.
9	The only other instruction I want to make
10	sure we're clear on at the outset is that if at any
11	time I ask a question that you don't understand, tell
12	me, and I'll phrase my question.
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. If you don't tell me that you don't
15	understand a question, is it fair to say that your
16	answers will reflect the fact that you understood and
17	were able to respond to my question?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Okay. Mr. Jones, are you currently taking
20	any medication that impact your memory at all?
21	A. No.
22	Q. So no reason why you wouldn't be able to
23	give truthful and complete answers to my questions?
24	A. No reason.
25	(Exhibit No. 1 was marked for

	11
1	identification.)
2	Q. I have already handed you this big stack of
3	documents and marked as Exhibit 1. That is certain
4	testimony with exhibits that you presented in the
5	Public Service Commission proceedings. I want to
6	start by asking you just a few questions about that.
7	Can you just flip through it, make sure it
8	appears, to your recollection, to be what you
9	submitted in September, just a week or ten days ago?
10	A. Yes. I did not look at all the exhibits but
11	I looked at the exhibit list, and it appears to be my
12	testimony.
13	Q. The very first two questions in your
14	testimony, I just want to refer you to those, it
15	begins on page one. You provided your name, business
16	address, occupation, and then described your
17	educational background and experience. Do you see
18	that?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. Is all of that still accurate?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And then you attached your resume to this
23	testimony, correct?
24	A. Correct. Designated as a CV, but resume.
25	Q. I'm sorry. Is your CV accurate and complete

	12
1	as of today's date?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. All right. Mr. Jones, can you identify for
4	us today every nuclear plan construction project in
5	which you have been involved.
6	A. Right. The first project I was involved
7	with is LaSalle County Station for Commonwealth
8	Edison. I was the lead project mechanical engineer
9	on that job. Eventually, I should say. I started
10	out as a mechanical engineer, worked up to the
11	project mechanical engineer in charge of the design
12	of the interface with the nuclear steam supply
13	system, and monitoring the construction and providing
14	engineering construction support on that project.
15	Q. We'll try to take these each at a time. So
16	when were you involved with this LaSalle County
17	project?
18	A. Approximately from 1972 through 1978, I
19	believe, 1978.
20	Q. What was the status of construction while
21	you were involved with that project?
22	A. Status was initially started when I was on
23	the project, meaning excavation. I was an integral
24	part of preparing the preliminary safety analysis
25	report that got the construction permit. This was at

	13
1	the time of the two-part licensing where you get a
2	construction permit and then an operating permit.
3	So construction was started on the plant. I
4	also then participated in the design and the
5	construction support for the plant, all the way up
6	until the time that, essentially, we went through the
7	final safety analysis report preparation and
8	submittal and obtaining the operating license, and up
9	through the final stages of pre-operational testing.
10	Q. So that six-year span that you were working
11	on this project was the entire construction phase; is
12	that right?
13	A. Pretty much, yes.
14	Q. Is this particular plant still in operation?
15	A. Yes, it is.
16	Q. What was the technology used at that plant?
17	A. That plant was a General Electric boiling
18	water reactor with Mark II containment, and it was
19	BWR5, Boiling Water Reactor 5, I'm sorry.
20	Q. Who was the contractor?
21	A. Let's see. You know, I don't recall who the
22	contractor was.
23	Q. That's LaSalle County. Can you identify for
24	us the next nuclear construction project in which you
25	were involved?

	14
1	A. The next nuclear construction project was
2	the Marble Hill Units 1 and 2 for Public Service
3	Indiana. And I was involved also in the final stages
4	of the preliminary safety analysis preparation, the
5	start of construction on that plant.
6	And, unfortunately, the plant was abandoned,
7	somewhat similar to V.C. Summer, at the partial state
8	of completion. And I believe I was on that project
9	from until 19 I believe it was slightly into
10	1983. The plant was actually, I think construction
11	was halted about 1982, at the end of the year, but
12	there was some kind of cleanup work that we did in
13	1983.
14	Q. When did you start working with Marble Hill?
15	A. Immediately after. I went from LaSalle
16	County directly to Marble Hill, and on that job I was
17	the Sargent & Lundy project manager for the
18	engineering work on that project.
19	Q. What was the first word you said? I thought
20	you said Sargent; is that right?
21	A. Yeah, Sargent & Lundy, that was the company
22	I was with.
23	Q. Oh, sure.
24	A. I'm sorry.
25	Q. And you said you were the what was your

	15
1	title?
2	A. Project manager.
3	Q. Was that effectively the same role you had
4	at the LaSalle County project?
5	A. It was actually a promotion. I went from
6	being the senior project engineer to being the
7	project manager.
8	Q. And is being a project manager for Marble
9	Hill meant that you were primarily responsible for
10	the progress of the construction?
11	A. No. Our work was engineering. We did the
12	design of the plant, but we also did construction
13	support. So it was construction support means
14	that field changes requested by the construction were
15	handled by us. We monitored the construction for the
16	utility, so we were the, what's designated as the
17	architect engineer on that job working for the
18	utility.
19	Q. Who was the contractor then?
20	A. I believe the contractor there was Newberg.
21	I believe they were the primary contractor.
22	Q. Do you remember the technology?
23	A. That plant was a Westinghouse pressurized
24	water reactor. It was a replicate of the Bryon and
25	Braidwood projects, meaning essentially a copy of

	16
1	that design, and it was licensed under the
2	replication standards of the NRC.
3	Q. You said it was abandoned some four years
4	after the project began; is that right?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Do you have an understanding as to the
7	amount of the cost of the project during that
8	four-year period?
9	A. I do not recall. There were it was well
10	over \$2 billion, but I don't recall what the exact
11	amount was.
12	Q. Do you recall why it was abandoned?
13	A. Yes. There were multiple construction
14	quality issues, primarily voids in the concrete, and
15	these caused they tried to continue with the
16	project by chipping out the voids while continuing
17	with construction, and that got to be very
18	problematic.
19	There was a lot of interference with
20	construction activities. Eventually, it cost just
21	got to the point where the utility could no longer
22	afford to complete the project, and they decided to
23	abandon it.
24	Q. Do you have any qualms with the decision
25	eventually made to abandon that project?

	17
1	A. No.
2	Q. All right. That's Marble Hill. Can you
3	identify the next nuclear construction project?
4	A. The next I'm sorry. The next project was
5	the Braidwood project, and, again, that was a
6	replicate plant of Byron. It was a sister plant to
7	unit Westinghouse pressurized water reactor. And
8	that plant, I was also the Sargent & Lundy project
9	manager on.
10	And at that time, the plant was under
11	construction when I moved from Marble Hill to
12	Braidwood. I don't remember the exact status of the
13	construction at that time, but it was the base mat
14	had been poured and construction was ongoing.
15	Q. And so did you move to the Braidwood project
16	immediately after the Marble Hill project?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And then how long were you associated with
19	the Braidwood project?
20	A. I was associated with the Braidwood project
21	until, I believe, 1984.
22	Q. What was the status of the Braidwood project
23	in 1984?
24	A. Again, it was in the preoperational testing
25	phase when I left the project.

	18
1	Q. So does that mean that the construction had
2	been completed?
3	A. Pretty much so, yes.
4	Q. And you were the project manager for that?
5	A. For the engineering work for Sargent &
6	Lundy, yes.
7	Q. And then who was the contractor?
8	A. I'm sorry, I don't recall who the contractor
9	was at that time.
10	Q. But you said it was the same technology as
11	the Marble Hill, the pressurized water reactor?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. That's three. Any other nuclear
14	construction projects?
15	A. I would also put Watts Bar Unit 1 into that
16	category. The Watts Bar unit was essentially
17	complete in construction when I was assigned to that
18	project, but they had run into major construction
19	quality issues, and Sargent & Lundy was one of the
20	engineering contractors that went on board to try to
21	get the regulatory issues and quality issues squared
22	away and the project bought online, and it was.
23	Q. When did you begin being involved?
24	A. '84 through 1986, I think.
25	Q. And what was the status of that project in

	19
1	1986, do you know that?
2	A. I would say that status is debatable. TVA
3	at that time felt the project was complete, but that
4	project went on, I think it eventually came online,
5	my recollection is 1996. It took a long time to get
6	that project squared away and completed.
7	Q. So TVA was the owner, right?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. And then you were a consultant for the
10	owner; is that right?
11	A. Correct.
12	Q. What were the problems during that ten-year,
13	generally? What were the problems in that ten-year
14	period between when you left and when it became
15	operational?
16	A. Oh, after I left, you're talking about?
17	Q. After you left.
18	A. I don't really know the details of what the
19	issues were, but there continued to be some of the
20	problems that we were familiar with. They had to do
21	a lot of electrical cable replacements, they had
22	damaged the cable in the initial pulling, and they
23	had overloaded the cable trays and there were
24	multiple issues, that's just one of them.
25	There were issues relative to piping

	20
1	quality, the piping had to be replaced. And so there
2	were multiple issues that went on and on with the
3	plant that caused the problems.
4	Q. Same question there: Do you recall the
5	contractor?
6	A. No, I do not.
7	Q. What about the technology?
8	A. The technology was also a Westinghouse PWR.
9	Q. That's four. Any other nuclear construction
10	projects?
11	A. Not in the phases of construction.
12	Internationally, I have participated in preliminary
13	safety analysis reviews, those kinds of things, but
14	not strictly on construction.
15	Similar to construction though were restart
16	activities which involved
17	Q. What exactly are restart activities?
18	A. Restart activities are an operating plant
19	that has been shut down, usually for regulatory
20	quality issues, and either operational quality
21	concerns or actual physical concerns in the project.
22	Q. How many of those restart issues, restart
23	projects, have you been involved with?
24	A. Two of those. The first was LaSalle County.
25	Commonwealth Edison. As a system, they had quality

	21
1	issues in their operations, and Admiral Oliver
2	Kingsley was brought in to bring that utility back
3	into quality compliance with the NRC. There was a
4	lot of organizational changes made.
5	They had a I think they volunteered to
6	shut down the plant, but I think they did get a
7	confirmatory letter from the NRC telling them to stay
8	shut down until they got the problems resolved. So I
9	led the, again, the Sargent & Lundy team that helped
10	them do the modifications that they needed to do to
11	get in compliance with the NRC regulations and to get
12	the plant restarted.
13	Q. You said there was one other restart?
14	A. Yeah. That was the D.C. Cook plant in
15	Michigan. That's also a Westinghouse pressurized
16	water reactor.
17	Pretty much the same situation there. The
18	owner of that plant was oh, wait a minute. It
19	slips my mind right now but I will think of it in a
20	minute.
21	Q. So fair to say that you have been involved
22	in probably five or six, depending on how you want to
23	count LaSalle County, instances where you were
24	attempting to take a nuclear reactor that was either
25	in construction or out of service and make it so that

	22
1	it could be in service; is that right?
2	A. I think generally that's an accurate
3	characterization.
4	Q. Of those instances, let's see, three
5	Marble Hill because it was abandoned, LaSalle County
6	because it was shut down, and the D.C. Cook plant
7	because it was shut down, had completely fallen out
8	of service or were never completed; it's in
9	construction, right?
10	A. When you say "completely fallen out of
11	service," you mean
12	Q. Yes.
13	A they weren't operating at the time?
14	Q. They weren't operating at the time.
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. All right. And then Watts Bar had a
17	ten-year, I will use the term saga, of construction
18	problems after you left?
19	A. That's basically the case. It was ten years
20	before they came online and generated power.
21	Q. So you would agree with me, would you not,
22	that constructing and maintaining operational nuclear
23	reactors is extremely complicated; is that right?
24	A. I would agree with that, yes.
25	Q. And often, once construction begins, events

	23
1	occur that either make it no longer feasible to
2	complete construction or require that units no longer
3	be maintained and in operation?
4	A. I would change that to say events may occur.
5	Q. And then I think over half of the projects
6	that you were involved in, they in fact did occur?
7	A. I would characterize shutdown as different
8	than abandonment, but there were quality issues on
9	quality issues and operational issues on those plants
10	that were in fact required restart, yes.
11	Q. So you were engaged on behalf of the owners
12	in each of these instances, right?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. And the owners incurred costs in connection
15	with the construction of Marble Hill, right, the
16	owners incurred costs that were associated with that?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Some of the billions of dollars that you
19	referred to earlier?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. And the owners of the D.C. Cook plant and
22	the LaSalle County, from the time that they were no
23	longer operational until the time that they became
24	operational, also incurred costs, correct?
25	A. Yes.

	24
1	Q. Are you aware of whether those costs were
2	ever covered by ratepayers of any of those owners?
3	A. Not specifically, no. And not the amounts
4	that were covered.
5	Q. Is that you're not aware or
6	A. I'm not aware.
7	Q. Would it be your expectation that at least
8	certain of those costs were covered by ratepayers?
9	A. I can't really say how the rates, the costs
10	were handled, because that was not part of my
11	purview, so I am not familiar with that at all.
12	Q. Mr. Jones, for purposes of the project,
13	which I will refer to today, when I use that term, I
14	mean the construction of Units 2 and 3 at the V.C.
15	Summer Nuclear Plant; is that fair?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. We'll understand I'm talking about the
18	project when I use that excuse me. I'll say that
19	better.
20	We will understand that I am referring to
21	that construction project when I use the term
22	"project" throughout the day today. Okay?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. So you were engaged on behalf of the Office
25	of Regulatory Staff in connect with the project; is

	25
1	that right?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. You were engaged in August of 2011, correct?
4	A. That's correct.
5	Q. What, to your knowledge, led to your
6	engagement?
7	A. I can't really I know they were looking
8	for someone with nuclear background to monitor, to
9	help them monitor the construction activities and
10	budget of the plant, and applied for the position and
11	was interviewed and they selected me.
12	Q. So how did you become aware of this position
13	being open?
14	A. I actually became aware of the position
15	through a colleague of mine from Sargent & Lundy who
16	had worked for a number of years in South Carolina,
17	exclusively on fossil plants, and primarily for
18	Santee Cooper. He and I actually proposed to do this
19	assignment jointly; he as a resident of South
20	Carolina, he lives in Charleston; and the division of
21	labor was going to be he was going to he was
22	well-versed in construction, so he was going to
23	monitor construction and the, quote, nuclear parts of
24	it. I was going to review the documentation
25	associated with the regulatory issues, the things

	26
1	that got into detail on the system design, those
2	kinds of things I was going to look at.
3	Q. Who is this individual? What's his name?
4	A. Eric Bergstrom.
5	Q. How do you spell his last name?
6	A. $B-E-R-G-S-T-R-O-M$.
7	Q. How did you guys arrive at that division of
8	labor?
9	A. It was fairly an obvious division of labor.
10	My background was nuclear, his was power plant design
11	and construction on the fossil basis, so it was a
12	natural outfall of those capabilities.
13	Q. How did you submit did you well, let
14	me ask you this way: Did you submit a proposal to
15	the ORS with Mr. Bergstrom?
16	A. Yes, we did, yes.
17	Q. And what form did that proposal take?
17 18	Q. And what form did that proposal take? A. I believe it was just a letter outlining
18	A. I believe it was just a letter outlining
18 19	A. I believe it was just a letter outlining our including each of our CVs and the manner in
18 19 20	A. I believe it was just a letter outlining our including each of our CVs and the manner in which we intended to approach the work, divide up the
18 19 20 21	A. I believe it was just a letter outlining our including each of our CVs and the manner in which we intended to approach the work, divide up the work.
18 19 20 21 22	A. I believe it was just a letter outlining our including each of our CVs and the manner in which we intended to approach the work, divide up the work. Q. Do you still have that letter or a copy of

	27
1	A. I don't really recall that either. It was
2	whoever was actually, at that time, Mr. Bergstrom
3	had the lead on this project, so he handled the
4	contact initially.
5	Q. Then you said you were interviewed following
6	this letter?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Do you recall who interviewed you?
9	A. Not specifically, but I think I did talk to
10	Mr. Scott and Shannon Hudson, and I think Anthony
11	James, so several people at ORS.
12	Q. You said Mr. Scott; is that Dukes Scott?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Did they describe to you precisely what role
15	you should have on the project?
16	A. Precisely, I'm not sure. In general, they
17	said that they were looking for someone to help them
18	monitor the construction activities and the budget of
19	the project.
20	Q. Did they tell you why that position was
21	necessary?
22	A. Well, it's their statutory responsibility to
23	do that as ORS, and they felt that they needed an
24	outside expert to supplement their capabilities to do
25	that.

	28
1	Q. And you and Mr. Bergstrom believed that you
2	were qualified, capable, to complete the task the ORS
3	had prescribed; is that right?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. Now, Mr. Bergstrom did not actually become
6	engaged; is that right?
7	A. No, he did not.
8	Q. Why not?
9	A. Well, it's somewhat embarrassing, I would
10	say, because ORS contacted me and informed me that
11	they just wanted me, and that caused an embarrassing
12	conversation with Mr. Bergstrom on my behalf. And I
13	tried to impress upon them "them" meaning ORS
14	that we thought that the best approach would be for
15	both of us to handle this assignment because he was
16	more readily available, a South Carolina resident, to
17	monitor the construction activities, but they just
18	wanted me.
19	And so eventually I told Eric that I was
20	really interested in this assignment because it was
21	one of only two nuclear plants in the U.S. to be
22	considered in about 30 years, so it was an important
23	assignment for me personally to be involved in a new
24	nuclear plant.
25	Q. Did ORS tell you why they were just

	29
1	interested in you?
2	A. Not specifically. It was my background
3	was nuclear, and that's what they were looking for.
4	Q. Did you have any concerns about your ability
5	to complete the task ORS put before you in light of
6	the fact that Mr. Bergstrom wasn't going to be
7	involved?
8	A. Not really. The only real concern I had was
9	coming out of Chicago. But I had as much
10	construction experience as Eric. So it wasn't a
11	matter of capability or qualifications for it; it was
12	just a matter of, more of availability. And then it
13	turns out that that wasn't really a major issue at
14	all.
15	Q. So you believe you were capable and
16	qualified to carry out the tasks the ORS put before
17	you?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. What are the terms of your engagement with
20	the ORS?
21	A. Could you expand on what you mean by that?
22	Q. Sure. Is there some sort of engagement
23	letter between you and the ORS?
24	A. Yes, there is.
25	Q. That engagement letter well, do you have

	30
1	a copy of that engagement letter?
2	A. Not with me, but I have it in my files, yes.
3	Q. Do you know whether or not that engagement
4	letter was produced to us in connection with the
5	subpoena that was served on you?
6	A. Yes. Well, no, I don't. I provided it to
7	my attorneys as part of the files I had on the
8	project, and I don't know whether they submitted it
9	or not.
10	Q. Fair enough. That engagement letter
11	includes provisions that allow you to be paid,
12	doesn't it?
13	A. Yes, it does.
14	Q. What are the terms, what are the payment
15	terms?
16	A. The payment terms are fees and expenses.
17	Q. So how do you differentiate between the two;
18	what are fees and expenses, in your mind?
19	A. Fees are the professional fees that I charge
20	on an hourly basis for my services, and expenses are
21	expenses I incur in travel and what other
22	miscellaneous expenses; for example, document
23	mailings that require special shipment, those kinds
24	of things.
25	O. So any expenses you incur in connection with

	31
1	your role as a consultant for the ORS are to be paid
2	back to you; is that right?
3	A. I would not say "any expenses." There are
4	some limitations on the expenses.
5	Q. Like what?
6	A. There is ORS regulations limit meal
7	expenses to \$32 a day, so that's what I submit, and
8	it's not usually what I pay for my meals, as you can
9	see. But the other part goes into my account as
10	business expenses, unbilled business expenses.
11	Q. Fair enough. And then what are your fees;
12	is it an hourly basis?
13	A. Yes, it is.
14	Q. How much per hour?
15	A. Current fee is \$275 an hour. It started out
16	at \$250 an hour.
17	Q. So you're still being paid by the ORS; is
18	that right?
19	A. I'm still being paid under the terms of the
20	ORS contract. The actual payment comes from is it
21	statutorial? Yeah, I believe it comes from South
22	Carolina Electric & Gas.
23	Q. Right, I was going to get to that question.
24	So your time here today you are charging to
25	the ORS at \$275 an hour; is that right?

	32
1	A. Most certainly.
2	Q. What about travel time, do you bill travel
3	time?
4	A. I do not.
5	Q. So it is your understanding then that SCE&G
6	actually pays the fees that you incur on behalf of
7	the ORS; is that right?
8	A. That is my understanding. And the wire
9	transfer comes from SCANA/SCE&G, so that pretty well
10	confirms it.
11	Q. Is it true that you submit invoices to SCE&G
12	for time you spend on the project?
13	A. That is correct.
14	Q. How do you go about determining the content
15	of the invoices that you provide? Let me describe it
16	a little bit better.
17	So lawyers are very familiar with invoices,
18	and we actually track specific tasks that we are
19	engaged in and provide information related to those
20	tasks with our invoices. Do you do the same?
21	A. I do.
22	Q. Has there ever been a change in your
23	practice in that regard during your time in the
24	project?
25	A. Not a change in my practice but there has

	33
1	been a change in what's submitted in my invoices.
2	Q. Why?
3	A. I have really no idea.
4	Q. When did that
5	A. I'm sorry. My understanding was that they
6	wanted to simplify the invoices.
7	Q. When did that change occur?
8	A. I don't recall specifically, but it's been
9	some time. It's been maybe two years, two and a half
10	years. I don't recall specifically when that
11	happened.
12	Q. What do you you described generally, but
13	do you recall anything more specific about the nature
14	of the change?
15	A. Well, the nature of the change. Previously
16	I submitted an invoice that was detailed in that it
17	provided the date of the work I performed, the title
18	of the work or the task I was performing, the hours
19	spent on that task, then the rate, hourly rate times
20	the charges, and then a detailed expense report that
21	provide the breakdown of airfare, car rental, room,
22	meals, miscellaneous expenses, taxi, miscellaneous
23	expenses. So there was a there was an expense
24	report that was an attachment to that invoice that
25	dave those details

	34
1	So all that I still do, and it's primarily
2	for my own records, but the invoice that I submit now
3	is a simplified letter, what I call letter invoice
4	that breaks down my charges for professional fees and
5	expenses, and then the combination of the two.
6	Q. So it's just a summary of this is how much
7	in professional fees, this is how much in expenses?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. You said you still have the more detailed
10	breakdown; is that correct?
11	A. That is correct.
12	Q. Do you know whether or not you produced that
13	to your counsel?
14	A. I did.
15	Q. Do you know, as we sit here today, whether
16	that was produced to SCE&G in response to the
17	subpoena?
18	A. I don't know that, no.
19	Q. Do your records, not the summary invoices,
20	but do your records reflect individuals with whom you
21	may have met in connection with the project?
22	A. In general, yes. If it's I used to
23	provide a fairly detailed breakdown that was
24	designated as an attachment, one which the primary
25	attachment was the monthly meetings that I had, that

	35
1	I had at the site with SCANA and SCE&G people, and
2	those attendees were designated on that. It was
3	basically, I would say, a modified copy of the agenda
4	that included all the people that attended.
5	In addition, I provided, if there were major
6	conference calls, the attendees on the conference
7	calls. The more recent invoices now usually just
8	designate ORS people, and the attendees are on my
9	note that I keep of the meetings.
10	Q. Do you make it a practice to reflect the
11	topics discussed in meetings in your detailed
12	records?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. You said that there was a time where it was
15	directed to you to provide a summary invoice as
16	opposed to the more detailed invoices; is that right?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Who gave you that direction?
19	A. That came from Shannon, Shannon Hudson. She
20	was my primary contact for contractual and
21	administrative-type issues.
22	Q. Do you recall specifically what Ms. Hudson
23	relayed to you on this point?
24	A. Other than not specifically. But in
25	general, it was they wanted to simplify. We had some

	36
1	issues relative to minor variances on the issues
2	on the invoices, like 32 cents one time and a dollar
3	and, you know, things like that that would I do
4	these things myself, so it would generate a whole new
5	invoice. So they decided that it was much easier to
6	simplify them and go to this easier format. And what
7	she indicated to me at the time was that SCANA and
8	SCE&G were very agreeable to that; they did not want
9	the detailed invoices.
10	MR. COX: Jon, if I could
11	interject for one minute. I wanted to make a
12	statement for the record that, although Shannon
13	Hudson was an attorney for the ORS, ORS
14	understands that some of the communication she
15	had with Mr. Jones were not for the purpose of
16	legal advice. Some of those conversations may
17	have been, but some were not. Therefore, I will
18	not be objecting to questions about the
19	communications between the witness and Ms. Hudson
20	that I don't believe implicate attorney-client
21	private.
22	MR. CHALLY: Okay.
23	BY MR. CHALLY:
24	Q. Did you ever have a discussion with anyone
25	affiliated with SCANA or SCE&G about this change in

	37
1	practice?
2	A. I did not.
3	Q. Just so I understand, you said there were
4	variances at 32 cents or a dollar. What do you mean
5	by "variances"?
6	A. Errors in addition or, you know, simple,
7	like, transposition, instead of 23 cents it was 32
8	cents, that kind of thing, so
9	Q. So if you were shorted, you needed to submit
10	an additional invoice for the additional; if you were
11	over, you needed to re-evaluate that for the next
12	month; is that kind of how it went?
13	A. Yes. And we had discussions about I'm
14	willing to forego the dollar instead of redoing all
15	my invoices, please, but I had to redo my invoices.
16	And I should also probably add that invoices
17	are not charged either, preparation of invoices.
18	Q. So do you recall anything else about the
19	reasons why there was a change in your invoicing
20	practices?
21	A. No.
22	Q. Did anyone ever convey to you in any way
23	that the change in the invoice practice was intended
24	to shield certain detailed information from SCANA or
25	SCE &G?

	38
1	A. No.
2	Q. It did in fact shield that detailed
3	information from SCANA and SCE&G did it not?
4	MR. COX: Object to the form.
5	THE WITNESS: It changed the
6	information that was provided. I would not
7	characterize it as shielding it, no.
8	BY MR. CHALLY:
9	Q. Fair enough. And following this, SCANA and
10	SCE&G received substantially less information as to
11	the nature of your work than they had previously,
12	right?
13	A. That's probably fair to say, yes.
14	Q. They would have no longer been able to see,
15	for instance, who you were meeting with in connection
16	with the project, correct?
17	A. That's true. The names were no longer
18	provided.
19	Q. And they would have no longer been able to
20	determine the subject of the meetings that you were
21	having, right?
22	A. Correct, but most of the time what we're
23	talking about is meetings with them, so
24	Q. I believe you said that your testimony was
25	that more recently your meetings are much more

	39
1	commonly with ORS than other individuals, right?
2	A. That is correct.
3	Q. And you did meet with, for instance, the
4	South Carolina Energy Users Committee and the
5	Electrical Cooperatives and various other people not
6	being SCANA and SCE&G, right?
7	A. Those people had been present at meetings
8	that I was attending, yes.
9	Q. Mr. Jones, so I don't think I asked you: Do
10	you recall whether your engagement articulates what
11	you are being hired to do specifically?
12	A. I think there is a general statement of my
13	scope of work.
14	Q. What's your recollection of that general
15	statement?
16	A. Beyond the monitoring construction and
17	budget, I don't recall the specifics of what that
18	engagement letter says.
19	Q. So what, generally, is your understanding
20	then of what you were asked to do?
21	A. Generally, it was to have periodic status
22	meetings with SCE&G managers and others on site, to
23	tour the site periodically, to participate in
24	preparation of reports that ORS made on the project
25	to participate in preparation of testimony, to

	40
1	testify to prepare testimony, testify before the
2	PSC, Public Service Commission, if required. I think
3	that covers my recollection.
4	Q. I believe I have seen it in some of the
5	testimony you have submitted that you understood your
6	role to be ongoing monitoring of the construction of
7	the plant and expenditure of capital through review
8	and audit of the quarterly reports under BLRA. Does
9	that sound right?
10	A. I would say the audit function was not my
11	function; the audit function was the audit function
12	of ORS. But in the interpretation of reviewing the
13	construction, I mean, the budgetary expenditures,
14	that's correct.
15	Q. So then your role included, did it not,
16	reviewing the company's ability to adhere to the
17	approved construction schedule on approved capital
18	cost estimates?
19	A. "Company's ability." I would not say review
20	the company's ability. It was to review what was
21	actually done, not necessarily their ability to do
22	it. It was to review the results.
23	Q. So you didn't view your function as
24	determining, at least in part, whether the company
25	would be able to meet the projections that it was

	41
1	suggesting?
2	A. Yes, I think I it would have included did
3	they have action plans in place and strategies in
4	place and that kind of thing in order to be able to
5	meet those. Did they have a schedule in place to do
6	that, those kinds of things? Yes.
7	Q. So that's a role you took seriously, right?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And you used your experience and the methods
10	available to you to collect information that you
11	thought was important to allow you to carry out that
12	responsibility, right?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And it led you to have access to information
15	regarding the project, didn't it?
16	A. It did.
17	Q. And you were involved in monthly site tours;
18	is that right?
19	A. For the most part monthly, yes; not strictly
20	monthly but for the most part, yes.
21	Q. Were there instances where they were more
22	frequent than monthly?
23	A. Yes, and there were instances where they
24	were not, like, I sometimes was on vacation.
25	Q. But absent you being on vacation, you were

	42
1	involved with monthly site tours of the project, of
2	the site; is that right?
3	A. In general, the plan was to do the site
4	tours monthly, correct.
5	Q. And then you were also involved in certain
6	plan-of-the-day meetings, weren't you?
7	A. I was not.
8	Q. You were never involved in plan-of-the-day
9	meetings?
10	A. I was not.
11	Q. Never attended a single plan-of-the-day
12	meeting?
13	A. Not to my recollection, I don't believe so,
14	no. Those meetings were attended by Mr. Gene Soult
15	of the ORS.
16	THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry,
17	Mr. Gene?
18	THE WITNESS: S-O-U-L-T, Soult.
19	BY MR. CHALLY:
20	Q. Did you receive reports on those meetings?
21	A. I did when there were well, I also was
22	able to review the notes of those meetings, but I did
23	not attend them. And if there were important issues
24	that were brought up, Gene would advise both me and
25	the other ORS team members of the results of those

	43
1	meetings that were significant.
2	Q. So to your knowledge, anything significant,
3	anything that Mr. Soult considered to be significant,
4	he conveyed to you from these meetings; is that
5	right?
6	A. As far as I know, yes.
7	Q. You said he would have also conveyed this to
8	the ORS team. Who is the ORS team?
9	MR. COX: Object to the form.
10	THE WITNESS: Pardon?
11	MR. COX: I object to the form.
12	BY MR. CHALLY:
13	Q. You can answer the question, if you're able.
14	A. Okay. It varied throughout the project, but
15	in general it was Ms. Allyn Powell. She was the ORS
16	lead, ORS representative of the team. But people
17	were Kelvin Major represented the audit function
18	for a time. Ms. Gabby Smith was also present. So
19	the team varied throughout my tenure on the project,
20	but usually there was an audit person from ORS and
21	the lead ORS person and Gene and myself.
22	And that also varied. There were times when
23	other people from other parts of ORS would also
24	attend, but, in general, that was the team make-up.
25	Q. So Ms. Powell, Mr. Soult and yourself were

	44
1	consistent members of that team; is that right?
2	A. Pretty much, yes.
3	Q. And you freely shared information amongst
4	yourself related to the project?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Amongst yourselves related to the project.
7	Excuse me.
8	So in addition to receiving notes from
9	plan-of-the-day meetings, you received weekly reports
10	on the status of the project, didn't you?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. What were those weekly reports?
13	A. Well, there was a weekly construction status
14	report. Most of the project documents were made
15	available to me through access to a Share File site.
16	So those documents were put on the Share File site,
17	and I could review them as required.
18	Q. Did you ever have any problems accessing the
19	Share File site?
20	A. A couple of times, but most of the time it
21	was some glitch.
22	Q. Did the fact that you were able to review
23	that material on a Share File site in any way
24	restrict your ability to carry out the responsibility
25	ORS had put to you?

	45
1	A. I don't understand that question. Repeat.
2	Q. Yeah. Did the fact that you were required
3	to review this material through the Share File site
4	restrict in any way your ability to carry out the
5	responsibility ORS had put to you?
6	A. I would answer that this way: The
7	information that was put on the Share File site I
8	assumed was complete and, therefore, the information
9	that I reviewed that was on the site did not in any
10	way restrict my ability.
11	Q. And the fact that you reviewed the
12	information through a Share File site and not in some
13	other way was just as fine to you
14	A. Yes.
15	Q right?
16	Okay. So in addition to weekly status
17	reports, you received various monthly reports on the
18	status of the project, right?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. I'm going to rattle off a few. Tell me if
21	you recall receiving these and if you recall any
22	others.
23	BLRA Milestone Tracking Report?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Commercial Issues Log?

	46
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Status reports directly from the Consortium
3	members?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. Did you receive information on staffing
6	metrics on the project?
7	A. In general, yes.
8	Q. Productivity reports?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Did you receive minutes of project review
11	meetings?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Did these productivity reports reflect
14	productivity factor?
15	A. They do.
16	Q. So how often did you receive reports of the
17	productivity factors?
18	A. Monthly.
19	Q. And then is that historical productivity
20	factors? In other words, what did you understand the
21	information related to productivity factors to convey
22	to you?
23	A. They presented current information and
24	historical information. I don't remember how far
25	back they took it, but there was some historical

	47
1	information available with productivity factors and
2	the current productivity factors.
3	Q. So it was a productivity factor, for
4	instance, the last month; is that correct?
5	A. Usually it was for the previous month, so
6	they were, like, lagging a month, but, yes.
7	Q. Do you recall seeing information on
8	productivity factors from inception to the time of
9	the report?
10	A. I do not recall seeing them from time of
11	inception, because my recollection is that those
12	reports did not start at inception; they started
13	later in the project when there were increased
14	demands for information.
15	Q. Do you know who requested, who asserted that
16	increased demand for information?
17	A. No, I do not.
18	Q. Was it the ORS or someone else?
19	A. Well, I mean, we certainly were looking for
20	additional information, but it didn't come about as a
21	result of our request.
22	Q. Are you aware of information related to
23	productivity factors that you didn't receive through
24	the reports that you had available to you?
25	A. I don't know quite how to answer that. How

	48
1	can I be aware of information that I didn't receive?
2	Q. Well, we're now a year and four months after
3	the abandonment of the project. So, now, sitting
4	here today, are you aware of information related to
5	productivity factors that you did not receive?
6	A. You're talking about through the discovery
7	process?
8	Q. In any way.
9	A. No, I don't think that I'm aware of
10	productivity factor information that I didn't
11	receive.
12	Q. Did you receive minutes of project review
13	meetings?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Did you receive schedule reports from the
16	scheduling software that the Consortium used?
17	A. I would characterize that as, periodically,
18	we did receive the schedule was a very complex
19	piece of software, so there were there was
20	schedule information provided, usually somewhat
21	restrictive on, like, 90-day lookaheads or two-week
22	lookaheads, those kinds of things, in general the
23	information that we received.
24	Q. And that was through the software,
25	scheduling software, Primavera; does that sound

	49
1	familiar to you?
2	A. Well, that's I'm sorry. That's what
3	generated the information, but we did not receive it
4	through that software; we received hard copies,
5	usually through status reports.
6	Q. Did you also receive risk and mitigation
7	reports?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Any other reports that you recall receiving
10	on a monthly basis related to the status of the
11	project?
12	A. There were many, many reports. We got
13	status of the ITACC, OTC that's the reports of the
14	NRC. You had to make submittals to the NRC when you
15	completed a specific task, and then they would decide
16	on it. So we got those, we got licensing amendment
17	requests, status reports. There are many other
18	specialty-type status reports that were also
19	provided.
20	Q. You said that I believe you said that the
21	schedule was created using this complex software; is
22	that right?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. And you're familiar with scheduling efforts
25	related to nuclear construction projects, right?

	50
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. That's a very complicated task, isn't it?
3	A. Yes, it is.
4	Q. And can you provide some additional color on
5	that? How do you understand schedules to be created
6	in light of that?
7	A. Schedules are built up from tasks that have
8	to be performed. So you define the task that you're
9	going to do, then you look at what are called
10	precursors, which are things that have to be done
11	before that task. In order to enable you to do that
12	task, you provide a linkage in the schedule to that
13	precursor. There are successor activities that the
14	activity that you're talking about or the task that
15	you're talking about, the successor activities
16	require that the task that you're discussing be
17	completed before those successor activities can be
18	performed.
19	So in a fully integrated resource loaded
20	schedule, you look at the task, you look at the
21	resources that are provided or need to be provided to
22	do the task, you utilize production rates; in other
23	words, how long does it take someone to do a weld,
24	how long does it take someone to pull a cable, those
25	kinds of things.

	51
1	So we look at the staffing levels that you
2	have got. You also need to take into account that
3	whether or not you can apply all the resources at
4	that in order to do that task at the time you want
5	to do it. In other words, in some cases, there's not
6	enough room in the plant to expand it to do the work
7	at the time that you would like to do it; you just
8	can't get that many people into the area. So you
9	have to take that into account.
10	You link these together through the
11	precursor successor activities, and you build a
12	schedule on that basis that defines, ultimately
13	defines both the critical path, meaning what's the
14	most important work that you have to do, and the
15	final completion date of the project.
16	Q. In a project like this project, isn't it
17	true that completion of the schedule requires a
18	significant amount of time and effort?
19	A. To complete the schedule?
20	Q. Yes.
21	A. Do you mean just to build the schedule?
22	Q. To build the schedule.
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. For a project of this sort, is the schedule
25	prepared with sort of a month's worth of effort

	52
1	likely to be sufficient, in your view?
2	A. No.
3	Q. Is a schedule prepared with less than ten
4	people being involved in the preparation of the
5	schedule likely to be sufficient for a project like
6	this?
7	A. In that case, I would say it depends on who
8	the people are, the qualifications of the people.
9	Q. Are you familiar with different descriptions
10	of schedule methodology? So, for instance, are you
11	familiar with what's referred to as a Level 2
12	schedule for construction projects?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And what is your view of a Level 2 schedule?
15	A. A Level 2 schedule basically provides you
16	with the most important milestones of the schedule.
17	If you start with a Level 1, Level 1 is strictly
18	milestones; it gives you no indication of what
19	activities are required to do that. Level 2 schedule
20	expands the level of detail in that to the point of
21	essentially identifying the important precursor and
22	successor activities associated with those
23	milestones.
24	Q. Is a Level 2 schedule a sufficient schedule
25	for identifying well, let me put it this way: Is

	53
1	a Level 2 schedule a fully integrated resource loaded
2	schedule?
3	A. No.
4	Q. It is substantially less than that, isn't
5	it?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Do you have an understanding as to what
8	effort is required, what information is required, to
9	go from a Level 2 schedule to a fully integrated
10	resource loaded schedule for a project like this?
11	A. Again, it depends on the resources
12	resources, I mean the scheduling resources, the
13	experience of the schedulers involved, and the
14	information that they have available to them to do
15	it. But it's an effort that takes some while to do.
16	Q. If you were doing a schedule, if you were
17	doing a schedule that you intended to be reliable for
18	purposes of the project, how long do you think it
19	would take you?
20	A. I would not undertake it myself solely. If
21	you're talking about when I was at Sargent & Lundy
22	and I had a scheduling team available to me to
23	develop a schedule, I would say an initial cut on a
24	fully integrated schedule for a project would
25	probably be three to six months.

	54
1	Q. And how many people would you have deployed
2	at Sargent & Lundy to do this sort of task?
3	A. I would have about ten.
4	Q. So ten people fully dedicated for three to
5	six months; is that right?
6	A. Yes. And that's the initial, the initial
7	schedule, not the update.
8	Q. So that would have been just a first cut; is
9	what you said?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And this is something that would have had to
12	have been refined and updated after that first cut,
13	right?
14	A. The schedule on a nuclear project is refined
15	all through the project. Things happen that have to
16	be modified, so it has to be updated throughout the
17	life of the project.
18	Q. So while you were at Sargent & Lundy, what,
19	did you charge an hourly rate?
20	A. To the clients?
21	Q. Yes.
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. What was your hourly rate?
24	A. At the end of my career, my hourly rate was
25	\$250.

	55
1	Q. So was your rate in line with the ten
2	schedulers that you would have put to a project like
3	this in trying to develop a schedule as you
4	described?
5	A. Did you
6	Q. Yeah, I'm just trying to get a ballpark. If
7	you, while at Sargent & Lundy, were trying to create
8	this first cut of a schedule, you said you would have
9	ten people for three to six months working fully
10	dedicated to this effort. I'm trying to get a sense
11	for what cost that would have created.
12	A. No, I was a principal in the firm at Sargent
13	& Lundy, I was one of the owners of the firm, and my
14	title was Senior Vice President and Project Director,
15	so my rate was not representative of what the rate
16	would have been for what a scheduler would get.
17	I can't totally but it would be in the
18	range of senior schedulers get the rate charged
19	to the client would be about, I would say, \$150 an
20	hour; the rate for more junior schedulers would be in
21	the range of \$100 an hour.
22	Q. How many senior schedulers would you have
23	needed to do this first cut of scheduling?
24	A. Probably two.
25	Q. And then the rest were more junior

	56
1	schedulers?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. So when we said fully dedicated to this
4	effort for three to six months, are you imagining
5	that as an eight-hour day?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Five days a week?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And then would we also, if we were trying to
10	ballpark the cost of this first cut schedule, we
11	would have to include the ten people; two at \$150 an
12	hour, eight at \$100 an hour, and then your time as
13	well; is that right?
14	A. My time would not have been dedicated
15	full-time to doing it. I would have been reviewing
16	it on a periodic basis.
17	MR. COX: Do you need a break,
18	Mr. Jones?
19	THE WITNESS: I need some more
20	water.
21	MR. CHALLY: Sure, we can take a
22	short break.
23	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
24	off the record at 10:46 a.m.
25	(A recess was taken.)

	57
1	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
2	back on the record at 10:59 a.m.
3	BY MR. CHALLY:
4	Q. Mr. Jones, I wanted to do a little math with
5	you here. I'm happy to give you a calculator if it
6	would help. But why don't I just do that. I'm going
7	to give you the calculator app on my phone. Okay?
8	There you go.
9	What I want to do is just figure out math
10	for this scheduling exercise that we were talking
11	about before we took a break. And I'm going to tell
12	you how I worked through it, and I just want you to
13	tell me if I messed something up.
14	So we had assumed ten schedulers to this
15	effort; eight junior at a rate of, I think we said
16	\$100 an hour; two senior at a rate of \$150 an hour,
17	right? Okay. So this is ten people. We're talking
18	about an eight hour day; is that right?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. So eight hours a day, times five days a
21	week; would that be right?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And then we're assuming four weeks in a
24	month; is that correct?
25	A. Yes.

		58
1	Q.	Roughly?
2	Α.	Roughly, yes.
3	Q.	And then you said it would take at least
4	three mo	onths to do this process?
5	Α.	Uh-huh.
6	Q.	Is that right?
7	А.	Yes.
8	Q.	So let's just get a monthly fee for this.
9	Eight ho	ours, times five days a week, times four weeks
10	a month,	I believe that 160 hours, right?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	For eight people, that is how many hours?
13	Α.	1,280.
14	Q.	Times \$100 an hour, that's \$128,000, right?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	So that's the eight junior schedulers. And
17	then we	would have two senior schedulers?
18	Α.	Right.
19	Q.	So that's 160 hours a month, times two, 320,
20	right?	
21	А.	Yes.
22	Q.	Times \$150 an hour. And that's \$48,000 a
23	month?	
24	А.	Correct.
25	Q.	So the cost per month would be \$128,000 plus

	59
1	\$48,000, right?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. So \$176,000?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And then if it was just a three-month
6	process, you're looking at somewhere in the
7	neighborhood of \$528,000, right?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And then if it stretched to six months, it
10	would be over a million dollars just to do the first
11	cut of the schedule?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And that wouldn't include any of your time?
14	A. Right.
15	Q. And it wouldn't include any other time
16	associated with managing a project of this sort,
17	right?
18	A. Right.
19	Q. Nor would it include any time associated
20	with assessing a project of this sort or assessing
21	the status of a project of this sort; is that right?
22	A. Yes, sir.
23	Q. Okay. Thank you.
24	We were talking, before we got into this
25	discussion of the schedule, we were talking about

	60
1	certain monthly reports that you received while you
2	were while you were consulting on the project. In
3	addition to these monthly reports, you received
4	certain quarterly reports, didn't you?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. What quarterly reports do you recall
7	receiving?
8	A. Well, in general, there was an SCE&G
9	quarterly report that was filed up until at least
10	during part of the project life. ORS also produced a
11	quarterly report, which I participated in preparing,
12	primarily based on the review of the SCE&G quarterly
13	report.
14	Q. Didn't you also have access to all invoices
15	that were paid by SCE&G in connection with the
16	project?
17	A. I did have access, but invoices were not
18	part of my scope of review. That was handled, the
19	review of the invoices, was handled by the audit
20	group of the ORS.
21	Q. Okay.
22	A. It's not to say that I did not occasionally
23	look at invoices, but it was not a regular
24	assignment.
25	O. While you were consulting on the projects

	61
1	and by that, what I am referring to is the time
2	before abandonment are you aware of any
3	restrictions or limitations on the information you
4	were able to receive?
5	A. While I was working on the project?
6	Q. Right.
7	A. Is that the question?
8	Q. That is the question.
9	A. The only restrictions I'm aware of are some
10	that would have been imposed for highly confidential
11	financial information that I think, in some cases,
12	dealing with financial analysts and that kind of
13	thing, so that I was not privy to.
14	Q. Was that information related to the project
15	specifically?
16	A. It could have been.
17	Q. Let me ask it this way: Did you ever ask
18	for information and the response back from SCE&G was
19	you cannot have it?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. What was that information?
22	A. The one that comes immediately to mind is
23	the Bechtel report.
24	Q. Do you recall specifically asking for the
25	Bechtel report?

	62
1	A. I did not ask for the Bechtel report. I
2	asked for any written report that was produced from
3	the Bechtel assessment.
4	Q. When did you ask for a written report
5	resulting from the Bechtel assessment?
6	A. The first time was October 27th or 28th
7	during our meetings, regular monthly meetings I'm
8	sorry, I need the year too of 2015 during our
9	regular monthly meetings with SCE&G.
10	Q. Who did you direct that request to?
11	A. The request was directed to Skip Smith.
12	Q. Do you know whether there was a report that
13	existed in October of 2015?
14	A. I do now.
15	Q. You do now?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. You now know that there was not a report
18	that existed in October of 2015?
19	A. No, I would dispute that. There were weekly
20	summaries which were written reports which were
21	submitted to SCE&G that existed in written form and
22	were available at that time.
23	Q. What do you recall Mr. Smith's response to
24	be to your request?
25	A. The response came from two sources; it was

	63
1	Mr. Smith and Shirley Johnson. Mr. Smith indicated
2	that there was no written report available. And we
3	asked about the assessment. He said he was not aware
4	of the results of the assessment, and it was
5	performed at a high level for the company beyond
6	essentially something along the lines of above his
7	paygrade, and that it was not available, and to his
8	understanding there would not be a written report.
9	Q. And that's what you received that's the
10	information you received from Mr. Smith?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. You said you separately had discussion with
13	Shirley Johnson on this topic; is that right?
14	A. She pretty much said the same thing; they
15	both said the same thing.
16	Q. Other than this request for a written report
17	from the Bechtel assessment in October of 2015, is
18	there any other information you asked for in
19	connection with your time on the project and the
20	responses was, in substance, you cannot have the
21	information?
22	A. Well, yes. I mean, there were multiple
23	times that we asked for the schedule, fully
24	integrated project schedule, and we were told that
25	that could not be provided to us.

	64
1	Q. What was your understanding as to why that
2	could not be provided?
3	A. The understanding that we had at the time
4	was that the schedule was undergoing additional
5	review by SCE&G in order to modify it and in order to
6	include mitigation strategies and that they needed to
7	do additional work before it could be provided to ORS
8	or to me.
9	Q. We'll talk about these two things in more
10	detail throughout the day, but I want to make sure I
11	understand. Is there anything else that you asked
12	for and the response back from SCE&G was you cannot
13	have the information?
14	A. I recall a couple of times where the initial
15	response was that, but when pressed and most of
16	the time it was because Westinghouse considered it
17	proprietary and confidential. But on further
18	discussion, I think usually we were able to get the
19	information. I don't recall specifically any other
20	instances.
21	Q. So is it fair to say, Mr. Jones, that you
22	had regular access to the construction site?
23	A. Yes, on a monthly basis we had a tour. We
24	did not have unrestricted access.
25	Q. What is your understanding of the

	65
1	restriction?
2	A. The restrictions were that we were never
3	badged so that we could go on site by ourself. We
4	always had to have SCE&G escort.
5	Q. Were there any instances where you asked for
6	access to the site and SCE&G said, no, I will not
7	escort you?
8	A. I'm not aware of any case that we were
9	turned down for. There were times when it wasn't
10	available at the time that we wanted it.
11	The primary team member that we really
12	wanted access was Gene. My visits did not present a
13	problem to me to be escorted, but Gene was there much
14	more than me, and we did request multiple times for
15	him to receive badging with unescorted access and it
16	was denied. But to my knowledge, no denials for
17	access other than just logistics of somebody not
18	being available at that particular time.
19	Q. And didn't you, Mr. Jones, interact directly
20	with the Consortium?
21	A. On several occasions, we did, yes.
22	Q. Can you describe those occasions?
23	A. Well, it's multiple. I would say that
24	probably the most meaningful was the Westinghouse
25	director started joining our meetings on a regular

	66
1	basis for ongoing session during our monthly status
2	meetings. So Mr. Churchman would join that meeting
3	as part of the regular meeting.
4	There were other times when we also had
5	interactions with the Consortium. At one time
6	earlier in the project, they came in for debriefing
7	downtown at the ORS offices, but and then there
8	were, you know, specific interactions multiple times,
9	but I think that the most important one was probably
10	Mr. Churchman's meeting.
11	Q. And then anything you learned of consequence
12	from the access that you had, as you just described,
13	you would have conveyed to the other members of the
14	ORS team; isn't that right?
15	A. Yes, but they were usually present with me.
16	Q. Did you report regularly to Dukes Scott?
17	A. Fairly regularly, yes.
18	Q. Would you agree that anything of consequence
19	you learned from your meetings and the access that
20	you had you would have also conveyed to Mr. Scott?
21	A. I tried to do so, yes.
22	Q. How would you convey that to him?
23	A. It varied throughout the history of the
24	project. As I said, initially in the early stages of
25	the project, we would have debriefing meetings.

	67
1	As a regular part of my monthly visit, there
2	would be a meeting excuse me. After the site
3	visits and the site meetings, there would be a
4	regular meeting downtown where Mr. Dukes was usually
5	present, not always, along with other senior members
6	or ORS staff where we would have a debriefing.
7	As I said, in the early, early stages of the
8	project, in many cases, SCE&G senior executives
9	well, let's just say executives, not senior
10	executives would be there along for a time with
11	the Westinghouse executive, the project director,
12	Westinghouse project director on site. That evolved
13	into just briefings with ORS staff. And then also
14	later stages, I would usually provide a written
15	summary of my comments and recommendations to
16	Mr. Dukes directly.
17	Q. Beyond Mr. Scott and the members of the ORS
18	team, was there anyone else at the ORS that you
19	reported to on a regular basis?
20	A. Well, I usually had discussions with Anthony
21	James; he was always involved with the project.
22	There were multiple people at the briefing meetings,
23	including the audit director, the attorneys, other
24	staff members, other senior staff members of ORS at
25	those meetings. But on a regular basis, I think

	68
1	Anthony and Dukes Scott were the primary contacts.
2	Q. Was there and I apologize if I missed
3	this, but was there sort of a periodic reporting
4	effort that you were engaged in, so was it every
5	month I am going to submit a written report or
6	something along those lines?
7	A. It varied throughout the life of the
8	project, it changed, it evolved. And like I say,
9	originally it was verbal briefing with multiple
10	parties present, then it was ORS briefing, and then
11	in some cases I think it went through a period where
12	I would give Mr. Dukes an oral briefing, and then he
13	asked that I provide him with a short summary of my
14	observations relative to the site visit.
15	Q. So you're using the phrase Mr. Dukes, which
16	is I believe his first name.
17	A. Mr. Scott, I'm sorry.
18	Q. I didn't know if you referred to him as
19	Mr. Dukes or not, I was just trying to be sure.
20	A. No. It's just a habit. Yes, I do that but
21	I shouldn't.
22	Q. And based on the information you collected,
23	you often made presentations to those outside the
24	ORS, right?
25	A. I would not say "often," but occasionally.

	69
1	Q. Periodically; is that right?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And, for instance, you made presentations to
4	the Electrical Cooperatives of South Carolina, didn't
5	you?
6	A. I made one presentation to the Electrical
7	Cooperative, yes.
8	Q. We'll talk about that in a little more
9	detail.
10	Didn't you meet with the members of the
11	Electrical Cooperatives, and specifically ECSC, more
12	often than this one occasion?
13	A. Yes. At another phase of the project, we
14	also, at their request, Mr. Scott, Anthony James,
15	Allyn Powell and, I would go over and discuss the
16	status of the project at the Electrical Cooperatives'
17	office, and varying members and representatives of
18	the cooperatives would be there.
19	Q. And were you trying to provide the
20	cooperatives in these meetings with all information
21	you thought relevant to describe the status of the
22	project as you understood at the time?
23	A. We would provide them with an update on the
24	status of the project, yes, sir.
25	Q. I guess what I'm trying to get at is: Did

	70
1	you go into any of those meetings knowing there is
2	some piece of information I am not going to convey?
3	A. No.
4	Q. In some instances, you provided testimony to
5	the Public Service Commission of South Carolina
6	regarding your understanding of the project, right?
7	A. That's correct.
8	Q. How many times do you recall doing that?
9	A. Twice, I think.
10	Q. Did you ever give testimony that you knew to
11	be false?
12	A. No.
13	Q. Did you ever give testimony that you now
14	believe to be false?
15	A. I don't believe it was false. It was based
16	on the information that was available to me at the
17	time.
18	Q. Now, as we sit here today in 2018, given
19	what you know regarding the project, you believe
20	correct me if I'm wrong that you did not receive a
21	couple of things that you believe you should have
22	received; is this fair?
23	A. A couple of things, yes.
24	Q. What exactly do you believe you should have
25	received that you did not?

	71
1	A. There are many things that have come to pass
2	in the discovery process; first and foremost is, in
3	my mind, is the Bechtel report. I think that would
4	have been a very important piece of information to
5	have.
6	Q. When you say, just so we're clear, when you
7	say "the Bechtel report," what exactly are you
8	referring to?
9	A. Well, there are several versions of the
10	Bechtel report. The ones that I am currently aware
11	of, and I may get the dates wrong, but there is a
12	I believe it's a November, November 9th or
13	November 5th, I don't remember the exact date that's
14	in my testimony, report that was submitted. Then in
15	February, February 5th of 2016 I'm sorry,
16	November 9th was 2015, I didn't give the year. The,
17	I think it was February 5th of 2016, there were
18	actually two reports; there was a separate Bechtel
19	scheduling report which took a long time to get, but
20	those are the reports I am referring to.
21	But there is also, I think various
22	additional things we should have known, not
23	necessarily that there is information that we should
24	have known.
25	Q. Okay.

	72
1	A. We should have known that Bechtel was going
2	to do an assessment.
3	Q. Okay. So first you referred to generally
4	the Bechtel report, and I understand that you are now
5	referring to these three different reports; the two
6	in February, and the one in November?
7	A. And I guess there was actually a fourth one;
8	that was where there was a second draft that's dated
9	a few days after November. There were two, two
10	November versions of the report.
11	Q. So is it your testimony that you should have
12	received every version of the Bechtel report?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. You believe you should have received every
15	single one?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. When do you believe you should have received
18	it?
19	A. I believe we should have received them at
20	the time they were issued.
21	Q. Time issued to whom?
22	A. Whoever, whoever on the project they were
23	issued to, we should have been in the process.
24	Q. If they were never issued to SCE&G, is it
25	your testimony you should have received them?

	73
1	A. I believe we should have, yes.
2	Q. Even if they were never issued to the owner?
3	A. I don't understand why they weren't issued
4	to the owner. I'm just saying that whatever version
5	of that report came out should have been should
6	have been provided to ORS.
7	Q. Well, so I understand, but you say whatever
8	version of that report that came out, I want to make
9	sure I understand what you, what you're referring to
10	as "came out."
11	A. Uh-huh.
12	Q. Are you saying that you should have received
13	the information that SCE&G received, or are you
14	saying that you should have received additional
15	information that SCE&G did not receive?
16	MR. COX: Object to the form.
17	THE WITNESS: My opinion is we
18	should have received the report in whatever form
19	it came out to whomever it was issued. That's my
20	opinion.
21	BY MR. CHALLY:
22	Q. So regardless of whether it was ever issued
23	to SCE&G directly?
24	A. That's my opinion, yes.
25	Q. All right. And that's true for each of the

	74
1	reports that you identified; these two in November
2	and the two in February; is that right?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Any other Bechtel report that you believe
5	you should have received?
6	A. It has come to light recently that there
7	were other revisions, the report which I have not yet
8	seen. But through the discovery process, I guess,
9	there were a couple of other revisions that I have
10	been made aware that exist that I was not aware that
11	existed at the time of my testimony.
12	But in general, what my position would be,
13	that we should have received whatever version came
14	out at whatever time it came out.
15	Q. Beyond the report, you said that you should
16	have known that Bechtel was doing an assessment.
17	A. Correct.
18	Q. At what time do you believe you should have
19	known that Bechtel was doing an assessment?
20	A. I believe we should have known Bechtel was
21	going to do an assessment when Mr. Marsh approved
22	that.
23	Q. So we have two categories of information
24	that you believe that you should have received at the
25	time at which you believe you should have received

	75
1	it. Is there anything else that you believe you
2	should have received?
3	A. Yes. Through the discovery process, we
4	found many communications between Santee Cooper and
5	SCE&G and back the other way. I believe that we
6	should have been privy to some of those
7	communications also.
8	Q. What specific communications are you
9	referring to?
10	A. I can't give you specific. There are some
11	identified in my testimony. I can characterize them,
12	I can't give you a specific. A characterization
13	would be those that provided Santee Cooper's concerns
14	about the project and their interactions with South
15	Carolina Electric & Gas.
16	Q. That's three categories. Anything else?
17	A. I'm sorry, let's go back to the original
18	question. The question was: Is there any other
19	documentation that we should have been provided?
20	Q. No. A little broader. Is there any
21	information that you believe you did not receive but
22	you think you should
23	A. Yes.
24	Q have received?
25	A. Schedules. I think that we should have been

	76
1	privy to the schedules that the Consortiums present
2	to SCE&G for their review so that we had some idea of
3	what the Consortium's positions were. So those were
4	withheld from us.
5	The final products or I wouldn't call
6	them final products but the products that were
7	generated with input from SCE&G were also withheld
8	from us, and I don't think those should have been
9	withheld from us.
10	Q. What specific schedules do you believe SCE&G
11	received that you did not receive?
12	A. Well, the schedule that Mr. Byrne references
13	in his testimony, the integrated updated schedule
14	from, was it August of 2013, is that correct, that
15	CB&I generated? We never received that. And we
16	never received the do I have the year right? I
17	need to I may not be able to find this as quickly
18	as I would like to. I can't. But I believe that is
19	the date, August of 2013, it was indicated that they
20	hadn't received an integrated schedule.
21	We never received that, that schedule. And
22	then I give a narrative in my testimony about how
23	that dragged on and eventually they got to the point
24	where even SCE&G did not receive schedule updates.
25	Q. So you were aware, were you not, from

	77
1	Mr. Byrne's testimony, that SCE&G had received this
2	schedule that you're referring to, right?
3	A. Correct.
4	Q. Did you ask for the schedule?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Who did you ask?
7	A. Multiple people. But generally, the process
8	that we used was to ask the attendees at the monthly
9	meetings, which would include Skip Smith, Alan
10	Torres, so, multiple people. And it was a standing
11	item on our agenda to get an update.
12	Q. Did you receive schedule updates?
13	A. We did not receive schedule updates of the
14	complete schedule. What we received was schedule
15	updates for 90-day lookaheads, two-week lookaheads
16	that were part of the ongoing progress reports that
17	were provided to us.
18	Q. So this request for a schedule, and in your
19	belief that you needed that schedule, was made
20	periodically throughout your involvement in the
21	project, right?
22	A. It was essentially made monthly.
23	Q. So we have the Bechtel report, we have
24	certain communications between Santee and SCE&G,
25	communications that you understand you have

	78
1	referenced in your testimony, and then information
2	related to the schedules. Is there any other
3	information that you believe you should have
4	received?
5	A. Yes, has come out through discovery also, I
6	believe that there were cost estimates generated by
7	SCE&G. And again, you're going to ask me the
8	specifics, but it was the estimate generated by
9	Carlette Walker. I think we should have been privy
10	to see those also.
11	So the cost estimates that SCE&G generated
12	on their own for the project, I think we should have
13	been involved in seeing those.
14	Q. And these are cost estimates created in 2014
15	and 2015; is that right?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Anything else?
18	A. There may be selective individual things,
19	like correspondence with the Consortium. I don't
20	recall offhand, but any more specifics, I don't
21	recall anything that I believe we should have
22	received.
23	Q. So, Mr. Jones, I want to make sure I have
24	the complete list, and I'm just going to give you one
25	more change. You have

	79
1	A. There is one more thing I did think of.
2	Q. Okay.
3	A. And this one was it wasn't that it
4	eventually was not made available, because it wasn't
5	very timely, and that was the estimates at the end of
6	the project that SCE&G generated for continuing on
7	the project. We got those, but it was a considerable
8	time after they decided to abandoned the project.
9	Q. But you have those but you have that
10	information now
11	A. Yes.
12	Q correct?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And you understand that an abandonment
15	petition is still pending, correct?
16	A. The abandonment position is still?
17	Q. Petition is still pending.
18	A. Oh, that's my understanding.
19	Q. So to the extent that this particular piece
20	of information impacts your analysis as to any issue
21	related to abandonment, you're still able to consider
22	it and evaluate it for purposes of your testimony,
23	right?
24	A. Correct.
25	Q. Now, Mr. Jones, you were aware in early 2015

	80
1	that SCE&G was considering an independent assessment
2	of the project, right?
3	A. I would say I was aware they were
4	considering it because they actually asked my input
5	in that time frame as to who, who might be someone to
6	perform that.
7	Q. And you had this discussion with Skip Smith;
8	isn't that right?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. What do you recall about that discussion?
11	A. Just he asked me who I thought would be some
12	candidates that might do an assessment of the
13	project.
14	Q. What did you tell him?
15	A. I told him I thought there were probably
16	three firms that I believed would be the top choices,
17	and that was Bechtel, Fluor, and my old company,
18	Sargent & Lundy.
19	Q. When do you recall that conversation
20	occurring?
21	A. I can't recall specifically, but it was in,
22	I think I think it was in early 2014.
23	Q. Early 2014?
24	A. I think so.
25	Q. Did you begin this conversation with

	81
1	Mr. Smith or did Mr. Smith begin this conversation
2	with you?
3	A. He with me.
4	Q. And what do you recall him asking you
5	specifically?
6	A. Basically asked me who I thought might be
7	good, good companies to perform an assessment of the
8	V.C. Summer.
9	Q. Did he explain to you why he was asking that
10	question?
11	A. No.
12	Q. And you responded with these three. Did you
13	give him any context around these three, what they
14	might be good at as between any of them?
15	A. Well, I mean, I gave him the context that I
16	believe they were premiere companies in nuclear power
17	plants and in construction and that they were the top
18	candidates.
19	Q. Did Mr. Smith give any additional
20	information related to the assessment that he was
21	considering?
22	A. No.
23	Q. What did you do with this information that
24	you learned from Mr. Smith that SCE&G was, in 2014,
25	considering an assessment?

	82
1	A. I really did nothing with it. I didn't know
2	if they were going to go through with it or not or
3	whatever.
4	Q. Did you have a view as to whether or not
5	that was a good idea?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. What was your view?
8	A. My view was it would have been a very good
9	idea.
10	Q. Did you express that to Mr. Smith?
11	A. I don't think, not at that time. But I had
12	expressed previously that I thought they needed to
13	bring somebody in of that type. So I, throughout
14	much of the project, I had indicated that I thought
15	that would be helpful.
16	Q. Did you report on this conversation to
17	anyone at ORS?
18	A. I don't recall that. It was, you know, very
19	preliminary discussions as providing some names of
20	companies at that time, so I don't recall if I did or
21	not.
22	Q. And then you are aware, are you not, that
23	well, let me ask it this way. So this was early
24	2014, to your memory. When is the next time you
25	recall being informed of any additional information

	83
1	related to an independent assessment?
2	A. The next time I recall was between
3	October 15th and October 27th. I don't recall the
4	specific date.
5	Q. So to the best of your memory, this
6	conversation with Skip Smith occurred in early 2014;
7	is that right?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Are you confident that it wasn't 2015?
10	A. No, not my recollection is that it was in
11	early 2014, but I am not super confident that it
12	wasn't in 2015.
13	Q. So were you ever informed by Gene Soult that
14	in August 2015, SCE&G's outside counsel had hired a
15	third party to conduct an assessment of the project?
16	A. No.
17	Q. You are aware though now, are you not, that
18	Mr. Soult was so informed in August of 2015?
19	MR. COX: Object to the form.
20	THE WITNESS: I have seen
21	Mr. Soult's summary that stated that, yes.
22	BY MR. CHALLY:
23	Q. And Mr. Soult it's your testimony that
24	Mr. Soult did not convey that point to you at the
25	time?

	84
1	A. No, he did not.
2	Q. It's my understanding that Mr. Soult was
3	informed as to some information related to the
4	assessment at an on-site entity meeting; is that your
5	understanding as well?
6	A. No. My understanding was that how Mr. Soult
7	found out was he was at the plan-of-the-day meeting,
8	which he periodically attended. At the end of
9	toward the end of that meeting, a gentleman stood up
10	unknown to Mr. Soult, announced his thanks to the
11	staff for their support during the assessment that
12	was just completed, then donned a Bechtel hardhat,
13	and the person next to him did the same thing. And
14	Mr. Soult did then inform us of that occurrence at a
15	meeting with Allyn Powell and myself.
16	Q. So following this plan-of-the-day meeting
17	where an individual with a Bechtel hardhat made
18	comments, Mr. Soult informed you and Ms. Powell
19	A. Correct.
20	Q of that development; is that right?
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. What do you recall Mr. Soult telling you?
23	A. Exactly as I conveyed; that the guy stood up
24	during the plan-of-the-day meeting, announced that
25	he thanked everyone for their assistance during the

	85
1	assessment, donned the hardhat, and the meeting was
2	over.
3	Q. Donned a hardhat with a Bechtel logo on it?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. So no doubt in your mind that following this
6	plan-of-the-day meeting, Mr. Soult, Ms. Powell, and
7	you were aware of the fact that someone with a
8	Bechtel hardhat had completed an assessment of the
9	<pre>project; is that right?</pre>
10	A. We knew they did some kind of an assessment;
11	did not know the scope nor results, whatever.
12	Q. And Bechtel was one of the three contractors
13	that you had suggested to Mr. Smith some time prior?
14	A. Correct.
15	Q. So what did you do once you learned this
16	information from Mr. Soult?
17	A. I generated a question on our agenda, which
18	was our standard practice. On the agenda, we
19	provided input on a monthly basis to SCE&G. We
20	provided information in advance of our questions
21	based on our document review and project developments
22	that occurred. So we generated a question, and my
23	question was: Give me the top ten results of the
24	Bechtel or the Bechtel assessment that was performed.
25	O. So how are you familiar with Bechtel?

	86
1	A. Worked with them. I mean, from the
2	beginning of my career, they were they used to be
3	more of a competitor to Sargent & Lundy than they are
4	now because they used to be more of an engineering
5	and construction firm. The reality of the case now
6	is more of a construction firm. So they were one of
7	our major competitors when I started my career. So I
8	have been associated with them as a competitor.
9	I also worked on teams that included Bechtel
10	personnel, worked on plants where Bechtel was the
11	major construction contractor. My old company has
12	been subcontracted to do engineering work for Bechtel
13	on multiple projects. So it's a long history of
14	familiarity with Bechtel.
15	Q. You're aware that they're prominent in the
16	nuclear construction industry?
17	A. Absolutely, yes.
18	Q. And in fact, much later, not only did you
19	recommend Bechtel to Mr. Smith, but in 2016, you
20	recommended Bechtel as an option to review SCE&G's
21	sensitivity analysis, didn't you?
22	A. That's possible. I don't recall that. I
23	have a vague recollection that they were looking for
24	someone to give some validation to their to the
25	analysis that they were doing themselves. I don't

	87
1	recall that specifically, but it's possible.
2	(Exhibit No. 2 was marked for
3	identification.)
4	Q. Okay. I'm going to hand you what I have
5	marked as Exhibit 2.
6	A. Oh, I'm sorry I misunderstood your question.
7	I thought you said SCE&G sensitivity analysis. I'm
8	sorry. I misunderstood your question.
9	Q. Yeah. No problem.
10	So what I have handed you as Exhibit 2
11	appears to be an e-mail from you to Ms. Powell
12	A. Yes.
13	Q dated June 6. Do you recall this e-mail?
14	A. I do. As I said, I misunderstood your
15	question. If we're talking about ORS, I definitely
16	remember making this recommendation, yes.
17	Q. So this was a recommendation you made as to
18	who the ORS might hire to evaluate the sensitivity
19	analysis submitted by SCE&G in 2016; is that right?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. Did you believe you weren't qualified to
22	evaluate that sensitivity analysis?
23	A. I thought that it needed more participation
24	than me, than a single individual.
25	Q. Okay.

	88
1	A. I always thought that I would be part of
2	whatever team came in, but I thought we needed more
3	resources to do that.
4	Q. What do you recall the response being to
5	your suggestion?
6	A. Well, the response was thank you for the
7	input. Other than that, I don't recall what happened
8	to this.
9	Q. But you knew, as your e-mail suggests, that
10	Bechtel had done work for SCE&G, at least the prior
11	year, right?
12	A. Yes. But I did not, as I said, I did not
13	know the scope or what they had been involved in.
14	(Exhibit No. 3 was marked for
15	identification.)
16	Q. Let me show you what I have marked as
17	Exhibit 3. You can however you want to organize
18	those, the court reporter will help you at some
19	point.
20	A. All right.
21	Q. Handing you what I have marked as Exhibit 3.
22	Do you recall this document, Mr. Jones?
23	A. It appears to be the agenda of our
24	October 27-28 site visit, yes.
25	Q. And this is the agenda that you said you had

	89
1	prepared in your testimony a few minutes ago, right?
2	A. Not prepared; provided input to. The
3	actual the red parts are input.
4	Q. So on page five, Section VI, Roman VI, d, it
5	discusses the status of the Bechtel assessment and
6	the top ten issues noted thus far.
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. So that's your addition to this agenda,
9	correct?
10	A. Correct.
11	Q. How did you know to identify top ten issues?
12	A. To me, that's an easy question. If somebody
13	does an assessment, tell me the top ten things you
14	found. I had no idea what their scope was. There
15	was a question that if I know that somebody did an
16	assessment, my question is going to be, well, what
17	were the most important things found.
18	Q. So if you're informed that someone is doing
19	an assessment, you have the understanding that they
20	must have reached certain conclusions related to that
21	assessment, right?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And so then in 2015, in October, you were
24	aware that Bechtel had not only done an assessment
25	but they had reached a certain conclusion?

	90
1	A. No, I was not aware. I assumed they had.
2	Q. And you assumed because you were simply
3	informed of the fact that there was an assessment?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. And you recall having a discussion that
6	followed your decision to put this item on the
7	agenda?
8	A. I'm sorry, "a discussion"?
9	Q. Do you recall a discussion with someone at
10	SCE&G about the items that you had on this agenda?
11	A. Discussion other than at the meeting?
12	Q. No, that discussion.
13	A. At the meeting, when we got to this item to
14	discuss it, that was the discussion that I talked
15	about previously was Skip Smith and Shirley Johnson.
16	Q. Do you recall asking Alan Torres for
17	information about this assessment?
18	A. Subsequent to the meeting, and I don't
19	recall the date or the time, but we were having a
20	general discussion, and what Mr. Torres told me was
21	that they didn't find anything new, said, no,
22	nevermind.
23	Q. So can you this discussion with
24	Mr. Torres was after your discussion with Mr. Smith
25	that followed your including this on the agenda

	91
1	items; is that right?
2	A. Right.
3	Q. Do you recall any with any additional
4	specificity when you had this discussion with
5	Mr. Torres?
6	A. No.
7	Q. Was it you submitted testimony to the PSC
8	in 2016, didn't you?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Was this discussion with Mr. Torres before
11	your testimony in 2016?
12	A. For my testimony in 2016, you said?
13	Q. Correct.
14	A. Yes. It was shortly after this, but I can't
15	give you the specific time.
16	Q. And is it your testimony that you recall
17	Mr. Torres telling you that he didn't have the
18	assessment?
19	A. We didn't discuss specifically whether he
20	had the assessment because I was told there was no
21	written assessment. But we were discussing results,
22	and he told me that they found nothing new and it was
23	a no-nevermind. Those may not have been his exact
24	words but pretty close.
25	O. So who informed you that there was no

	92
1	written assessment at this time?
2	A. Mr. Smith and Shirley Johnson.
3	Q. And that is the discussion that you recall
4	occurring at this site meeting?
5	A. Correct.
6	Q. So did you ask Mr. Torres whether there was
7	an assessment, a written assessment, at this time?
8	A. Not at that time, no, I did not.
9	Q. You did ask him what the results of the
10	assessment were; is that right?
11	A. I think he actually started the
12	conversation, because I think he had talked to Skip
13	Smith about our request, and I think he told me that
14	the results were they didn't find anything. I don't
15	think I asked him a specific question; he told me
16	that it was a no-nevermind.
17	Q. So you're aware of Bechtel's prominence in
18	the construction industry and specifically with the
19	nuclear projects, correct?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. And you were aware of that at the time of
22	your discussion with Mr. Torres?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. And you're aware that you had recommended to
25	Skip Smith, potentially in 2014, that Bechtel be

	93
1	hired to do an independent assessment of the project?
2	A. Correct.
3	Q. And you're further aware that that
4	assessment had been conducted in 2015, correct?
5	A. What I was aware of at this time is that
6	Bechtel had done something.
7	Q. Right.
8	A. I had no idea what their scope was.
9	Q. You called it an assessment?
10	A. They called it an assessment.
11	Q. Correct. And you have an understanding,
12	generally, what you described as to what an
13	assessment would do, which is lead to some
14	conclusion.
15	A. Yes. But there is a broad range available.
16	Q. Understood. So you understand that one of
17	the prominent construction engineering firms in the
18	country has done an independent assessment, as they
19	described it, of the project; you're informed that
20	nothing new arises out of that project. Do you ask
21	Mr. Torres for any additional information?
22	A. No, I did not, because he said there was
23	nothing new.
24	Q. Do you recall anything else at all about
25	this discussion with Mr. Torres?

	94
1	A. No.
2	Q. Do you recall telling Mr. Torres that you
3	intended on following up with Dukes Scott on this
4	issue?
5	A. I have seen that, but to I do not recall
6	that. I am not saying it's not true. I have seen
7	that in Mr. Torres's testimony, but I do not recall
8	that.
9	Q. Do you recall reporting to Mr. Scott that
10	one of the, in your view, leading engineering and
11	construction firms had conducted an assessment of the
12	project?
13	A. I actually don't recall that.
14	And to give you some context, this was the
15	time when the new amendment had been issued, so we
16	were very much more involved in what was going on
17	with that. So I don't recall whether I actually told
18	Mr. Scott or not that Bechtel had done some
19	assessment. I may have. I don't recall.
20	Q. You expect you would have reported this
21	discussion with Mr. Torres to Ms. Powell?
22	A. I may or may not have. In fact, I don't
23	even know if she was present. She could have been
24	present at the time the discussion took place, but I
25	don't recall. I do recall that there was some

	95
1	discussion.
2	Q. So you don't recall conveying the substance
3	of your conversation with Mr. Torres to anyone; is
4	that right?
5	A. I do not recall, no.
6	Q. Prior to the July 31st, 2017 abandonment of
7	construction at the project, did you have any other
8	discussions with Mr. Scott about Bechtel's
9	assessment?
10	A. Prior to the abandonment, you said?
11	Q. Correct.
12	A. No.
13	Q. You never discussed with Mr. Scott the fact
14	that Bechtel had conducted an assessment prior to
15	abandonment?
16	A. Oh, we did after the response to the AIR.
17	We did have a discussion of why Bechtel was not
18	included in their list of consultants. Once they
19	responded to our AIR, and that's specifically
20	referenced to I don't recall the specific number,
21	but we did discuss that: Why, why isn't Bechtel on
22	here in the list of consultants that they hired.
23	Q. So at the time of the AIR and this is one
24	that I think denominated as 132; is that right?
25	A. That sounds correct.

	96
1	Q. So at the time that you received SCE&G's
2	responses to that AIR, you immediately questioned why
3	Bechtel wasn't identified; is that right?
4	A. We did.
5	Q. And you discussed that with Mr. Scott?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. So Mr. Scott, at the time of the AIR
8	response, was fully aware of the fact that Bechtel
9	had conducted some sort of an assessment, right?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Because you had conveyed that to him?
12	A. Right.
13	Q. In that conversation, did he relate to you
14	that he had separately become aware of that fact?
15	A. No.
16	Q. So that was the first he had heard of
17	Bechtel conducting an assessment, when you told him?
18	A. I don't know.
19	MR. COX: Object to the form.
20	BY MR. CHALLY:
21	Q. Don't know?
22	A. I'm sorry. I don't know.
23	Q. Was anyone else involved in that
24	conversation?
25	A. I don't recall.

	97
1	Q. Do you recall any lawyers being involved in
2	that conversation?
3	A. I don't recall.
4	Q. What do you recall discussing with
5	Mr. Scott?
6	A. All I recall is the discussion. And there
7	may have been others present, I don't remember, but
8	the fact that, hey, why didn't they why isn't
9	Bechtel listed on this as one of the consultants that
10	they hired. We didn't understand that at all,
11	because we knew that they did some kind of an
12	assessment. We didn't know the scope or what it was,
13	but we couldn't understand why they weren't listed.
14	Q. Was that your comment or was that someone
15	else's comment?
16	A. It was joint. It was a joint revelation to
17	all of the team, to Gene, to Alan, and to me. It's
18	like when we and we saw the responses at different
19	times, but all of us had the same reaction.
20	Q. You all knew at the time you saw the
21	response that Bechtel had conducted an assessment of
22	some sort, right?
23	A. Correct.
24	Q. Now, what do you recall concluding as to
25	that? You said you discussed why SCE&G might not

	98
1	have revealed that. What do you-all recall
2	concluding?
3	A. Well, we concluded at the time that they
4	were withholding information.
5	Q. Who did you did you follow up with them?
6	A. We did; we gave them a second chance.
7	Q. When?
8	A. We revised the AIR, sent it out again.
9	Q. And then that was responded to, correct?
10	A. Correct.
11	Q. Did you have a discussion as to the response
12	that you received?
13	A. Yes, we did.
14	Q. What was that discussion?
15	A. The discussion was they still didn't list
16	Bechtel.
17	Q. Any further topic addressed during that
18	discussion; meaning, was there any further context to
19	the discussion you had related to the fact that SCE&G
20	didn't mention Bechtel in that response?
21	A. I don't I don't recall what the
22	subsequent discussion was or whether we had I
23	mean, we were still all surprised that they didn't
24	provide us with Bechtel.
25	Q. So back to October of 2015, you include

	99
1	discussed the status of the Bechtel assessment and
2	top ten issues on this agenda. You have a discussion
3	with Skip Smith and Shirley Johnson related to this
4	topic at the time. And you sometime thereafter have
5	a discussion with Alan Torres. Are you aware that
6	this particular item wasn't contained on the November
7	agenda prepared for a similar meeting?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. And you chose not to include that on the
10	agenda; isn't that right?
11	A. We did. We broached the topic again, but it
12	was not an agenda item because we believed that there
13	was no further discussion to be had.
14	Q. So you say you discussed the Bechtel
15	assessment again in November?
16	A. We brought up the topic and
17	Q. Who do you recall bringing up the topic?
18	A. At that time, it was actually Gene Soult
19	that brought it up again.
20	Q. What was the context of him bringing up the
21	topic?
22	A. I think it was like I characterized as
23	giving them another chance to say what, what were the
24	results of the Bechtel assessment or what was the
25	scope of the Bechtel assessment.

	100
1	Q. Who did he direct that question to?
2	A. Again, it was to Skip Smith and Shirley
3	Johnson who were regular attenders at the meeting.
4	Q. What do you recall their response being at
5	the time?
6	A. Still the same.
7	Q. Which was exactly what?
8	A. That there was no written report and we
9	don't know anything about it.
10	Q. Did you indicate you intended to follow up
11	with anyone else?
12	A. Not at that time, no.
13	Q. Why?
14	A. We had been told that there was no written
15	report, we had been told that there were no
16	significant findings, and so we didn't see any reason
17	to pursue it. We did not know what the scope was,
18	and we had been told it was for a high level kind of
19	an assessment, so we didn't pursue it at that time.
20	Q. So after November of 2015, this meeting that
21	you've just described, do you recall discussing the
22	assessment let me back up, let me be clear.
23	After this November 2015 meeting, and
24	excluding your discussion with Alan Torres, do you
25	recall having a discussion with anyone at SCEAG about

	101
1	this assessment prior to abandonment?
2	A. The only other person that I think I had
3	discussion with was almost the same context was Kyle
4	Young, and it was in the same time frame as we're
5	talking about here. He said essentially the same
6	thing as Alan Torres; that it was nothing new,
7	nothing to see here, no-nevermind.
8	Q. Can you give any greater specificity as to
9	when that conversation with Mr. Young occurred?
10	A. I cannot.
11	Q. Do you recall whether you brought it up or
12	he brought it up?
13	A. No. In that case, I actually think it
14	was Kyle was usually our tour guide for the site
15	visit, so I think it just came up in conversation as
16	we were driving around in the truck.
17	Q. Did you ever talk to anyone at Santee Cooper
18	about the assessment?
19	A. No.
20	Q. Did you ever talk to anyone at SCE&G about
21	Bechtel, other than these times that you have
22	recounted?
23	A. I can't recall. I don't know if I did or
24	not.
25	Q. Same question with Santee Cooper: Did you

	102
1	ever talk to anyone at Santee Cooper about Bechtel?
2	A. No.
3	Q. Did you ever speak to anyone affiliated with
4	the Electric Cooperatives about the assessment?
5	A. About the Bechtel assessment?
6	Q. Yes.
7	A. No.
8	Q. Did you ever speak with anyone at ECSC
9	related to the assessment?
10	A. No.
11	Q. Did you ever speak to Mike Couick about the
12	assessment?
13	A. No.
14	Q. Did you ever speak to Mike Couick about
15	Bechtel?
16	A. I can't recall whether or not I mean,
17	Bechtel may have come up in some conversations about
18	Vogtle, but I don't recall.
19	Q. So all of this information that you
20	described about the Bechtel assessment, as you
21	understood it, is information that you had before
22	your 2016 PSC testimony, right?
23	A. Repeat that, please.
24	(The record was read as requested.)
25	THE WITNESS: All of the

	103
1	information that I had that they had done some
2	assessment
3	BY MR. CHALLY:
4	Q. Yes.
5	A without knowing what it was? Yes.
6	Q. And you didn't mention Bechtel or this
7	assessment in your 2016 testimony, right?
8	A. I did not.
9	Q. You nevertheless extensively discussed the
10	status of your project in that testimony, didn't you?
11	A. I discussed the status of the project in my
12	testimony, yes.
13	Q. And your testimony reflects your independent
14	evaluation of the status of the project, doesn't it?
15	A. Yes, based on my review of the documentation
16	available to me and my experience, yes.
17	Q. It further reflects your independent
18	evaluation of the EPC amendment and specifically the
19	fixed price option, doesn't it?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. You concluded, as least as it relates to
22	schedule, that the ORS recommends that the Commission
23	approve the proposed guarantee, guaranteed
24	substantial completion dates, didn't you?
25	A. I did.

	104
1	Q. And you concluded ultimately that the
2	request sought by SCE&G in this 2016 docket was
3	appropriate in that testimony, didn't you?
4	A. I did, based on the information available to
5	me at the time.
6	Q. You never told anyone at the Commission
7	about the assessment that you knew had been ongoing,
8	right?
9	A. "Ongoing"? What does that mean?
10	Q. Did you ever tell anyone at the Commission
11	about the assessment that you knew had been conducted
12	on the site?
13	A. By Bechtel?
14	Q. By Bechtel.
15	A. No.
16	Q. You didn't think you needed to provide that
17	information, did you?
18	A. I did not. I didn't think it was
19	significant.
20	Q. Do you recall meeting with Mike Couick and
21	Mike Tye of the Electric Cooperatives in December of
22	2015?
23	A. Not specifically, but there were meetings
24	where I did meet with Mike Couick.
25	(Exhibit No. 4 was marked for

	105
1	identification.)
2	Q. I'm handing you what I have marked as
3	Exhibit 4. This appears to be an invoice that you
4	<pre>submitted; is that right?</pre>
5	A. I don't remember if this one was submitted
6	or not, but it's my detailed invoice that I prepared.
7	I don't remember what time I stopped submitting
8	detailed invoices.
9	Q. Okay. Flip to do you see the Bates
10	number that's at the top? And I think my copy is in
11	red, yours might not. GJ Notes. Do you see that?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Okay. Go to 001544.
14	A. Okay.
15	Q. There is a Date of Work or Expenses field,
16	2015, 12/16, Meetings with SCE&G and ORS management
17	at the VCS site offices, document review and meeting
18	with Mike Couick and Mike Tye of Electric
19	Cooperatives of South Carolina.
20	A. Okay.
21	Q. Who is Mike Tye?
22	A. Actually, I don't know. I got his name at
23	the meeting but I really don't know who he is.
24	Q. Is it your understanding he is affiliated
25	with the cooperatives?

	106
1	A. I don't know. He was at the meeting.
2	That's all I know.
3	Q. What do you recall happening at this
4	meeting?
5	A. What do I recall? I don't recall anything.
6	A general characterization, I would say, you know,
7	it's an updated status of the project, but I have no
8	recollection of this meeting.
9	Q. Prior to abandonment, is it your testimony
10	that you were unaware that Bechtel had issued any
11	written report?
12	A. That's correct.
13	MR. CHALLY: So I'm at a logical
14	stopping break and it's 12:10. Terry, you
15	mentioned you wanted
16	MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, this is
17	fine.
18	MR. CHALLY: This works?
19	MR. RICHARDSON: Fine. No
20	problem.
21	MR. CHALLY: Okay. Why don't we
22	take a relatively short break for lunch.
23	MR. COX: Yeah, let's go off.
24	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
25	off the record at 12:11 p.m.

	107
1	(A recess was taken.)
2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going
3	back on the record at 1:21 p.m.
4	MR. CHALLY: Just one thing I want
5	to note before I begin questioning, and I
6	mentioned this to Mr. Cox and Ms. Pickling before
7	we began.
8	Is it Mr. Hamm, is that right,
9	representing the ORS?
10	MR. HAMM: Yes, Steven Hamm.
11	MR. CHALLY: Steven Hamm.
12	Mr. Hamm, I understand that you were recently
13	affiliated with Richardson Plowden, a firm here
14	in Columbia, and you're not sort of stating on
15	the record not, certainly not asking you a
16	question as to this, but as Richardson Plowden
17	represents SCANA and SCE&G in a wide variety of
18	matters. I am not here today to object
19	specifically to your involvement on behalf of the
20	ORS, but I want to make clear that you me
21	allowing your participation in that capacity in
22	this deposition doesn't waive the ability of
23	SCANA or SCE&G to object to your continued
24	representation of the ORS in this matter.
25	MR. HAMM: I hear you. But for

	108
1	the record, I have virtually no idea what my firm
2	has or is doing in this matter. I have never had
3	any involvement in it whatsoever. And I couldn't
4	answer the first question about what my former
5	firm is doing.
6	MR. CHALLY: Okay. We'll deal
7	with all that at a later time, but, thank you.
8	MR. HAMM: All right. I just want
9	to protect the record.
10	MR. CHALLY: Understood.
11	BY MR. CHALLY:
12	Q. Mr. Jones?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. We talked about some testimony that you
15	presented on behalf of the ORS at various points in
16	time earlier. Can you tell me generally what the
17	process was for preparing that testimony, the
18	pre-filed testimony that was submitted?
19	A. Well, in general, the process would be after
20	the filings by SCE&G for a revised budget and
21	schedule. We would start preparing our assessment of
22	whether those were proper and acceptable and prudent
23	in preparation for presenting our recommendation to
24	the Public Service Commission.
25	Q. Okay. I should have been a little bit

	109
1	clearer. I am actually looking for very granular.
2	Did you write the words that appear in the pre-filed
3	testimony submitted on your behalf?
4	A. Absolutely, yes.
5	Q. You wrote every single word; you typed them
6	in?
7	A. I can't say that I wrote every single word.
8	There was some formatting that took place after my
9	but the words were mine. They may have been word
10	processed after me, but the words were mine.
11	Q. Understood. Okay.
12	So, Mr. Jones, you were aware in 2014 that
13	the Consortium presented to the owners of the V.C.
14	Summer project a revised construction schedule
15	and expected cost to complete the project, right?
16	A. Repeat the date again, please.
17	Q. 2014.
18	A. 2014 that the
19	Q. That the Consortium, had presented to the
20	owner a revised construction schedule and expected
21	cost to complete the project.
22	A. We were aware that they were supposed to,
23	and we kept requesting that. But as far as knowing
24	that it had actually been submitted, I don't think we
25	were ever really aware of when it was submitted.

	110
1	Q. Mr. Jones, do you regularly review pre-filed
2	testimony submitted by SCE&G in connection with the
3	PSC proceedings related to the project?
4	A. Yes, I usually do reviews of other
5	testimonies, yes.
6	Q. So as it comes in, you would review it and
7	make sure well, you would review it, right?
8	A. Are you talking about my testimony or
9	others?
10	Q. I am talking about other testimony.
11	A. I would say selectively. I don't review all
12	testimonies that are submitted, but some that are
13	more pertinent to my areas, I do review.
14	Q. So testimony of Steve Byrne?
15	A. Oh, you're talking about I'm sorry. Yes,
16	I would review that.
17	(Exhibit No. 5 was marked for
18	identification.)
19	Q. So I have handed you what I have marked as
20	Exhibit 5. Is this testimony that you would have
21	reviewed at the time it came in, meaning the time it
22	was submitted to the PSC?
23	A. Based on the title that's there, yes.
24	Q. Flip with me to page 36.
25	A. All right.

	111
1	Q. The second full paragraph begins, "In the
2	third quarter of 2014, SCE&G received what WEC/CB&I
3	termed a revised fully integrated construction
4	schedule."
5	Do you see that?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. "Accompanying the construction schedule data
8	was information related the revised cost estimates
9	for completing the project, the
10	estimated-at-completion (EAC) cost."
11	Do you see that?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. So as reflected in Mr. Byrne's testimony,
14	you were aware that in 2014, the Consortium,
15	Westinghouse and CB&I, presented to the owners a
16	revised construction schedule and expected cost to
17	complete the schedule, right?
18	A. Again, I would say we were aware they were
19	supposed to.
20	Q. Well
21	A. On reading this, I became aware of it. But
22	there was always the case that we were expecting them
23	to submit the construction schedule, but it was not
24	provided to us.
25	O. And Mr. Byrne confirmed to the extent

	112
1	there was any doubt as to whether that happened,
2	Mr. Byrne testified that it did in fact happen in
3	2014, right?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And you're aware that estimates provided by
6	the Consortium were based on a series of assumptions
7	regarding future performance, correct?
8	A. Yes, estimates are always based on that,
9	yes.
10	Q. And particularly with respect to these
11	assumptions or as to performance, there was an
12	assumption related to a productivity factor for the
13	work that needed to be done, correct?
14	A. Yes, I'm aware of that.
15	Q. And you're aware that that factor was 1.15,
16	correct?
17	A. Yes. I should say I'm aware that that's
18	what was reported as their bases. We did not see the
19	actual, you know, the actual estimate itself, but
20	that was what was reported to be the basis was the
21	estimate.
22	Q. Okay. Sitting here today and with
23	additional information that you have collected in
24	discovery, do you have any reason to doubt that 1.15
25	was the factor, productivity factor, used to develop

	113
1	the assumptions for that schedule?
2	A. I can say I don't have any reason to doubt
3	it. I also don't really have any reason to confirm
4	it. It was what was reported to us as the basis.
5	(Exhibit No. 6 was marked for
6	identification.)
7	Q. I'm handing you what I have marked as
8	Exhibit 6. This is a request that I believe you
9	submitted to Chad Burgess with a "cc" to various
10	individuals that are titled, or having the purpose of
11	follow-up on initial AIR submittal. Do you see that?
12	A. Okay. Yes.
13	Q. Do you recall this request?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And you recall requesting that this
16	information be provided to you by May 29, 2015?
17	A. I don't recall that specifically, but if
18	that's what it says, then, yes.
19	Q. And this is a specific discussion of the
20	productivity factors, right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. In your request, not even in the response,
23	your request, which you issued sometime prior to
24	May 29, 2015, said that you state, meaning SCE&G,
25	states "that the productivity factor of 1.15 was

	114
1	chosen by the Consortium as the basis for the EAC;"
2	is that right?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. So you knew, at least as of the time that
5	you made this request, that the Consortium's
6	productivity factor, for purposes of the schedule and
7	cost estimates it had provided, was 1.15?
8	A. Again, I knew that that's what was reported
9	to us as the basis.
10	Q. And you also knew, did you not, as reflected
11	in this Response to Interrogatory, that the
12	historical productivity factors were much higher?
13	A. I did.
14	Q. And you knew that on your own, didn't you?
15	Because you had access to the productivity factors on
16	a more regular basis.
17	A. We received the productivity information
18	monthly, so I was aware that they had not met those
19	productivity factors of 1.15.
20	Q. So you knew at this time in 2015 that using
21	a different productivity factor would lead to a
22	different schedule completion date, right?
23	A. In general, yes. But there are other things
24	you can do, like, if you have a bad productivity
25	factor, you can increase staff.

	115
1	Q. You can always hire more people to address a
2	poor productivity factor?
3	A. Correct. Change the way you perform the
4	work. So if there's things that can be done that is
5	not a direct correlation, but if you do nothing and
6	continue, then it's going to impact
7	Q. The schedule.
8	A the schedule.
9	Q. But it's going to impact the cost of the
10	project regardless, right?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. So a poorer productivity factor will lead to
13	an increased cost to complete the project, right?
14	A. In general. Again, if you do if you do
15	nothing, then, yes, it will.
16	Q. And so you knew in 2015 that applying a
17	productivity factor higher than 1.15 would lead to a
18	different cost estimate than if you had used a 1.15
19	productivity factor, correct?
20	A. I'm sorry, repeat that again.
21	MR. CHALLY: Maybe you can read it
22	back.
23	(The record was read as requested.)
24	THE WITNESS: Yes. If you
25	again, if you do nothing other than accept the

	116
1	productivity factor as it's done, it will lead to
2	a higher cost.
3	BY MR. CHALLY:
4	Q. You also knew, did you not, that there were
5	various mitigation efforts under way to improve the
6	historical productivity factor at this time, right?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And you also knew, did you not, that the
9	Consortium had promised to achieve this level of
10	productivity?
11	A. I actually became aware of that through the
12	testimony, through, I think it was Mr. Byrne's
13	testimony.
14	Q. His 2015 testimony?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And you knew though, at this time, that
17	particularly in light of the historical productivity
18	factors, that the Consortium might not be able to
19	meet this promised 1.15 productivity factor, right?
20	A. I knew that it would be a challenge and that
21	they would definitely have to employ and fully
22	implement the mitigate strategies or some other
23	mitigation strategies in order to meet that, yes.
24	Q. And all of that, all of that we just
25	described as you knowing in 2015, was clear from

	117
1	Mr. Byrne's 2015 testimony, isn't it?
2	A. I would say it was fairly clear that, and
3	that it was acknowledged, that significant
4	improvements needed to be made in the productivity
5	factors in order to achieve the schedule and budget,
6	yes.
7	Q. Now flip with me to pages 38 and 39 in
8	Mr. Byrne's testimony.
9	A. All right.
10	Q. So I want to read you a particular subset of
11	this and then ask you a couple of questions about it.
12	As to both timing and cost, the schedules
13	are based on productivity factors that WEC/CB&I
14	represents can be met
15	A. Excuse me, could you give me a more specific
16	reference?
17	Q. Sure. Yeah. I'm sorry. Page 38.
18	A. Okay.
19	Q. The carryover paragraph at the end, third
20	sentence.
21	A. Okay.
22	Q. I'm going to start again. "As to both
23	timing and cost, the schedules are based on
24	productivity factors WEC/CB&I represents can be met
25	given the current status of the project. Meeting

	118
1	those productivity factors will pose a challenge to
2	WEC/CB&I, but doing so will benefit the project both
3	in terms of cost and schedule. For that reason, as
4	owner, SCE&G, has no basis or interest in insisting
5	that WEC/CB&I should use less challenging
6	assumptions. However, SCE&G does recognize that
7	WEC/CB&I has set itself a significant challenge to
8	future productivity."
9	A. Okay.
10	Q. Do you agree with that statement?
11	A. Yeah, I think, in general, that would
12	characterize what had to be done, yes.
13	Q. So you do understand also that using a less
14	aggressive productivity factor, so a higher number,
15	would ultimately increase the cost of the project,
16	right?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And those are costs that would be borne by
19	someone, and if approved by the PSC, ultimately the
20	ratepayers, correct?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. So the lower cost that was used here, lower,
23	reflecting the promised producitivity factor as
24	opposed to a historical productivity factor, actually
25	saved money?

	119
1	A. No, it did not.
2	Q. How so?
3	A. If you're not going to meet those
4	productivity factors, you're not going to save
5	anything.
6	Q. But by 2016, you understood, did you not,
7	that Westinghouse had assumed the cost, the potential
8	for cost overruns, associated with a poor
9	productivity factor, right?
10	A. Through the implementation of the fixed
11	price, yes.
12	Q. So at least as of 2016, through
13	implementation of the fixed price option, the
14	productivity factor was now Westinghouse's problem
15	exclusively, right?
16	A. I would not say "exclusively," no. The
17	ultimate responsibility for the project still
18	remained with SCE&G. But, in theory, the financial
19	burden had been moved to the Consortium or to
20	Westinghouse.
21	Q. All right. So by March of 2016, after
22	Mr. Byrne's testimony, you understood that the
23	promised productivity improvements, those promised
24	productivity improvements that Westinghouse had
25	promised, had not been achieved, right?

	120
1	A. Yes.
2	(Exhibit No. 7 was marked for
3	identification.)
4	Q. I'm going to show you what I have marked as
5	Exhibit 7 to your deposition. This is a letter from
6	Dukes Scott to Kenny Jackson. Do you see that?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. This reports on the ORS's retention of you
9	as a consultant, which I believe SCE&G already knew,
10	but then discusses the certain issues related to the
11	project. Do you see that?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Were you involved in the preparation of this
14	letter?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Tell us what led to the preparation of this
17	letter.
18	A. Basically, we were concerned that the
19	project was not meeting its schedule and budget
20	commitments, and that we believed that additional
21	actions needed to be taken, and so we thought that it
22	would be appropriate to outline this to SCE&G.
23	Q. So what of this letter did you actually
24	develop?
25	A. I can't tell you specifically, but I was

	121
1	I was intimately involved with the development of the
2	letter and identified, I would say, where you get
3	into any kind of technical issues, most of those were
4	identified by me.
5	Q. So on page two of this letter, it begins, "A
6	discussion of certain factors that existed in 2008."
7	Do you see that?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Do you agree that in 2008 all these factors
10	were evident?
11	A. Yes, I put together that paragraph,
12	essentially.
13	Q. So do you agree, even today, that as of
14	2008, all of these things were true?
15	A. Yes. In 2008, that's the case.
16	Q. And would you further agree that in the
17	section entitled "Actual Experience," that these were
18	developments since 2008? That's what it has intended
19	to convey, right?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Are any of these developments things that
22	you disagree with today?
23	A. Probably only one.
24	Q. Which one?
25	A. On the page that I don't see page

	122
1	numbers but the one involving the EPA rulings on
2	non-greenhouse gas. Those have been pretty much put
3	on hold.
4	Q. Everything else though is accurate?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. So footnote three on this second page
7	indicates that "We expect SCE&G to be filing for
8	approval of the executed amendment dated October 27,
9	2015 to the contract."
10	A. Okay.
11	Q. Do you see that?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Is that the EPC amendment that allowed for
14	the possibility of a fixed price option?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. So okay. Then you identify certain
17	challenges to or this letter identifies certain
18	challenges to the project on the third page, correct?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. One of those is "Productivity continues to
21	be lower than to meet construction schedules," right?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And what on what did you well, let me
24	ask you this: Did you develop these bullet points?
25	A. Yes.

	123
1	Q. On what did you base that assertion?
2	A. Based on the record that we have on a
3	monthly basis of what actual productivity numbers
4	were, productivity factors and productivity.
5	Q. It's easy to follow and reach this
6	conclusion based on the information that you had at
7	the time, right?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. So then, in conclusion, there are certain
10	bullets that are described after that introductory
11	phrase. Do you see that?
12	A. You're talking about the "Conclusion"?
13	Q. Yes.
14	A. Okay. Yes.
15	Q. Did you develop those bullet points?
16	A. I don't know if I developed all of them, but
17	I had significant input into those.
18	Q. Fair enough. Do you agree today that the
19	BRLA methodology reduces costs per an independent
20	study?
21	MR. COX: Objection. Object to
22	the form.
23	THE WITNESS: Okay. That's one
24	that I did not, and I think that's based on
25	historical pre-me, that they had done studies in

	124
1	South Carolina that indicated that, but I don't
2	really that wasn't my
3	BY MR. CHALLY:
4	Q. Let's go to the last page. I have got one
5	other question to ask you about the bullet points.
6	But before we get there, last page, the last
7	sentence, "The BLRA, as it presently exists, remains
8	an essential element to success," and then it
9	continues.
10	Do you see that?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Do you disagree with anything that's
13	contained in that paragraph?
14	A. I would say I don't disagree with it at the
15	time, no.
16	Q. Then flipping back to the bullet points,
17	"The project faces significant but not insurmountable
18	challenges."
19	Do you see that?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. So you knew, even as of March of 2016, that
22	the project would face significant but not
23	insurmountable challenges; is that right?
24	A. I would not say "knew." There appear to be
25	mechanisms that it was achievable if the mitigation

	125
1	plans were successfully implemented and if they had
2	attained their goals. I did not know that.
3	Q. But it was nevertheless your understanding,
4	based on the information that you had available to
5	you, right?
6	A. Yes.
7	(Exhibit No. 8 was marked for
8	identification.)
9	Q. I have handed you what I have marked as
10	Exhibit 8. This document is an e-mail from you to
11	Dukes Scott. It's dated May 6th yeah, it's dated
12	May 6th, 2016, right?
13	A. Okay.
14	Q. So in this, this document is a summary of a
15	site visit you conducted in April; is that right?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. And is this part of your reporting to
18	Mr. Scott on the status of the project?
19	A. Yes. This was one of the mechanisms that
20	evolved in eventually in my reports to Mr. Scott.
21	Q. At what time did you start doing these
22	written reports?
23	A. I honestly can't tell you. It was an
24	evolution of the project, but I don't remember
25	exactly when it started.

	126
1	Q. But as of this time, as of 2016, you were
2	providing these reports on a monthly basis; is that
3	right?
4	A. Pretty much on a monthly basis, not I
5	wouldn't say every month. If there was nothing
6	changed, sometimes we wouldn't do it; but, in
7	general, yes, on a monthly basis.
8	Q. Flip to the last page of this report,
9	please.
10	A. Okay.
11	Q. The point referred to under Section K,
12	"Construction labor productivity rates and overall
13	productivity improvements have not yet significantly
14	<pre>increased;" is that right?</pre>
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. So that was your observation based on the
17	information available to you at the site at the time,
18	right?
19	A. Correct.
20	Q. And you reached the same conclusion in May,
21	didn't you?
22	A. All I can say is probably, because that was
23	the situation. I don't know if I indicated that, but
24	that would have been my conclusion in May, yes.
25	Q. Yeah. So there was no confusion as to the

	127
1	difficulty in achieving the enhanced productivity
2	that the Consortium had previously promised, was
3	there?
4	A. No, I don't think there was any confusion.
5	The productivity increases have not been met.
6	Q. Right. And that was obvious to anyone who
7	was observing the project, right?
8	MR. COX: Object to the form.
9	THE WITNESS: I would say anyone
10	that understood what productivity numbers are and
11	what productivity factors and was conversant in
12	construction would have understood that, yes.
13	BY MR. CHALLY:
14	Q. Fair enough. So you understood that, and
15	you understood that your job was, in part, to
16	describe those facts as you understood them to others
17	at the ORS, right?
18	A. Correct.
19	(Exhibit No. 9 was marked for
20	identification.)
21	Q. All right. Just to make sure the record is
22	clear, this is Exhibit 9. These are similar notes or
23	notes of your concerns regarding SCE&G responses to
24	ORS AIRs.
25	A. Right.

	128
1	Q. And in four, you indicate the "Quality,
2	productivity and scheduling adherence issues continue
3	to cause a concern," correct?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. Productivity later, skipping a couple, or
6	one sentence, "Productivity and construction
7	performance continue to lag, and the rates needed to
8	support the current completion schedule are not being
9	met."
10	Do you see that?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. So you knew that in May of 2016, right?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And you think you reached a very similar
15	conclusion in June 2016, right?
16	A. That would have been so.
17	(Exhibit No. 10 was marked for
18	identification.)
19	Q. This is Exhibit 10. Tell me if you recall
20	this document.
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Very first let me ask you this: The
23	e-mail is from you to Brittany Waring. Do you see
24	that? Who is Brittany Waring?
25	A. She is the administrative assistant to

	129
1	Mr. Scott.
2	Q. You said, "Please see that Dukes gets this."
3	Was there some specific prompting of this
4	particular communication from Mr. Scott?
5	A. I don't understand that question.
6	Q. Do you know what led to you sending this to
7	Ms. Waring and suggesting specifically that she see
8	that Dukes gets this?
9	A. I don't recall a specific reason. I know
10	that there was some concerns that Dukes had problems
11	with e-mail and overloaded with e-mail and he
12	preferred that many of these things go to Ms. Waring.
13	Q. All right. So then in your actual summary
14	that you prepared and attached to this e-mail, your
15	very first observation and comment is that
16	"Westinghouse and Fluor continue to struggle with
17	craft labor productivity," right?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And you're aware at the time that the
20	performance factor was at, in June 2016, hovering
21	around 2.0, correct?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And say, "The project has never attained the
24	revised 1.15 performance factor that was the basis of
25	the approval of Order Number 2015-661."

		130
1	A.	Yes.
2	Q.	So all that's true and accurate, correct?
3	Α.	Yes. Best of my knowledge and the
4	informat	cion available to me, yes.
5	Q.	And you knew all of that as of June 2016?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	Then go down to six. "Lack of schedule
8	performa	ance continues" I think it should be "to
9	be" but	it says "continues be a significant issue on
10	the proj	ect. Even short-term goals are seldom met on
11	schedule	· "
12	Α.	I'm sorry, I didn't follow. Where that was?
13	Q.	Number six.
14	Α.	Oh, six. Okay.
15	Q.	Page two.
16	Α.	And you are
17	Q.	Very first sentence.
18	Α.	Where
19	Q.	"Lack of schedule performance."
20	A.	Okay. All right. Thank you. Yes. Okay.
21	Q.	So again, this is information that you were
22	able to	determine just based on your access to the
23	site at	the time, correct?
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	Then you, in the following pages, comment on

	131
1	certain filings. You say, "Issues associated with
2	files."
3	Do you see that? It starts on page three.
4	A. Where are you, at the top?
5	Q. Middle.
6	A. Middle?
7	Q. Bold
8	A. Okay.
9	Q language.
10	A. All right.
11	Q. So as of this time, June of 2016, ORS had no
12	confidence that the stated completion schedules would
13	be met; isn't that right?
14	A. I would say I can't speak for ORS. I can
15	speak for me and that statement would be true. At
16	this time, the increases that I had thought would
17	come about with Fluor, increases in productivity and
18	production, that I thought would happen with Fluor.
19	They had been six months on the job and that did not
20	happen, and so I was pretty certain that the schedule
21	would not be met.
22	Q. So this is before you submitted testimony to
23	the PSC in October of 2016, right?
24	A. I don't recall the dates.
25	Q. Well, the date of this is June of 2016,

	132
1	right?
2	A. Okay.
3	Q. And you recall submitting testimony to the
4	PSC in October of 2016, right?
5	A. I recall submitting testimony. I don't
6	remember the date. If that's the date, then that's
7	the date.
8	Q. Do you remember telling the PSC that, what
9	you concluded in paragraph six here?
10	A. Not in those words. I indicated to the PSC
11	that there is going to be significant challenges in
12	order to meet the dates.
13	Q. And SCE&G indicated the same thing to the
14	PSC, didn't they?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And in fact, in paragraph four, you say as
17	much. You say, "I have no confidence that the budget
18	cited by SCE&G in their filing represents the final
19	costs of the project, and neither do they as stated
20	in their filing", right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. So it was clear to you in June of 2016 that
23	SCE&G had serious concerns related to Westinghouse's
24	ability to meet the promised budget, correct?
25	A. Yes.

	133
1	Q. Now, you reiterated this point to Mr. Scott
2	in early August reporting on a result of a site visit
3	in July, didn't you?
4	A. I assume you have the document so we'll see.
5	(Exhibit No. 11 was marked for
6	identification.)
7	Q. I do. Here's Exhibit 11.
8	A. Thank you.
9	Q. Mr. Jones, does this document reflect notes
10	of your site visit conducted in July of 2016?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And in substance, these observations and
13	comments reflect similar information as to what you
14	had conveyed to Mr. Scott in April, May and June,
15	correct?
16	A. If you're speaking specifically of
17	productivity not being met, yes.
18	Q. You understood at this time, this July time
19	frame, that SCE&G and Westinghouse were evaluating
20	certain payments to be made following exercise of the
21	fixed price option, right?
22	A. I can't comment specifically as to when I
23	knew that. I became aware that there were specific
24	negotiations relative to certain payments that would
25	be made to Westinghouse. I don't remember the time

	134
1	frame.
2	Q. Flip to the last page of this particular
3	document then.
4	A. Okay. Okay.
5	Q. "Additional issues associated with the
6	filing."
7	A. All right.
8	Q. "Following updates apply."
9	And then paragraph two, "Still not an
10	agreement between Westinghouse and SCE&G on the
11	revised milestone payment schedule. We were informed
12	that the July transition payment of \$100 million will
13	be the last such payment."
14	And then it continues.
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. So you were aware of negotiations related to
17	certain payments to be made to the Consortium
18	following exercise of the fixed price option, right?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. You were aware, were you not, that SCE&G was
21	paying \$100 million a month to Westinghouse to act as
22	a bridge until Westinghouse and SCE&G could agree on
23	a milestone payment schedule, correct?
24	A. That was the information that was conveyed
25	to us, yes.

	135
1	Q. Did you have any concern with that
2	particular arrangement, payment of \$100 million on a
3	monthly basis?
4	A. I did not at that time. And the reason for
5	that was, when I looked at previous months, the
6	payments had been in that range of \$100 million a
7	month, so it wasn't a significant concern to me that
8	they were doing that at that time.
9	(Exhibit No. 12 was marked for
10	identification.)
11	Q. Here is Exhibit 12. My first question for
12	you, Mr. Jones, is: Do you recognize this document?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. What is it?
15	A. As stated, it's a proposed or conceptual
16	draft of a settlement agreement.
17	Q. Did you draft this?
18	A. No.
19	Q. Do you know who did?
20	A. I think it was Mr. Soult.
21	Q. Are these your handwritten notes on the
22	document?
23	A. The thing in the bubble up there is, yes.
24	Q. And it indicates, "Provided by Gene Soult on
25	2016/6/21. Discussed by ORS management and others at

	136
1	meeting on 6/17/2016," right?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Do you know who was involved in this
4	particular meeting?
5	A. I do not recall the attendees, no.
6	Q. Was Mr. Scott there?
7	A. I do not recall.
8	Q. But you and Mr. Soult were there, right?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Now I want to flip to page five of this
11	document.
12	A. All right.
13	Q. There is a paragraph that begins,
14	"Summarizing the above."
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. I think it's the second sentence, "The lack
17	of productivity, accompanied with a 'first of kind'
18	NRC influenced technology, coupled with the lower
19	skilled labor market and construction material issues
20	leaves ORS very concerned about the company's ability
21	to complete both units within their GSD's."
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. The GSD there is guaranteed substantial
24	completion date, right?
25	A. Right.

	137
1	Q. Then it continues, "ORS believes that
2	without a significant change, neither unit will be
3	able to complete in time to obtain the production tax
4	credit advantages."
5	Do you see that?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And you noted, "I am not here yet. I think
8	you two can make it," correct?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Why did you make that notation?
11	A. It was a point of discussion during the
12	meeting and a comment that I still believed that
13	Unit 2 had a chance to make the December of 2020
14	date.
15	Q. But that wouldn't have been within the
16	then-existing guaranteed substantial completion date,
17	right?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. So you had no dispute with the statement
20	that ORS was very concerned about the company's
21	ability to complete both units within their GSDs,
22	correct?
23	A. No, I had no dispute with that.
24	Q. Then it was because of that, it was because
25	of the concern over the ability of the owner or

	138
1	excuse me the contractor to meet those GSDs that
2	led the ORS to enter into a settlement agreement with
3	the owners that called for, among other things,
4	exercise of the fixed price option; isn't that right?
5	A. Well, I think the fixed price oh, that's
6	right, the fixed price option had to be agreed to by
7	the PSC, so, yes.
8	Q. So then when you submitted your testimony in
9	2016, did you tell the PSC that you didn't think the
10	guaranteed substantial completion dates could be met?
11	A. No, I did not.
12	Q. Why not?
13	A. Quite frankly, with the implementation of
14	the fixed price agreement, I didn't consider it an
15	issue.
16	Q. Why didn't you consider it to be an issue?
17	A. Because through the settlement agreement, we
18	had gotten the guarantee that the cost would be first
19	to Westinghouse, and if not to Westinghouse to
20	Toshiba, and if not Toshiba would be borne by SCE&G,
21	not the ratepayers.
22	Q. So in your view, the settlement agreement
23	and the fixed price option removed any need for you
24	to convey to the Commission that the guaranteed
25	substantial complete dates would not be met?

	139
1	A. Another factor that and that I had no
2	other date to offer them.
3	Q. Why did you have no other date to offer
4	them?
5	A. Because I don't develop the schedule of the
6	project.
7	Q. But you could have said, well, if you assume
8	a 1.15 productivity factor, you get to a schedule of
9	this day, but if you assume a productivity factor
10	more in line with historical performance, you get to
11	a date of this other day, right?
12	A. I could have said a lot of things, but I am
13	not and was not the manager of the project, nor the
14	constructor of the project. It was not my job to
15	develop a schedule.
16	Q. But it was your job to review and approve
17	the schedule and cost estimates, or I should say
18	review and evaluate the schedule and cost estimates
19	presented by the owner, correct?
20	A. That's correct.
21	Q. And in that regard, you could have done what
22	I just suggested, which is use historical
23	productivity factors to determine a revised schedule
24	and cost estimate that were higher and longer in time
25	than the schedule and cost estimate assumed by

	140
1	Westinghouse?
2	A. I could have. I had no reason to do so.
3	Q. And you had no reason to do so because you
4	believe the fixed price option absolved you of any
5	need to disclose that to the PSC; is that right? It
6	just wasn't important when you consider the fixed
7	price option, correct?
8	A. I would agree with the last statement; I
9	didn't consider it to be important when you had the
10	fixed price in place.
11	Q. Okay. So at the time you submitted your
12	testimony to the PSC in October of 2016, you were
13	aware, were you not, of a sensitivity analysis that
14	SCE&G had created to evaluate the potential for
15	further delays associated with construction, right?
16	A. I was aware of it.
17	Q. And this is the sensitivity analysis that
18	you suggested to, I believe it was Ms. Powell, that
19	the ORS engage Bechtel to further address, right?
20	A. I believe that to be the case, yes.
21	Q. So you received access to the sensitivity
22	analysis before it was presented to the Public
23	Service Commission, didn't you?
24	A. I cannot definitively say that, no.
25	(Exhibit No. 13 was marked for

	141
1	identification.)
2	Q. Let me see if this jogs your memory at all.
3	This is Exhibit 13. It's an e-mail from Ms. Powell
4	to you
5	A. All right.
6	Q dated July 7, 2016.
7	This appears to suggest that you were having
8	a meeting with, or at least Ms. Powell was having a
9	meeting with, Joe Lynch to discuss the sensitivity
10	analysis. Do you see that?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Do you recall participating in such a
13	meeting?
14	A. I do not. I am not definitively stating I
15	wasn't there, but I don't recall being in this
16	meeting. I don't think I was, but
17	Q. Do you recall Ms. Powell participating in
18	such a meeting?
19	A. I can't recall for her.
20	Q. I guess so let me ask it a different way.
21	I'm trying to figure out whether you recall this
22	meeting occurring.
23	A. I was aware through this announcement that
24	the meeting was going to occur, yes.
25	Q. And as we sit here today, do you have any

	142
1	reason to dispute the idea that this meeting actually
2	occurred in July of 2016?
3	A. No, I don't have any reason to dispute that,
4	no.
5	Q. But you certainly received this material on
6	July 7 of 2016, correct?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And you reviewed it and evaluated it as you
9	did other material you received related to the
10	project, right?
11	A. Yes. In general, yes.
12	Q. So this document further conveys the very
13	real possibility of further delays associated with
14	construction of the project, correct?
15	A. I would not characterize it as "the very
16	real." I mean, it's a study to determine what the
17	impact would be if these productivity factors
18	proceeded on the basis that's indicated here.
19	Q. And so then the impact would be hundreds, at
20	least hundreds of millions of dollars in cost
21	overruns, right?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And you understood that in July of 2016?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. And that those that possibility of cost

	143
1	overruns reflected the fact that SCE&G had concerns
2	with whether Westinghouse could achieve the
3	productivity it had promised, right?
4	A. I can't say I understood on that basis. I
5	knew they did this study to see what the impact would
6	be.
7	Q. And you knew though, at this time, that this
8	study actually supported exercise of the fixed price
9	option, correct?
10	A. Yes, I was aware that that was the case.
11	Q. Because the cost overruns that are reflected
12	here as possibilities were as of the exercise to the
13	fixed price option, the responsibility of
14	Westinghouse and not SCE&G, correct?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. You understood, did you not, that even as of
17	the time of the fixed price option, there was at
18	least the possibility that Westinghouse would not
19	accept the loss that these cost overruns might create
20	and therefore wouldn't complete the project, right?
21	A. I understood that to be a possibility, yes.
22	Q. And you concluded that this risk was
23	mitigated by a handful of factors, right?
24	A. I don't know what that means.
25	(Exhibit No. 14 was marked for

	144
1	identification.)
2	Q. Okay. Let me show you your testimony. This
3	is Exhibit 14.
4	A. All right.
5	Q. This is another report you prepared, I
6	believe you prepared following a site visit in March
7	of 2016?
8	A. All right.
9	Q. Do you agree with that?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And then this reflected information that you
12	conveyed to Mr. Scott as to the results of your site
13	visit, right?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Okay. And in paragraph two of the notes,
16	you state that "SCE&G advised that, due to concerns
17	with the financial stability and viability of
18	Westinghouse's parent company, Toshiba, they are
19	pursuing a design information escrow with
20	Westinghouse."
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. So you understood, as of March 2016, that
23	there was the possibility that Westinghouse might not
24	complete the project on the terms that it had
25	committed to complete the project, right?

	145
1	A. I can't say that I understood that. I
2	understood that Westinghouse may have been subject to
3	additional costs beyond the fixed price, that
4	whether that had anything to do with the completion
5	of the project, was not in my
6	Q. What is design information escrow?
7	A. The design information escrow was a program
8	that was set up to basically take the Westinghouse
9	design information and their computer programs and
10	provide them to a third party. So these were
11	proprietary, this was proprietary information for
12	Westinghouse.
13	So all the design documents well, maybe
14	not all the significant design documents and the
15	computer programs that generated the analysis that
16	was necessary for the licensing and for the operation
17	and for the design of the plant went into escrow at a
18	third-party facility so that in the unfortunate
19	eventuality that Westinghouse was unable to perform,
20	they would be available to SCE&G through this
21	third-party facility.
22	Q. So you had contemplated at least the
23	possibility that Westinghouse wouldn't be able to
24	perform, correct?
25	A. In this case, I would say that it was SCE&G

	146
1	had come to that conclusion that they wanted to
2	address that eventuality.
3	(Exhibit No. 15 was marked for
4	identification.)
5	Q. I have handed you what I have marked as
6	Exhibit 15.
7	A. Okay.
8	Q. Do you recall this document?
9	A. Yes, from the identification here, yes.
10	Q. What is this?
11	A. This was the draft of my testimony in
12	preparation for the submittal to PSC in the 2015
13	case.
14	Q. You ultimately didn't submit testimony to
15	the PSC in the 2015 docket though, did you?
16	A. I did not.
17	Q. Why not?
18	A. The settlement agreement was with SCE&G
19	was reached prior to the submittal date of the
20	testimony, and ORS advised me that when settlement
21	agreements are reached in advance of submittal of
22	testimony, the practice is to address for the
23	testimony to address only the settlement agreement.
24	Q. Is there any aspect of the pre-filed
25	testimony reflected in this exhibit that you disagree

	147
1	with? Let me ask it a better way.
2	Was this true and correct as of the time you
3	prepared it in June of 2015?
4	A. To the best of my knowledge and based on the
5	information I had at the time, yes.
6	Q. So you knew in 2015, that in June of 2015,
7	that there was likely to be schedule delays in the
8	project?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And that was because, among other things,
11	production and delivery of sub-modules had been an
12	ongoing issue for several months, right?
13	A. That's one of the reasons. There were many
14	issues on the project at this time.
15	Q. And you understood that there was the
16	possibility for delay, in part because of the
17	material that had been submitted in quarterly updates
18	by SCE&G, right?
19	A. I don't understand that question.
20	Q. Go to page nine.
21	A. Okay. Where are you?
22	Q. I'm sorry. Let me refer you to what I was
23	reading. I may have stated it incorrectly.
24	The very last sentence, "The revisions to
25	the project schedule presented by the Consortium to

	148
1	SCE&G in March of this year, which took into account
2	delays already experienced, any updated production
3	schedules provided by the subcontractors performing
4	the work on the modules and panels indicated that the
5	delays in the project schedule would occur," right?
6	A. Yes, in the report.
7	Q. And you indicated in this draft testimony
8	that that was not a surprise, and in fact had been
9	expected by ORS, and you yourself, right?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. You also indicated that schedule impacts
12	were likely because of what was reflected in
13	Mr. Byrne's 2015 testimony in terms of relatively
14	poor productivity demonstrated by craft labor,
15	correct?
16	A. Do you have a specific place you want to
17	take me to there?
18	Q. Sure. Page 12.
19	A. Okay. All right. And
20	Q. Very last paragraph.
21	A. Okay.
22	Q. So you understood from Mr. Byrne's testimony
23	that he had conveyed relatively poor productivity
24	demonstrated by craft labor, correct?
25	A. Yes.

	149
1	Q. And you further understood that that poor
2	productivity was likely to result in schedule delays,
3	correct?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. So you understood in 2015 that SCE&G had
6	filed an update to revise the construction schedules
7	and capital cost schedules to be approved by the
8	Commission, correct?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And you understood the purpose of that
11	update was to change the construction schedule,
12	including the substantial completion date for the
13	units?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And you understood the substantial
16	completion dates were to change for Unit 2 to 2019
17	and for Unit 3 to June of 2020?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And that increased cost of approximately
20	\$700 million, right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And you knew at this time that the
23	Consortium and SCE&G weren't in agreement on the cost
24	and the schedule, correct?
25	A. What I knew was that SCE&G had advised us

	150
1	that they were still working with the Consortium to
2	try to refine the schedule.
3	Q. It was your opinion that, despite the fact
4	that these costs and the schedule were estimated that
5	it was still reasonable and prudent to award SCE&G
6	the cost that they were then expecting or excuse
7	me the cost that they were seeking in the
8	petition, correct?
9	A. Yes. I should modify that. As modified by
10	the settlement agreement, by the terms in the
11	settlement agreement. I'm sorry, this was before the
12	settlement agreement. Nevermind.
13	Q. Correct.
14	A. Sorry.
15	Q. The delays that were evident, even as of
16	2015, were, in your view, in 2015, similar to the
17	delays associated with other AP 1,000 design
18	construction projects, right?
19	A. Similar to, yes.
20	Q. Yeah. And they were not unusual in light of
21	the difficulty of nuclear construction, nuclear
22	reactor construction projects, correct?
23	A. Specifically speaking of U.S. nuclear
24	construction, yes, that's true.
25	Q. Well, okay.

	151
1	And you knew that in the instances where
2	these sorts of delays were evident outside of the
3	project, that these delays were caused by the lack of
4	quality and schedule performance by the vendors
5	supplying equipment and components, correct?
6	A. One of the contributing causes was that,
7	yes, but not the sole.
8	Q. And that didn't impact your views as to the
9	prudency of the costs that SCE&G was seeking to
10	recovering in connection with this docket, right?
11	A. Not at that time, no.
12	Q. Okay. So page 15 and 16 of this testimony,
13	you're discussing estimated completion costs.
14	A. Okay.
15	Q. The end of this page, "The productivity
16	factors demonstrated thus far result in significantly
17	less production than is needed and anticipated for
18	the remainder of the project. SCE&G acknowledges
19	this, but indicates that it would not be in the best
20	interests of the project to insist that the
21	Consortium use more pessimistic productivity factors
22	which would increase the projected cost and remove
23	the incentive of the Consortium to improve in this
24	area."
25	Do you see that?

	152
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Where, to your understanding, did SCE&G
3	acknowledge this fact? Was it in pre-filed
4	testimony?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Then is it your understanding that it would
7	not be in the best interest of the project to insist
8	that the Consortium use more pessimistic productivity
9	factor?
10	A. At that time, I would say, yes, it would not
11	have been.
12	And I should qualify that also. It would
13	not have been in the best interest in dealing with
14	the Consortium to do that.
15	Q. And who are you excluding a certain
16	constituency in that answer?
17	A. Yes. What I'm saying is that SCE&G should
18	have had a schedule that they believed in and one
19	that they would have been able to stand behind
20	themselves. In dealing with the Consortium, I can
21	see why you would want to hold their feet to the fire
22	on the schedule, but you yourself should know what it
23	really is.
24	Q. So is it your belief that SCE&G should have
25	hired its own schedulers to compete with what

	153
1	Westinghouse was providing?
2	A. Well, if you want to talk about beliefs, my
3	belief is they should have hired an owner's engineer
4	earlier in the project, and part of that component
5	would have been a scheduler or a scheduling crew.
6	Q. Didn't impact your opinion as to the
7	prudency of the cost; that belief didn't impact your
8	opinion to the prudency of the cost that they
9	incurred and were seeking in 2015, correct?
10	A. At that time, that's correct.
11	Q. Nor did it impact your view as to the
12	prudency of the cost that they had incurred and were
13	seeking approval for in 2016, right?
14	A. Based on the information I had at that time,
15	no.
16	(Exhibit No. 16 was marked for
17	identification.)
18	Q. Okay. This is Exhibit 16. Does this look
19	to be a copy of the testimony, pre-filed testimony
20	you provided to the PSC in 2016?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. So you understood in 2016 that SCE&G had
23	filed a request for updates and revisions to its
24	capital costs and construction schedule at this time,
25	right?

	154
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And that was to reflect the fact that the
3	EPC contract had been amended; is that right?
4	A. Oh, yes, yes.
5	Q. In parts of the process here, CB&I had
6	exited the project and Fluor had become engaged,
7	right?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. And Fluor was an entity that you had
10	suggested to Skip Smith in, I believe you said 2014,
11	as a possible independent assessor of the project,
12	correct?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. So you were familiar with Fluor?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And tell us about your familiarity with
17	Fluor at this time.
18	A. Again, it goes all the way back to my days
19	at Sargent & Lundy. Fluor, again, much similarly to
20	Bechtel, they were a competitor of Sargent & Lundy at
21	the time, and throughout the years I had worked on
22	projects where they were both the engineer and the
23	constructor.
24	And Sargent & Lundy has also been
25	subcontracted by Fluor to do engineering work. We

	155
1	were their prime engineering subcontract Flour's
2	engineering subcontractor on the South Texas project.
3	I don't remember the number, but it was the plant
4	that was under construction, or under not under
5	construction, under they were going through the
6	licensing process to get a license in Texas. And
7	that project was subsequently I don't think it's
8	officially been canceled but it's been deferred,
9	delayed, cast aside, it's not going to be built.
10	Q. So this sort of well, I will strike that.
11	But you viewed Fluor's involvement here as a
12	positive element, right?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. You understood, did you not, that the fixed
15	price option provided for an increase in liquidated
16	damages in the event that Westinghouse wasn't able to
17	meet the proposed guaranteed substantial completion
18	dates?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. It also established a dispute resolution
21	board, correct?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And you also understood that it revised a
24	construction milestone payment schedule to better
25	align with the project priorities, right?

	156
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. You noted, nonetheless, that you did have
3	some concerns that we talked about earlier related to
4	Westinghouse's ability to absorb potential financial
5	losses that were possible if the projected cost
6	wasn't met, right?
7	A. Yes.
8	MR. COX: Could you repeat that
9	question?
10	(The record was read as requested.)
11	THE WITNESS: I guess the only
12	part of that I don't understand is why it's
13	"nonetheless." But the basis of the question is
14	still there that I understood that that was
15	that I still had the concerns.
16	BY MR. CHALLY:
17	Q. You still had what I meant by
18	"nonetheless," you still had those concerns but you
19	nevertheless thought that the fixed price option was
20	the appropriate choice?
21	A. Yes. And particularly in light of the
22	also the terms of the settlement agreement, which not
23	only what I refer to as triple guarantee, took you
24	through Westinghouse, Toshiba, and then South
25	Carolina Electric & Gas as the guarantors of

	157
1	finishing the project with no additional cost to the
2	ratepayers.
3	Q. So you understood at the time of your 2016
4	testimony that the guaranteed substantial completion
5	dates provided for in the exercise to the fixed price
6	option were still likely to be delayed?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And you knew at the time you knew that at
9	this time, and also that Fluor which had just come
10	on, had not completed its review of the construction
11	schedule?
12	A. What time frame are we talking about?
13	Q. The time of your testimony.
14	A. October?
15	Q. Yes.
16	A. No, I did not know that.
17	Q. Let's flip to page 278. About midway
18	through the first paragraph, "At this time, it does
19	not appear that the GSCDs will extend beyond the
20	18-month duration allowed by the Commission.
21	However, this will be better known later this year
22	when Fluor completes its review of the construction
23	schedule," correct?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. So you I'm sorry.

	158
1	A. At that time, we the Fluor construction
2	schedule was under review, and we were supposed to be
3	provided that schedule after the review by SCE&G.
4	Q. But the fact that you didn't have that
5	information didn't in any way restrict you from
6	taking the position that the costs sought in this
7	docket were prudent and appropriate, right?
8	A. Not based on the information that we had,
9	no.
10	Q. And about Westinghouse's potential failure,
11	you discussed the information available to you as to
12	how to mitigate that concern, right?
13	A. I am not following that question.
14	Q. Okay. Let's go to page 30 of your
15	testimony.
16	A. Okay.
17	Q. Here you say, halfway through the first full
18	paragraph, "WEC executive management assured SCE&G
19	and ORS that WEC abide by the terms of the EPC
20	contract and absorb the losses that are forecasted."
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. So you make no mention of this triple
23	protection that you referred to earlier; that being
24	that SCE&G would somehow assume the losses of WEC's
25	failure. You instead focused your testimony on what

	159
1	WEC executive management had conveyed to SCE&G, ORS,
2	right?
3	A. Right, but the conclusions are based on the
4	acceptance of the settlement agreement also.
5	Q. And there were further assurances that you
6	had received from WEC at this time, correct, and they
7	are also recounted in your testimony?
8	A. By further assurances I mean, the only
9	assurance I recall was the assurance from the meeting
10	with the Executive VP, Mr. Benjamin, of Westinghouse.
11	Q. Tell me what you recall about that meeting.
12	A. It was on site in the nuclear operations
13	building at the site. There were several attendees.
14	My recollection is that none of the representatives
15	of Santee Cooper was there. A representative of
16	Westinghouse, Mr. Benjamin, was there. A
17	representative of Fluor was there, Gary Flowers.
18	Also one of the top executives at Fluor. Mr. Scott
19	was there. Allyn Powell, my colleague, was there.
20	Who else. From SCE&G, Mr. Byrne was there, I think.
21	I think I think there is a fairly accurate list
22	provided in the testimony of the direct testimony
23	of, I think it was Jimmy Addison's testimony.
24	Q. So you participated in this meeting. Was it
25	your understanding that the purpose of this meeting

	160
1	was to give you and others an opportunity to ask
2	questions directly of the Consortium?
3	A. That was one of the purposes of the meeting,
4	yes.
5	Q. Were you restrained in any way in your
6	ability to ask questions that you thought were
7	appropriate?
8	A. No, we were not.
9	Q. Did you get all the information that you
10	thought necessary during that meeting?
11	A. Again, I can't say we got all the
12	information we thought necessary. I mean, we kept
13	asking for a schedule, and there were promises made
14	about the schedule, too. But, I mean, one of the
15	primary things was to get the assurance from
16	Westinghouse that they understood the potential risk
17	and that they were willing to stand behind those.
18	Q. And they made clear to you directly that
19	they were?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. They both understood those risks and willing
22	to stand behind them?
23	A. Yes. And they recounted that, you know,
24	Westinghouse was dedicated to the nuclear power plant
25	market, that they recognized that both V.C. Summer

	161
1	and the Vogtle plant represented their hallmarks for
2	maintaining their presence in the nuclear power plant
3	market, and that both of these plants were paramount
4	importance to the organization, and they assured us
5	that they would carry through and complete these
6	plants.
7	Q. And it was based, in part, of those
8	assurances in the fixed price option that you
9	ultimately supported the requests that SCE&G had made
10	in the 2016 docket, right?
11	A. That's correct.
12	Q. So those assurances alleviated your concerns
13	related to the lack of a final schedule, didn't they?
14	A. I wouldn't say they alleviated my concerns
15	relative to a final schedule. They were one of the
16	things that entered into the picture that if
17	Westinghouse understood the risk and were willing to
18	stand behind it, which I thought they could be taken
19	at their word, wrongly, that that provided a good
20	level of comfort that the project would be completed
21	and at no additional cost to the ratepayers.
22	Q. So I guess my question is: But you didn't
23	get a schedule at that meeting, right?
24	A. Oh, no, no. We just made known that we were
25	still looking for that.

	162
1	Q. And despite the fact that you didn't get a
2	schedule, you didn't refuse to support the
3	settlement, correct?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. Why not?
6	A. It actually appeared to be a very good deal
7	for the ratepayers of South Carolina.
8	Q. And that was true even though you hadn't
9	received the schedule that you requested of the
10	Consortium, correct?
11	A. That's correct.
12	I will just add we didn't stop asking for
13	it; it's just that we didn't it wasn't something
14	that we believed should hold up proceeding with the
15	fixed price and with the terms of the settlement
16	agreement.
17	Q. And that's true even though you understood
18	the basics of Dr. Lynch's sensitivity studies at this
19	time, right?
20	A. Yes.
21	MR. COX: Can we take a break
22	whenever?
23	MR. CHALLY: Okay.
24	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
25	off the record at 2:44 p.m.

	163
1	(A recess was taken.)
2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
3	back on the record at 2:58 p.m.
4	(Exhibit No. 17 was marked for
5	identification.)
6	BY MR. CHALLY:
7	Q. Mr. Jones, I'm going to hand you what I have
8	marked as Exhibit 17. This is an e-mail from
9	Ms. Powell to Anthony James, you're copied. The
10	subject is "Final Presentation."
11	The first sentence of the e-mail is,
12	"Attached is Gary's final presentation edits from
13	this morning."
14	Do you see that?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. So then this attaches a presentation that's
17	entitled "Status of the V.C. Summer Units 2 and 3
18	nuclear power plants," correct?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And this is the presentation you made to the
21	Electric Cooperatives of South Carolina in March of
22	2016; is that right?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Did you prepare this presentation?
25	A. Yes.

	164
1	Q. Did you prepare it exclusively or did you
2	rely on assistance of others at ORS?
3	A. There were comments provided, but and I
4	think the final format was, but basically they were
5	my slides transposed onto these, this format.
6	Q. So the substance of this was primarily
7	developed by you; is that fair?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. I want to refer to Slide 2 first. You
10	indicate that or the title of the slide is "A Very
11	Good Idea in 2008."
12	Are you referring to Units 2 and 3 as the
13	"Very Good Idea in 2008;" is that right?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. In summary, the reasons why are those
16	described in the text of the slide; is that right?
17	A. What we thought in 2008, yes.
18	Q. And then you further describe some
19	developments since 2008 that you experienced; is that
20	fair?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And despite those developments, you
23	concluded that the BLRA remains an essential element
24	to success, correct?
25	A. Yes.

	165
1	Q. Did you believe that in 2016, correct?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Do you believe that today?
4	A. It's hard to say that now because it has not
5	been an element of success.
6	But the basic structure of the BLRA, I think
7	it definitely in retrospect, I don't think there
8	were provisions that should have been changed, but
9	the general approach I would still agree with. But
10	there definitely should have been some changes
11	relative to, for example, abandonment.
12	Q. So the general approach that you understand
13	to be a good idea, what is it your what do you
14	describe that general approach to be?
15	A. Well, the general approach was the recovery
16	of the financing cost as the project advanced. I
17	think this gave an amount of certainty that was
18	required at the time these plants were authorized in
19	order to go ahead with that and the assurance that
20	to be able to proceed with the plant and not revisit
21	it.
22	Q. So you understand that the BLRA provides for
23	a prudency determination at the outset of a project,
24	correct?
25	A. That's what I understand, yes.

	166
1	MR. COX: Object to the form.
2	BY MR. CHALLY:
3	Q. And it's your understanding that that
4	certainty associated with the preconstruction
5	prudency review is a good idea, roughly?
6	A. I think the general concept is a good idea.
7	I think there probably should have been additional
8	limits on it.
9	Q. But you understood that it was a good idea
10	because it provided for certainty to owners of the
11	sorts of nuclear facilities, correct?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. Certainty as to their ability to recover
14	costs, correct?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And that's critical to incentivizing the
17	construction and development of these sorts of
18	facilities, right?
19	A. At the time, I think that's the case, yes.
20	Q. So you alluded to the fact that you believe
21	there needs to be some tweaks for abandonment. What
22	tweaks do you believe should be applied?
23	A. I can't speak to the I have not really
24	reviewed in-depth, but I think I would say my
25	basic belief is that abandonment costs at least ought

	167
1	to be shared between the utility and ratepayers.
2	Q. So is it your understanding that, under the
3	BLRA, a decision to abandon doesn't require a
4	reduction, an immediate reduction in the rates that
5	were previously approved?
6	MR. COX: Object to the form.
7	THE WITNESS: You're going beyond
8	my
9	BY MR. CHALLY:
10	Q. Okay.
11	A purview of the BLRA's
12	Q. So that's fair enough. Let me make sure I
13	just get the full extent of your understanding then.
14	It's your understanding the BLRA was to
15	allow for recovery of certain financing costs
16	associated with the construction of the nuclear
17	facility, correct?
18	A. Correct.
19	Q. And that once those costs were approved,
20	they could not later be eliminated?
21	MR. COX: Object to the form.
22	BY MR. CHALLY:
23	Q. Withdrawn?
24	A. Within certain parameters, yes.
25	Q. Do you understand what those parameters are?

	168
1	A. Not fully, no.
2	Q. Do you understand those parameters to relate
3	in any way to a decision as to whether to complete
4	construction of the project?
5	A. I can't speak to that. I don't know the
6	specific provisions.
7	Q. I understand you don't understand the
8	specific provisions. But as we sit here today, are
9	you aware, in concept, that the costs approved by the
10	PSC under the BLRA are subject to revision dependent
11	on the status of construction?
12	A. I can say, yeah, I basically understood
13	that, yes.
14	Q. What about that the costs, once approved,
15	are subject to revision dependent upon abandonment?
16	A. The cost repeat that, please?
17	Q. Do you understand that the costs, once
18	approved under the BLRA, are subject to revision
19	dependent on abandonment?
20	A. What I would say now is I know there's been
21	legislative changes, so I'm not totally familiar with
22	all of those legislative changes. If you're talking
23	about the original BLRA, then I would say that that
24	appears to be the case. But the new provisions that
25	have been enacted, I couldn't say how that stacks up.

	169
1	Q. Let's just talk about your understanding
2	about the original BLRA. Is it your understanding
3	that costs approved under the BLRA were to the
4	owners or SCE&G, excuse me was entitled to
5	continue to collect those costs regardless of whether
6	there was an abandonment of the project?
7	A. My understanding of the BLRA is that, yes,
8	original BLRA.
9	Q. Then on page five of this slide.
10	A. I would like to modify that. Costs
11	prudently incurred could be recovered.
12	Q. Was it your understanding that the prudency
13	determination was made at the time those costs were
14	incurred?
15	A. That's that is supposed to be the case,
16	yes.
17	Q. That's the certainty that you identified as
18	being important to incentivize owners of nuclear
19	reactor facilities, correct?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Now on Slide 5 under your title, "BLRA
22	Remains an Essential Element to Success," the first
23	bullet is, "Stable environment ensures project
24	financing." I think we talked about that.
25	The second is, "Independent study shows

	170
1	plant is still a positive."
2	What are you referring to there?
3	A. Let's see, what was you know, I think,
4	no, that wasn't independent. What was I referring
5	to?
6	Oh, I well, I think I was referring to
7	the ORS had brought on board someone to look at the
8	sensitivity studies performed by Dr. Lynch, and I
9	think that's what I was referring to there. That's
10	my recollection.
11	Q. Who did the ORS bring on board to look at
12	those sensitivity studies?
13	A. I don't remember his name. That's a
14	question for other staff, other staff other than me.
15	I had really no well, let's see. I believe it was
16	Mr. Richardson, but I would not Norm Richardson,
17	but I would not you need to ask someone other than
18	me.
19	Q. Okay. Just to make sure I understand what
20	you said, you believe that Norm Richardson was tasked
21	with that?
22	A. I believe that's the case.
23	Q. Who would know?
24	A. Well, for sure, Nanette Edwards would know,
25	I would assume other people would know. I mean, my

	171
1	first choice would have been Shannon, but she's not
2	there anymore, so
3	Q. Then your presentation identifies certain
4	project challenges, and I just want to make sure I
5	understand. This is all stuff that you
6	A. Where are you?
7	Q. I'm on page 19, on pages 19 and 20.
8	A. Okay.
9	Q. This is all information that you were aware
10	of given your involvement in the project as of this
11	date?
12	A. When you say "all information," I mean,
13	what's presented here is information that I was aware
14	of at that time, yes.
15	Q. And is any of this different than what you
16	understood to have been conveyed in testimony that
17	SCE&G submitted to the Public Service Commission by
18	this time?
19	A. I think there may be some detail in some
20	cases, but I'm not aware of any major differences.
21	Q. Do you recall did you actually give this
22	presentation on March 3, 2016?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Do you recall who attended the presentation?
25	A. No. I mean, there were representatives of,

	172
1	I think, almost all of the major electric co-ops, but
2	I don't know who they were, sorry.
3	Q. What was the reason for this meeting?
4	A. It had been requested basically by Mike
5	Couick through Mr. Scott. So that was my
6	understanding of how this came about.
7	Q. Do you know why it was requested?
8	A. Not specifically, but I think the
9	cooperatives had concerns that they weren't getting
10	the full story of the project and wanted someone else
11	to provide it.
12	Q. And you understood this was in connection
13	with the evaluation of the fixed price option,
14	correct?
15	A. No, I did not understand that that was the
16	case.
17	Q. You understood, did you not, that the
18	electrical cooperatives I'm sorry ECSC
19	ultimately intervened in the PSC docket in 2016,
20	right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. You understood that they were part of the
23	settlement agreement that the ORS entered into in
24	2016, right?
25	A. Yes.

	173
1	Q. So is it your understanding that your
2	provision of information here was intended to
3	facilitate the evaluation of that settlement?
4	A. I was not told that or did not know that.
5	But my what I was told was that this was to give
6	the cooperatives a better understanding of the status
7	of the project.
8	Q. You didn't tell the cooperatives at this
9	time that you knew there was an assessment going on,
10	right?
11	A. No.
12	Q. You didn't tell them that you knew Bechtel
13	had done some work on the project, right?
14	A. No.
15	Q. You didn't tell the cooperatives that they
16	should withhold support for any increased costs until
17	you got more information related to this assessment,
18	right?
19	A. No.
20	Q. Nor did you tell them that they should
21	withhold support for any increased costs on the
22	project until you learned more about what Bechtel was
23	doing on the project, correct?
24	A. No, I did not.
25	Q. You didn't tell them that they should

	174
1	withhold support for the project in light of the
2	problems that SCE&G had disclosed in its relationship
3	with the Consortium, did you?
4	A. No, I did not tell them that.
5	Q. You didn't believe that the cooperatives or
6	the ORS should withhold its support for the project
7	in light of those problems, right?
8	A. I had nothing to say about the cooperatives.
9	Q. Fair enough. But as to the ORS, you didn't
10	believe that it should withhold its support,
11	continued support, for the project because of the
12	problems that existed with the Consortium?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. Nor did you believe that they should
15	withhold support for the project in light of the fact
16	that you didn't have further information related to
17	the assessment?
18	A. And the "they" you're referring to is ORS?
19	Q. Correct.
20	A. That's correct, I did not believe they
21	should.
22	Q. Do you recall a meeting involving SCE&G
23	employees and specifically Ken Brown in 2015?
24	A. No, you'd have to be a little more specific
25	than that.

	175
1	Q. Did you meet with Ken Brown regularly in
2	connection with the project?
3	A. Not regularly. We did meet with him
4	occasionally but not regularly.
5	Q. How often do you recall meeting with him?
6	A. I can't say. We met with him several times
7	during the course of the project, but I don't
8	remember.
9	Q. Do you recall discussing with Ken Brown in
10	2015 issues related to the estimated completion?
11	A. I don't remember that specifically, no, but
12	it's possible.
13	Q. You don't recall receiving a presentation
14	from Ken Brown in 2015 where he discussed the
15	estimated completion?
16	A. I don't recall that specifically. I know we
17	were I believe this was all tied to them
18	explaining to us all the changes that they had
19	submitted that did not have approved change orders
20	for the project and had not got Consortium buy-in to
21	the numbers that were there.
22	So there were several meetings that happened
23	during that time frame, because we were concerned
24	about how they had submitted this update. And those
25	are outlined in my testimony also, the fact that this

	176
1	was very unusual, that always before we had had
2	signed-off change orders, at least draft change
3	orders that had been accepted by the Consortium, but
4	in this case we got estimates, some of which were
5	only from SCE&G.
6	Q. Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 1, your
7	testimony. I'm going to ask you similar questions
8	that relate to this testimony I asked you previously.
9	What was the process for preparing this
10	testimony? Did you draft it or was a draft prepared
11	for you?
12	A. No, I drafted it.
13	Q. You acknowledge in this testimony that at
14	the time the V.C. Summer project began, there was a
15	resurgence of interest of nuclear power in the United
16	States, right?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And the AP 1,000 design was considered a
19	major breakthrough in nuclear plant technology,
20	right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. You also state that the EPC contract SCE&G
23	entered into with the Consortium appeared to offer
24	in 2008 appeared to offer an economical efficient
25	approach to building the plant; is that right?

	177
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And it was actually a risk-reducing approach
3	to building those plants, correct?
4	A. It was thought so at that time, yes.
5	Q. And then you go on in your testimony to talk
6	about certain unexpected problems and delays that
7	impacted the project, correct?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And those are delays in the Nuclear
10	Regulatory Commission's issuance of the
11	certificate or the COL; is that right?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And certain delays associated with
14	Westinghouse's design not being as complete as it was
15	advertised?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. And you talk about contract structure that
18	created some problems, commercial issues between the
19	owners and the Consortium.
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. And changes to the Consortium partners that
22	further resulted in problems in the project, right?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. You state though that, despite all of these
25	challenges that you describe, the project had

	178
1	potentially workable solutions and mitigating
2	approaches, right?
3	A. As identified to us, yes.
4	Q. So what you say is, on page eight of your
5	testimony, that you this is the first full
6	paragraph, "I asserted then" towards the end of it
7	"I asserted then and continue to maintain, based
8	on the available record evidence reviewed thus far,
9	that the actions taken by SCE&G appear to have been
10	reasonable based on the best information available at
11	the time;" is that right?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. So what precisely are you referring to here,
14	what actions? Are you talking about all actions
15	taken in connection with the construction of the
16	project?
17	A. No, I wouldn't say "all actions," I don't
18	know all actions. But what I am talking about is
19	that when they encountered problems, they worked
20	towards solutions, they had mitigating strategies
21	that were implemented. So the actions that were
22	taken, appeared at this point, to be genuinely
23	focused on completing the project in an efficient
24	manner.
25	Q. So these are problems that you had

	179
1	identified prior to September 24 of 2018? You said
2	"at this time." I want to make sure
3	A. "At this time" means in the time frame
4	before March 2015.
5	Q. Oh, okay. So this comment then relates
6	exclusively to conduct that occurred before March 12,
7	2015?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And it is conduct that you believe occurred
10	after March 12, 2015 that is not reasonable; is that
11	right?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. But you're not quibbling with any actions
14	taken prior to that time?
15	A. Based on the record that I have seen so
16	far again, I'm not going to say I'm not quibbling
17	with any action, I'm just saying that I am not I
18	don't know of any that I would disagree with.
19	Q. Notwithstanding these events or information
20	you believe occurred after March 2015, it's true, is
21	it not, that you believe the decision to abandon the
22	project in July of 2015 was prudent?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. And it was prudent, at least in part,
25	because Westinghouse's bankruptcy resulted in voiding

	180
1	the EPC contract, right?
2	A. That's one of the reasons, yes.
3	Q. And because Santee Cooper decided that it
4	couldn't continue with the project, correct?
5	A. I agree with that, yes.
6	Q. So SCE&G would not have been financially
7	able to complete the project alone, right?
8	A. In that case, I can only say what they
9	asserted; that they would not have been financially
10	able to complete the project on their own.
11	Q. And in light of that reality, abandonment
12	was a prudent decision, correct?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Well, you also agree, I believe in your
15	testimony, that the decision to monetize the Toshiba
16	settlement was prudent at the time that decision was
17	made, right?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. And that's because there was a concern
20	regarding Toshiba's ongoing viability, correct?
21	A. There were financial issues associated with
22	Toshiba that indicated that it was a good idea to
23	take the money up front, yes.
24	Q. And so you don't state in your testimony
25	that SCE&G's decision to abandon the construction of

	181
1	the nuclear facilities automatically means that SCE&G
2	is no longer entitled to collect the rates the PSC
3	previously approved, correct?
4	MR. COX: Can you repeat the
5	question?
6	(The record was read as requested.)
7	THE WITNESS: I can say that I
8	don't state that and I don't see any reason why
9	it would.
10	BY MR. CHALLY:
11	Q. Because it's not your understanding of how
12	it works, correct?
13	A. It's not my that's not my call.
14	Q. Okay. But it's your opinion that the only
15	costs that SCE&G should not be responsible or
16	excuse me that SCE&G should be responsible for are
17	costs incurred after March 12 of 2015?
18	A. At the current time, there are little tweaks
19	on that.
20	Q. What are those "little tweaks"?
21	A. Well, they're not my little tweaks. They're
22	tweaks that the audit people have found that they're
23	disputing costs going back further than that, and
24	there are specific issues.
25	So I'm talking about in the big picture what

	182
1	you say is correct, but there are exceptions to that
2	that the audit, ORS audit department, has identified
3	and are pursuing on their own. I'm just aware of
4	these. I can't give you any details on them, just
5	know they're there.
6	Q. Fair enough. Now, you state in your
7	testimony that SCE&G's delays in providing ORS with
8	requested information and/or refusal to provide
9	requested information prevents you from being able to
10	opine with any certainty regarding the prudency of
11	SCE&G's conduct prior to March 12, 2015, right?
12	A. Right.
13	Q. What delays are you referring to?
14	A. Information from discovery that they have
15	not provided all the information that was requested,
16	some of which I think we got over 40,000 documents
17	like last Monday or Monday a week ago, Monday a week
18	ago, I think. So and there's still outstanding
19	information that is being identified that still
20	hasn't been provided.
21	Q. What specifically are you looking for?
22	A. I don't know specifically what I'm looking
23	for. We're looking for all the information to be
24	provided. If I knew what I was looking for, then I
25	probably wouldn't be asking for it.

	183
1	Q. Well, you had extensive information related
2	to the project well before March 12, 2015, right?
3	A. I did.
4	Q. And you received reports on a daily, weekly,
5	monthly, quarterly basis, correct?
6	A. Yes. But as I have identified during
7	discovery, we did not get all the information that we
8	needed.
9	Q. And the information that I believe you said
10	you didn't receive are issues related to the Bechtel
11	report, correct?
12	A. Several issues. I don't think we got
13	information that pertained to how SCE&G regarded the
14	schedule submitted by the Consortium, what their
15	confidence levels in those schedules were, and the
16	schedule and the cost. So there was information
17	there that wasn't provided to us that should have
18	been.
19	And going back again relative to Bechtel,
20	the very fact that they were doing an assessment
21	would have greatly impacted our decision to move
22	ahead with the March 12, 2015 filing. That would
23	have had a major impact on whether we would recommend
24	moving ahead with that. And then all the Bechtel
25	information itself.

	184
1	Q. So okay, Mr. Jones. We discussed these
2	categories of information that you thought you needed
3	earlier that was the Bechtel report. It was certain
4	communications between
5	A. Yeah.
6	Q Santee and SCE&G, certain information
7	related to schedules, cost estimates generated by
8	SCE&G, and then estimates of oh, estimate at the
9	abandonment or excuse me, my notes are bad on
10	this estimates of the cost of the project at the
11	time SCE&G was determining whether or not to abandon.
12	Those, I think, are all the categories of
13	information that you believe that you didn't receive
14	at one point or the other.
15	MR. COX: Object to the form.
16	BY MR. CHALLY:
17	Q. Is that right?
18	A. I think those are the that's the
19	information. When you asked the question, that's the
20	input that I provided.
21	Q. Okay. And you, in your testimony just a
22	minute ago, said that had you known about the
23	assessment in March 2015, you would have taken a
24	different approach. Is that what you're telling me?
25	A. Yes.

	185
1	Q. You knew about the assessment in 2015,
2	Mr. Jones.
3	A. I did not.
4	Q. Your testimony earlier today was that you
5	knew that Bechtel had done an assessment in 2015.
6	A. That I knew about I'm talking about the
7	March 12 filing.
8	Q. Okay.
9	A. March 12, 2015.
10	Q. I understand. But you knew in March 2015
11	that Bechtel had been engaged to do an assessment on
12	the project.
13	A. I knew in October of 2015 that Bechtel had
14	been engaged.
15	Q. Correct. And you submitted you continued
16	working on the project until it was abandoned in
17	2017, and you submitted testimony to the PSC after
18	that time, didn't you?
19	A. I don't understand. What I knew is that
20	Bechtel had done an assessment. I had no idea the
21	scope, the content. I don't understand why knowing
22	that Bechtel did an assessment somehow influences
23	what happened to the rest of the project.
24	Q. Because you said in your testimony that had
25	you known they were doing an assessment on March 12,

	186
1	2015, that you would have done something differently.
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And you knew they did an assessment, and you
4	did nothing differently after that time.
5	MR. COX: Object to the form.
6	THE WITNESS: I don't understand
7	the form of that question either. What I'm
8	telling you is that if we had known that Bechtel
9	was going to do an assessment of the project, we
10	would not have proceeded with the case before the
11	PSC in the March 12, 2015 case. If we had known
12	at that time that Bechtel was going to do an
13	assessment, it would not have proceeded.
14	BY MR. CHALLY:
15	Q. So you knew that Bechtel was doing an
16	assessment later in 2015?
17	A. I knew that they had done an assessment,
18	yes.
19	Q. And that was before the PSC had issued an
20	order on the 2015 in the 2015 docket, right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Yes. And you didn't do anything to stop the
23	PSC
24	A. Absolutely not, because we had no idea what
25	the scope of the Bechtel assessment was, nor what the

	187
1	results were.
2	Q. So it wasn't at all the fact that Bechtel
3	was doing an assessment that you believe required a
4	change in course, it was some other fact?
5	A. No. You've got to take it in the context of
6	the timing. If we had known in March of 2015 that
7	SCE&G was planning to have Bechtel do an assessment,
8	the first thing we would have found out is, what is
9	the assessment going to be, what's the scope of the
10	assessment.
11	If the scope of the assessment had been to
12	do an independent assessment of the project with 14
13	people and take two months and look at the status of
14	construction and also take a look at the schedule, or
15	even if it wasn't to look at the schedule, if we had
16	known that they were going to do an independent
17	assessment due to the status of the update that they
18	filed, which was based on estimates with no with
19	no approved change orders, with no buy-in by the
20	Consortium, we would have been we would have I
21	can't say "we," I back off on that. I, my
22	recommendation would be not to proceed with the case
23	before the PSC, because we would await the results of
24	the Bechtel assessment.
25	O. So. Mr. Jones, you knew in by mid 2015.

	188
1	that Bechtel was doing an assessment, an independent
2	assessment, of the project, right?
3	MR. COX: Object to the form.
4	THE WITNESS: No, I did not know
5	by mid 2015. I knew October between
6	October 15th and October 27th is when I found
7	out.
8	BY MR. CHALLY:
9	Q. So you knew between October 15 and
10	October 27 that Bechtel was doing an assessment?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And that was before the time that the PSC
13	had entered an order on the 2015 docket, right?
14	A. That's correct.
15	Q. And you did nothing to tell the PSC, stop,
16	we need to know about the Bechtel assessment?
17	A. I had no reason to.
18	Q. And in fact, other than asking for a copy of
19	the Bechtel report on two occasions, you did nothing
20	to figure out more information related to the Bechtel
21	assessment before allowing the PSC to enter an order
22	in the 2015 docket?
23	A. I had nothing, because we had been told that
24	there was nothing to that nothing new had been
25	found, that it was an assessment that was a

	189
1	no-nevermind.
2	Q. So it's not at all the fact of an assessment
3	being conducted that causes you to believe action
4	taken after March 12, 2015, are unreasonable, and it
5	is something else?
6	A. No. Context and time must be taken into
7	consideration. If I had known at the time that SCE&G
8	was planning for Bechtel to do an assessment of the
9	project, as I said, the first step would be to find
10	out what the scope of that assessment was. It could
11	have been a minor thing where two Bechtel executives
12	come in and give some guidance to Kevin Marsh about
13	maybe some of the things he should do, and that
14	wouldn't have necessarily been important.
15	If I had known that the plan was to bring a
16	substantial crew of senior Bechtel staff into the
17	project and do a comprehensive independent assessment
18	of the project, my recommendation to ORS and to the
19	PSC would be, this needs to be put on hold until the
20	Bechtel assessment is completed and the results have
21	been reviewed.
22	Q. So
23	A. That's an entirely different thing than just
24	knowing that an assessment was done, and it was a
25	no-nevermind.

	190
1	Q. Right. So it isn't the fact of an
2	assessment that causes a change in course; it's the
3	significance of that assessment, right?
4	A. I guess, yes.
5	Q. Okay. If the assessment is ultimately
6	insignificant, it wouldn't have required a change in
7	course at all?
8	A. That's certainly true. If it was
9	insignificant, then, no, you wouldn't have to change
10	course.
11	Q. And if the information provided related to
12	schedule was unreliable, it wouldn't have required a
13	change in course at all, would it?
14	A. That presupposed that the information was
15	unreliable.
16	Q. But if it was unreliable, it wouldn't have
17	required a change in course.
18	A. If it was, and if we agreed that it was
19	unreliable, then, no.
20	Q. So it's the significance of the assessment
21	that you believe causes the change in course. And
22	what specifically conveys to you that an assessment
23	is significant?
24	A. Well, several things would convey it. One
25	would be the scope of the assessment, what did they

	191
1	intend to look at, what is the scope outline that
2	they're going to review. That would be one of the
3	first considerations of whether or not it's going to
4	be a significant assessment.
5	I think the level and depth that they
6	plan and that ties, to some extent, to the number
7	of people and the qualifications of the people that
8	are going to do the assessment. So that ties into
9	whether it's going to be a significant assessment.
10	The results of the assessment certainly
11	determine whether or not it's a significant
12	assessment. And the recommendations, the findings
13	and the recommendations, determine whether it's a
14	significant assessment.
15	Q. Anything else that goes into determining the
16	significance of an assessment and whether you would
17	have recommended a change in course?
18	A. Off the top of my head, I can't think of
19	anything that would be another determinant of the
20	significance of an assessment other than the scope,
21	reviewers, findings, recommendations. No, I can't
22	think of anything else.
23	Q. So that's one basis for you contending that
24	SCE&G should be responsible for all costs incurred
25	after March 12, 2015, that there wasn't information

	192
1	related to the significance of this assessment
2	that well, I'm butchering this. Let me start
3	over.
4	So one part of your testimony is that the
5	significance of the assessment needed to be revealed
6	to you, and that because that significance wasn't
7	revealed to you, costs incurred after March 12 of
8	2015 shouldn't be allowed, correct?
9	A. I would go to the first thing that needs to
10	be revealed is there is an assessment being done.
11	Then you get into the discussions of the significance
12	of the assessment.
13	Q. But you knew there was an assessment being
14	done.
15	A. Did not. Did not know in March of 2015 that
16	there was an assessment being done. Did not know
17	that.
18	Q. You knew that in October of 2015.
19	A. Correct.
20	Q. And everyone at the ORS knew that in October
21	of 2015, right?
22	MR. COX: Object to the form.
23	THE WITNESS: I can't possibly
24	tell you that everyone at ORS knew that.
25	

	193
1	BY MR. CHALLY:
2	Q. Well, Ms. Howell knew.
3	A. Members of my immediate team, definitely.
4	Q. Ms. Powell knew it; is that right?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And Mr. Soult knew it?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Mr. Scott knew it?
9	A. That, again, my memory there is somewhat
10	faulty. He knew of it definitely later. He may have
11	known at that time. I don't remember whether it was
12	conveyed to him or not.
13	Q. Well, at least three of you knew of the
14	Bechtel assessment in October 2015.
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And didn't do anything about Bechtel until
17	after abandonment of the project?
18	MR. COX: Object to the form.
19	THE WITNESS: Didn't do anything
20	about it? It was portrayed to us as an
21	assessment that found nothing new. We didn't
22	think any action would be required if nothing new
23	was found.
24	BY MR. CHALLY:
25	Q. And so long as that's true, so long as the

	194
1	Bechtel assessment didn't reveal anything new, you
2	would agree, would you not, that nothing needs to be
3	changed in light of the Bechtel assessment in terms
4	of what costs are to be covered?
5	A. I would not agree with that. I think that
6	it was an important disclosure to let us know that
7	the assessment was being done.
8	Q. The disclosure you received in October of
9	2015?
10	A. I'm talking about the disclosure we should
11	have received in earlier than that, that an
12	assessment was planned and was going to be done.
13	But and I think it would have been I would say
14	it would have been part of SCE&G's defense that it
15	was insignificant, and our acceptance that in fact it
16	was insignificant. But I think we should have been
17	brought in to process to make that determination on
18	our own.
19	Q. So you had been asked by Skip Smith for
20	recommendations on who could provide an independent
21	assessment of the project?
22	A. Right.
23	Q. You knew that well before March of 2015,
24	right?
25	A. I knew that he had asked me for

	195
1	recommendations. I did not know whether or not it
2	had been acted upon.
3	Q. And by October of 2015, you knew that
4	Bechtel had done an assessment?
5	A. Correct.
6	Q. And none of that required you to take a
7	different course in connection with any PSC
8	proceedings until after abandonment of the project,
9	right?
10	A. I don't think so.
11	Q. Okay.
12	A. Based on the information that we had at the
13	time, I don't think it required us to take any
14	different course of action.
15	Q. It's the reason the reason it didn't
16	require you to take a different course of action is
17	because you understood that Bechtel, if it had been
18	reported to you, that Bechtel had not identified
19	anything of significance?
20	A. That's basically correct.
21	Q. So what you believe is that Bechtel
22	identified something of significance, number one; and
23	number two, that should have been disclosed to you.
24	A. What I believe now, based on the record that
25	I have been able to review, yes.

	196
1	Q. Okay. All right. We're going to get to
2	that in more detail.
3	Separate and apart from Bechtel, is there
4	any other reason why you believe costs incurred after
5	March 12, 2015 related to the project should be
6	SCE&G's responsibility?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. What?
9	A. I believe that they misled us on their views
10	of the Consortium schedule. If it is important for
11	the schedule to be supported by, and I can't think of
12	a better word, but believed by the utility, if they
13	don't believe that it can be achieved, then I believe
14	that it amounts to deception to tell you that this is
15	the schedule of the project. And I believe that
16	deception was involved in that they did not believe
17	either the schedule that was provided by the
18	Consortium or the budget provided by the Consortium.
19	Q. Mr. Jones, you didn't believe in the
20	schedule as provided by the Consortium in 2016,
21	right?
22	A. 2016?
23	Q. No. In 2016, you didn't believe in the
24	schedule that was provided by the Consortium?
25	A. I did not believe that they were going to

	197
1	achieve the schedules that were there, no.
2	Q. Didn't stop you from recommending approval
3	and believing prudent and reasonable the costs that
4	SCE&G was then requesting to be approved, correct?
5	A. Correct, because the prudent cost would be
6	the only cost that would be incurred by the
7	ratepayers, and then on that basis by SCE&G.
8	Q. And you understood in 2015 that Mr. Byrne
9	didn't believe that the schedule was certain to hold,
10	correct?
11	A. I believe what he testified and what the
12	information I had was that it would be a significant
13	challenge for them to make the schedule.
14	Q. And he said in his pre-file testimony, these
15	schedules can and almost certainly will change, did
16	he not?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. So the fact that SCE&G believed that
19	schedules could change didn't impact your position on
20	whether it should receive any costs as sought in the
21	2015 docket or in the 2016 docket, right?
22	A. In the 2015 docket, I believed that the
23	schedules, at that time, I believe the schedules were
24	attainable within the 18-month window allowed by the
25	BLRA. And I think that was even in that draft

	198
1	testimony that that was so stated. So I didn't think
2	that they were going to meet the schedules that were
3	there, but I believe that they were within the
4	18-month allowed by the by the BLRA.
5	And so we considered that to be essentially
6	meeting the schedule. And when you say the schedule
7	changed, I would say that schedules always change;
8	that doesn't mean that they're going out by years, it
9	means that there is always schedule changes that
10	happen on nuclear power plants. So the fact that
11	Mr. Byrne made the statement that people believe the
12	schedule had changed did not surprise me or cause me
13	great concern.
14	Q. In 2015, your draft testimony that you
15	prepared and were ready to submit to the PSC, you
16	say, The schedule will also be impacted excuse me.
17	You say, "If the Consortium's goals for improving
18	productivity are not met, the schedule will also be
19	impacted because the work may not be completed on
20	time," correct? Pages 12 and 13.
21	A. What's the Exhibit Number, 16? Right.
22	Q. I don't recall.
23	A. 2016 testimony.
24	Q. The draft 2015.
25	A. Oh, '15.

	199
1	Q. I'm referring to pages 12 and 13 of your
2	testimony, very end.
3	A. I would like to direct your attention to
4	page 13, beginning on line 10, where it says,
5	"Reasonably achievable within the 18 to 24-month
6	boundaries established by the Order." That was my
7	belief.
8	Q. That was your belief?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And that was based on your belief that a
11	schedule that anticipated a 1.15 productivity
12	factor excuse me that a these units could be
13	completed within 18 to 24 months of a completion date
14	based on a 1.15 productivity factor, correct?
15	A. I believe that they could have productivity
16	improvements that would permit them to meet the dates
17	within the 18-month schedule.
18	Q. Even though you knew at the time that there
19	was at least a possibility that productivity wouldn't
20	improve beyond a 2.00 factor?
21	A. I did not know that. I did not know that at
22	that time.
23	Q. But you knew there was at least the
24	possibility that the productivity factors could be as
25	bad as they historically were, right?

	200
1	A. The historical ones didn't necessarily hover
2	around 2. They were in the upper 1.8 something or
3	but, again, I thought the productivity could be
4	improved, I thought that additional resources would
5	be added to the project, and that the schedule could
6	advance in combination with implementing mitigation
7	factors, adding additional construction staff. So I
8	thought there were ways to get there within the
9	18-month allowable.
10	Q. But you said in your 2015 draft testimony
11	that you're skeptical of the expected extent of
12	improvement, right?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And notwithstanding the fact that you were
15	skeptical, your expected the expected extended
16	improvement and the risk that that had on the
17	schedule and the cost, that you thought the 2015
18	request was appropriate at the time?
19	A. Was?
20	Q. Appropriate at the time.
21	A. I thought it was within the bounds of
22	possibility, yes.
23	Q. And that's true even though you knew, as
24	Mr. Byrne had disclosed in 2015, that there were
25	concerns about the likelihood of meeting the schedule

	201
1	that Westinghouse had imposed on itself.
2	A. I knew I would go back to Mr. Byrne's,
3	that there were significant challenges that had to be
4	met for them to do that. I was aware of that, that
5	definitely there were significant challenges that had
6	to be overcome in order for them to do that, yes.
7	Q. So what exactly do you believe today that
8	SCE&G understood as to the Consortium schedule in
9	2015?
10	MR. COX: Would you repeat that
11	question?
12	(The record was read as requested.)
13	MR. COX: I will object to the
14	form.
15	THE WITNESS: Based on the
16	documentation that I have gone through and the
17	discovery, I think that they were they didn't
18	believe the Consortium schedule at all, that they
19	had absolutely no faith in the Consortium being
20	able to meet that schedule or meet those dates.
21	BY MR. CHALLY:
22	Q. On what do you base that conclusion?
23	A. There's several exhibits cited in my
24	testimony, including those that indicate that these
25	dates are not going to be met and this we were

	202
1	very we don't think this is going to happen.
2	Q. And some of what you cited in your testimony
3	is actually testimony of SCE&G on that point, isn't
4	it?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Yes. So you knew from that testimony that
7	SCE&G had significant concerns related to the
8	likelihood of Westinghouse's ability to meet the
9	schedule?
10	A. We knew that there were concerns. The
11	concerns were, I think, much greater than portrayed.
12	Q. You point in your 2018 testimony, on page
13	14, that July 24
14	A. I'm sorry, which one are you in?
15	Q. Your 2018 testimony, page 14.
16	A. Okay. All right.
17	Q. You point to July 24, 2015, the testimony of
18	Mr. Kevin Marsh where he acknowledged the lack of
19	confidence in the proposed cost and schedule
20	estimates, right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. So that testimony was submitted in the 2015
23	docket, correct?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. The 2015 docket that followed the petition

	203
1	filed in March of 2015, correct?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And it's that petition that you believe
4	marks the line between what should be approved and
5	what should not be approved as recoverable costs,
6	correct?
7	A. Correct.
8	Q. So in the very same docket, in four months
9	later, Mr. Marsh says, clearly, as you state in your
10	testimony, "a lack of confidence in the proposed cost
11	and schedule estimates."
12	That's what you understood from Mr. Marsh's
13	testimony in 2015?
14	A. What I have come to understand, based on
15	other documentation and other exhibits I cite, it's a
16	matter of degree that their confidence was at a much
17	lower level than what was portrayed here.
18	Q. On what do you understand that lower level
19	of confidence to be based?
20	A. I'm sorry, you're saying what other exhibits
21	or whatever?
22	Q. Yes. Here you have Mr. Marsh saying, we
23	don't have confidence in the proposed cost and
24	schedule. Here we have, at this time, you're already
25	aware in 2015 of the historical productivity factors

	204
1	that were materially worse than the 1.15 that was
2	assumed. What other information do you believe SCE&G
3	had that further reflects a lack of confidence in the
4	schedule?
5	A. I think I have outlined it in my testimony
6	and the exhibits provided there that there were other
7	things that indicated that they had even less
8	confidence than was portrayed here.
9	It also kind of tweaks my interest as to why
10	you believe that it was okay if Mr. Marsh didn't
11	believe in the schedule, why was it advanced by him.
12	Q. I'm asking you. You submitted testimony.
13	You had the possibility, in 2015 as the consultant
14	for the ORS, to put a stop to any additional costs
15	associated with this project. You didn't exercise
16	that opportunity, and you didn't because you didn't
17	think it was important, and you didn't because you
18	knew, even though you knew the productivity,
19	historical productivity factors, even though you knew
20	from testimony from Mr. Marsh and Mr. Byrne that
21	SCE&G lacked confidence in the schedule and the cost
22	estimates that the Consortium had provided. So I'm
23	asking you why you didn't put a stop to anything at
24	that time?
25	A. Well, my job is not to schedule the project

	205
1	and not to manage the project. Our review is based
2	on the information provided by SCE&G, and we expect
3	that information to be correct, truthful, and
4	forthcoming. And my belief now is that it was not.
5	And that forms part of the basis for why I believe
6	that they filed a misleading docket that they
7	didn't or filing that they didn't even believe in.
8	So if they didn't believe in it, why did they file
9	it.
10	Q. So, Mr. Jones, I'm trying to understand
11	exactly what you believe to have been misleading. We
12	have talked about issues related to the Bechtel
13	report we're going to come back to that. But you
14	have included a second category of information that
15	you believe to have been misleading, and that was
16	their opinion of the schedule.
17	A. Right.
18	Q. And so what I am asking you is: What do you
19	believe was misleading about their opinion of the
20	schedule, in light of the fact that, in your own
21	testimony, you're pointing to their contemporaneous
22	comments about the unreliability of the schedule?
23	A. And as I say in my testimony, you can view
24	this from a different light. At the time, there is a
25	difference between believing that it's challenging,

	206
1	which I took Mr. Marsh's comments to mean that it was
2	going to be challenging to meet the schedule versus
3	believing that it's impossible, which I now believe
4	that they thought to be the case.
5	Q. On what do you base your belief as to
6	SCE&G's view that it was impossible to meet the
7	schedule?
8	A. From the exhibits that I have found during
9	discovery and quoted them throughout my testimony.
10	So I have come to believe that they did not believe
11	at all that this schedule could be met, that and
12	it's also based on the status of the docket that they
13	gave us, the fact that it seemed to be totally
14	premature, and was without precedent in the way they
15	presented it. So the question is: Well, why did
16	they do that then?
17	When you look at it in retrospect and say:
18	What were they trying to accomplish? Why did they
19	why did they provide us with information that did not
20	have change orders when always before they had? Why
21	did they provide us with information that was based
22	solely on their estimates instead of getting the
23	Consortium buy-in on those estimates? Why did they
24	give us a schedule that was not approved on a
25	contractual basis? And I grant you, the reason they

	207
1	gave us seemed reasonable at the time, but in
2	retrospect isn't.
3	So all of these things combined together,
4	plus the discovery of various exhibits that I found
5	here that definitely indicate that they had no faith
6	in meeting the schedule or the budget.
7	Q. So is it hindsight?
8	A. Yet they filed it.
9	Q. Is it hindsight, Mr. Jones?
10	A. Yes, of course it's hindsight based on the
11	discovery evidence that I have.
12	Q. No. Those are two different things. And I
13	want to make sure I understand. We have already
14	established that you were aware of the productivity
15	factors, the historical productivity factors. We
16	have already established that you were aware of the
17	various comments SCE&G made related to concerns of
18	meeting this project schedule, and you were aware of
19	those at the time and it didn't cause you to do
20	anything differently.
21	Now you're saying you're aware of some other
22	information, and I'm trying to
23	A. Right.
24	Q figure out: Is it hindsight, or what
25	specific information do you believe conveys to you

	208
1	that there was no chance this schedule could be met?
2	A. You will have to go through my exhibits.
3	Each one of them, I think, conveys that, that they
4	had no confidence.
5	Q. Do any of those exhibits in any way retract
6	the promise that Westinghouse made to meet the
7	schedule?
8	A. Do they retract Westinghouse's promise? No.
9	Q. No. Westinghouse had promised to meet the
10	schedule that was reflected and requested in the 2015
11	document, right?
12	MR. COX: Object to the form.
13	THE WITNESS: I I don't know
14	what Westinghouse promised. I know that this was
15	the basis that was provided.
16	BY MR. CHALLY:
17	Q. And you knew that their failure to meet that
18	would create would entitle SCE&G liquidated
19	damages, correct?
20	A. If they did not meet the substantial
21	completion date, liquidated damages would ensue, yes.
22	Q. So Westinghouse had promised to meet the
23	schedule, and nothing in any of the exhibits that's
24	stacked up in front of you retract Westinghouse's
25	promise in that regard?

	209
1	A. No, nothing that I have has really anything
2	to do with Westinghouse.
3	Q. Right. Nothing retracts, nothing in any of
4	those exhibits retracts the effort that Westinghouse
5	put towards the schedule that they had conveyed to
6	SCE&G at the time, does it?
7	A. Repeat that one, please.
8	Q. Well, you're aware of the process that it
9	takes to prepare a schedule for a project like this.
10	A. Right.
11	Q. We have said that that process would take
12	three to six months and go from \$500,000 to
13	\$1 million just for purposes of creating the
14	schedule.
15	A. We have said that for creating the initial
16	schedule. This was not an initial schedule.
17	Q. So this schedule so the cost of the
18	schedule that would have been reflected by
19	Westinghouse at this time was much greater than that
20	cost, isn't it?
21	A. Wait, I didn't understand that question at
22	all.
23	Q. The total scheduling costs, by the time
24	Westinghouse provided its 2014 cost and schedule
25	estimate, the total cost of scheduling for

	210
1	Westinghouse efforts would be far greater than the
2	\$500,000 to \$1 million that you described?
3	A. I think that's a reasonable assumption.
4	They had been updating the schedule as it was all
5	along.
6	Q. Aren't you aware that Westinghouse had
7	dozens of people to work on the schedule for this
8	project?
9	A. I am aware of that.
10	Q. And aren't you aware that they have spent
11	months and months evaluating the schedule for this
12	project as of the time they submitted it to SCE&G
13	2014?
14	A. I am aware that they expended time updating
15	the schedule, yeah, trying to update the schedule.
16	Q. And it would have cost more than \$1 million
17	to get the product that they provided to SCE&G in
18	2014, right?
19	A. Are you talking about cumulatively?
20	Q. Yes.
21	A. I mean, that's a different, whole different
22	thing. I mean, they had been producing the schedule
23	on the project for years.
24	Q. It would have been millions of dollars of
25	cost to scheduling by that point.

	211
1	A. For the entire cost of the scheduling group,
2	yes, it would have been millions of dollars.
3	Q. And nothing in your exhibits retracts the
4	promise that Westinghouse made to meet the schedule
5	that it had developed through this process that you
6	just described, right?
7	A. I would agree with that. I saw nothing from
8	Westinghouse and in fact didn't expect anything from
9	Westinghouse.
10	Q. You say in your testimony that you thought
11	SCE&G's March 12, 2015 filing was seriously
12	deficient. Do you recall that?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Why was it seriously deficient?
15	A. I think it was because of the reasons I have
16	cited already; that, again, at the time, we
17	recognized the deficiencies but thought we had little
18	choice under the BLRA to other than to accept. We
19	were concerned from the outset about the, again, the
20	lack of lack of the change orders, the lack of
21	buy-in by the Consortium to the estimates, the
22	various assumptions that were made, and then the
23	deficiencies involved in the disclosure that they
24	planned to have a project assessment done and the
25	deficiency of their true assessment of the schedule.

	212
1	Q. So it's the Bechtel assessment, the
2	questions related to the schedule, both of which we
3	have discussed before. And what was the third?
4	A. The deficiency in the submittal itself, the
5	fact that it wasn't there wasn't change orders, it
6	wasn't didn't Consortium buy-in on the estimates,
7	they were only SCE&G estimates.
8	Q. All of that, that which falls into this
9	third category, is stuff that you actually disclosed
10	to PSC and made clear in your testimony at the time,
11	right?
12	A. That's true.
13	Q. And it didn't impact your decision to
14	support SCE&G's request for costs as reflected in the
15	2015 docket, right?
16	A. It did not at the time, no.
17	Q. Is there anything else that forms your
18	opinion that this March 2015 filing was seriously
19	deficient?
20	A. I think that's enough.
21	MR. CHALLY: Okay. Let's take a
22	short break.
23	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
24	off the record at 4:06 p.m.
25	(A recess was taken.)

	213
1	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
2	back on the record at 4:19 p.m.
3	BY MR. CHALLY:
4	Q. Mr. Jones, we're going to talk about Bechtel
5	in a little bit more detail.
6	Don't you now know that Bechtel's
7	preliminary presentation of its schedule was made
8	only in October of 2015?
9	A. My understanding, it was made October 22nd,
10	2015.
11	Q. Right. So it was made after this March 12,
12	2015 PSC filing, right?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And you understand that the final report
15	wasn't issued until February of 2016?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. So how is it that you're selecting March 12,
18	2015 as the date?
19	A. Again, as I have said before, the decision
20	to engage Bechtel was made before that date. That
21	decision was material; that if it had been known that
22	Bechtel was going to be doing an assessment of the
23	project, my recommendation would have been to delay
24	the hearings until that assessment was completed and
25	the results were reviewed.

	214
1	Q. That's what you say your recommendation is
2	now, but that was not your recommendation when you
3	discovered that there was a Bechtel assessment in
4	2015, right?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Okay.
7	A. And again, at the time, if it had been
8	announced that the Bechtel assessment was going to be
9	made, we would have we would have pursued what the
10	scope of that assessment was going to be.
11	Q. Now, you say that in your testimony that
12	SCE&G's deletion of the schedule from the report,
13	from the Bechtel report, was a direct attempt to
14	misrepresent and to hide relevant and significant
15	information from disclosure to the PSC and ORS,
16	right?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. How do you know that SCE&G deleted the
19	schedule from the report?
20	A. From information that I have subsequently
21	seen in discovery, the indication is that the
22	schedule was removed through interaction with SCE&G
23	and the schedule. I guess the first thing is the
24	schedule was in the original report. There were two,

two revisions of that, and then the schedule was

25

	215
1	taken out from the final report, the February report,
2	and actually prepared in a separate report.
3	Q. I understand all that. Your testimony
4	though is that SCE&G deleted the schedule from the
5	report.
6	A. That's the understanding I have now from
7	the Bechtel deleted it from the report, but at the
8	request of SCE&G.
9	Q. You understand that that request came from
10	SCE&G?
11	A. That's my understanding, yes.
12	Q. So you don't understand that that request
13	came from the suggestion of a lawyer with experience
14	in scheduling for these kinds of mega construction
15	projects?
16	A. I don't understand that to be the case, no.
17	Q. If it were the case that this schedule
18	information was deleted because, one with familiarity
19	and scheduling concluded that the scheduling
20	methodology was unreliable, would that change your
21	testimony?
22	MR. COX: Object to the form.
23	THE WITNESS: Not really, because
24	the schedule was also presented at the
25	October 22nd meeting, so it was clearly provided

	216
1	to SCE&G.
2	BY MR. CHALLY:
3	Q. But I believe we have already discussed that
4	what matters is whether or not any of this is
5	significant. Significance of the assessment is
6	what's critical to you concluding that SCE&G
7	shouldn't be allowed additional costs, right?
8	A. Yes. If it's insignificant, then that it
9	would be insignificant.
10	Q. And that's true for the schedule analysis as
11	well; if the schedule analysis is unreliable, it
12	would not cause you to believe that SCE&G shouldn't
13	be entitled to those costs, right?
14	A. If in fact I wouldn't characterize this
15	as "unreliable." This was not a this was not a
16	detailed schedule for the project. This was an
17	assessment of what they believed that the project
18	would ultimately see.
19	So it's not a comparison of the schedule
20	that would be generally a Level 3 schedule that would
21	be generated by three months' effort from a
22	scheduling crew. This is somewhat equivalent to the
23	schedule that you hope that I would produce, which
24	was take a production factor and multiply it by when
25	the project is going to be completed, but it was

	217
1	based on Bechtel's knowledge of construction,
2	productivity rates and quantities and that kind of
3	thing.
4	So there isn't an equivalence that the
5	schedule would have been worth knowing for at least
6	discussion purposes and refinement.
7	Q. So the schedule that Bechtel prepared was
8	not as reliable as the schedule that you understand
9	Westinghouse had prepared, right?
10	A. I wouldn't say that. I wouldn't say that
11	any Westinghouse schedule was reliable.
12	Q. Okay.
13	A. I think that's been proven.
14	Q. In terms of methodology, the methodology
15	that Westinghouse had pursued to develop its schedule
16	was more reliable than the methodology that Bechtel
17	had prepared, correct?
18	A. I would not say that. Reliability also
19	depends on not only the volume of people that you
20	have got working on it, but also the input
21	information that you provide on the assumptions that
22	you make to do your schedule, and based on the
23	history that Westinghouse has demonstrated. I think
24	their schedules were much more unreliable than
25	Bechtel's schedules.

	218
1	Q. Well, as you testified earlier, if someone
2	asked you, as a person who was involved in the
3	engineering and construction of a nuclear reactor
4	project to prepare a schedule and an estimate
5	completion, you would have dedicated ten people for a
6	series of months to that process, right?
7	A. No. As I understood your question,
8	initially, this was to prepare an actual construction
9	schedule for an ongoing project, not an assessment of
10	a project. There is a difference between doing an
11	assessment of a project and doing a schedule that
12	you're actually going to be working with and trying
13	to obtain.
14	Q. So I'm trying to understand how a well,
15	ask it this way: You would agree with me that
16	Bechtel's schedule analysis was much less intense
17	than was Westinghouse's schedule analysis?
18	A. I would agree that it was prepared in a
19	shorter duration and with less manpower and less
20	manhours than Westinghouse.
21	Q. In fact, it was prepared in less than in
22	about seven weeks or so, right?
23	A. Yes, that's my understanding of how
24	what how the project
25	Q. And you are aware that the entire assessment

	219
1	fee that Bechtel received for its work was a million
2	dollars?
3	A. Correct.
4	Q. And you're aware, are you not, that Bechtel
5	had difficulties in accessing information from the
6	Consortium to conduct the review that was requested
7	to provide?
8	A. I have seen that in documentation that we
9	received during discovery, yes.
10	Q. And aren't you aware that Bechtel itself
11	acknowledged that the manner in which information was
12	provided to them limited their ability to fully
13	assess the information they received?
14	MR. COX: Object to the form.
15	THE WITNESS: That's also I
16	have seen that statement.
17	BY MR. CHALLY:
18	Q. And aren't you aware that Bechtel was
19	actually unable to download the full project schedule
20	during the time that they conducted their review?
21	A. Again, I have seen that also.
22	Q. And you have seen because the October 22
23	presentation is an exhibit to your testimony, that
24	Bechtel identified its schedule conclusions as
25	<pre>preliminary, right?</pre>

	220
1	A. And that would be what I expect from an
2	assessment.
3	Q. But it's your view, in light of all of that,
4	and its comparison to the much more significant
5	effort that you know Westinghouse put into its
6	scheduling, that the Bechtel schedule analysis is
7	more reliable than the Westinghouse schedule
8	analysis; is that right?
9	A. As an engineer, I like to base things on
10	result. And I won't comment on the reliability, but
11	I can comment on the fact that the Bechtel schedule
12	came much closer to coming up with a more factual
13	estimate of completion when compared with the
14	estimate that SCE&G eventually did just before they
15	decided to abandon the unit.
16	Q. How close was that?
17	A. I don't remember exactly. But the other
18	part I have got that comparison in my testimony.
19	But the other comparison is also there had been an
20	additional, essentially over a year's delay, where
21	productivity was still productivity rates were
22	still not met.
23	So the SCE&G schedule was later than the
24	Bechtel schedules. But, again, there had been
25	another year in the project to progress where even

	221
1	Bechtel made the statement that all of us at that
2	time expected productivity improvements to come about
3	with the employment of Fluor as a construction
4	manager, but they did not.
5	Q. So the reason for your belief that the
6	Bechtel analysis is more reliable is benefit of
7	hindsight, right?
8	A. Benefit of hindsight? I wouldn't say it's
9	hindsight when you compare two numbers. Bechtel's
10	schedule gave the completion date, SCE&G gave a
11	completion date, Westinghouse gave a completion date,
12	and Westinghouse was never even close.
13	Q. SCE&G's estimate was based on information
14	that postdated Westinghouse's analysis of the
15	schedule, right?
16	A. Yes. SCE&G went and did their own
17	assessment based on their own productivity rates,
18	their own estimate of what had been completed, their
19	own estimate of quantities to be done, and it was
20	essentially an entirely different basis than
21	Westinghouse, so
22	Q. And Bechtel's analysis was done based on
23	information that postdated Westinghouse's schedule as
24	provided in 2014, right?
25	A. Postdated their schedule?

1	Q. Took information not available to
2	Westinghouse because time had not elapsed.
3	A. I am not fully understanding that question.
4	But that the schedule that the only schedule
5	I'm aware of that Westinghouse completed is the one
6	that was the basis of the 2016 filing. I never saw
7	an updated one from that time.
8	Q. Okay.
9	A. And that schedule essentially came out at
10	the same time because it was part of the October 27th
11	amendment that came out at the same time as the
12	Bechtel schedule, essentially.
13	Q. So you described Bechtel's analysis as
14	reflecting a rigorous methodology; did you not?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. What is your understanding of their rigorous
17	methodology?
18	A. Well, we'd done an assessment. They went
19	through and used their based on their construction
20	experience, they used their own unit rates of what it
21	takes to do piping, to do cable tray, to do concrete.
22	So all of those, they took each of those commodities
23	to be installed, remaining on the plant to be
24	installed, and went through an analysis to determine
25	how much of that remained to be done. They used

	223
1	their own productivity basis, their own their own
2	assessment of I can't remember the phrase, but
3	basically how many people you can get into one area.
4	There is a phrase for it, I just can't recall it
5	right now. So they used their own numbers there.
6	They also did review what was available to
7	them from Westinghouse, and although not in my
8	testimony and I haven't confirmed it yet, based on an
9	analysis of one of my ORS colleagues, they looked at
10	over 2,000 documents in order to generate their
11	schedule.
12	Q. So what, to your understanding, what did
13	Bechtel have that you didn't have?
14	A. Well, for one thing they had more people,
15	for another thing they have scheduling capabilities
16	that I don't have. I don't have access to Primavera,
17	I don't have access to regularly scheduling programs,
18	so and quite frankly, they have specific
19	construction experience of things like unit rates to
20	install they have this rapidly available. I would
21	have to do a lot of research. These things are not
22	available to me directly to do unit rates for what it
23	takes to install piping, what it takes to install
24	cable, those kinds of things. The updated unit rates
25	are available to Bechtel because they're still

	224
1	working in the construction arena.
2	So they had a number of capabilities
3	available to them that I do not have, and they had
4	the time to devote, if you want to say seven weeks to
5	looking at generating a potential schedule.
6	Q. But you certainly had the same information
7	or substantially the same information they had on the
8	status of the project, right?
9	A. I can't really say that's true. I don't
10	know what information they actually used to determine
11	the completion. And we're talking when we're
12	talking about that, we're talking about in specific
13	areas, how many commodities had been installed, how
14	many remained to be installed, those kinds of things.
15	Q. Do you understand that's what Bechtel did in
16	developing its schedule?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. To that level of detail?
19	A. They did.
20	Q. That's required to provide a Level 2
21	schedule?
22	A. I would say it gives you a better handle on
23	a Level 2 schedule.
24	Q. Do you know whether or not they did that?
25	A. From the information we see, that's what

	225
1	they indicated in their in part, they described
2	their methodology in their weekly report, some of the
3	things that they did, and it's, as we understand how
4	they developed this schedule, they did that.
5	Q. If they didn't do that, would that impact
6	your opinion as to the significance of their schedule
7	of completion?
8	A. I think one of the issues that we have to
9	get to is: Do you discount Bechtel out of hand? If
10	you presume that you can discount their schedule when
11	you get a schedule from them on October 22nd and you
12	totally discount it and decide to sign your contract
13	on October 27th, that seems a little premature to me.
14	So my do I think that the Bechtel
15	schedule would have stood exactly as it was
16	developed? No. But I think it was certainly
17	worthwhile to take that schedule and should have been
18	seriously looked at and used as input to refine the
19	schedule and not just to cast it aside and say, well,
20	this is all, this is all a guesswork, because it was
21	not.
22	Q. As of the time of that UPC amendment, the
23	schedule was Westinghouse's responsibility, wasn't
24	it?
25	A. Yes.

	226
1	Q. And the failure to meet the schedule as
2	Westinghouse promised was on their dime, right?
3	A. Ultimately, with the fixed price agreement,
4	yes.
5	Q. So are you suggesting that what SCE&G should
6	have done is take the Bechtel analysis, pushed the
7	schedule out further and give Westinghouse the
8	ability to take more time?
9	A. No. I'm suggesting that for their own
10	purposes, SCE&G should have concentrated on refining
11	the or at least taking into account the Bechtel
12	schedule so that they had a good handle on what
13	they actual schedule of the project is going to
14	be. Because it's important to know what the schedule
15	of the project is, even though you don't necessarily
16	have to pay for it, because there is all kind of
17	other things that enter into that. They're going to
18	have to look at their purchase power agreements at
19	the plant is not going to be completed at the time
20	that they think that it's going to be completed.
21	So there is all kinds of fallout to the
22	utilities that happen on meeting the schedule, so
23	it's just not, oh, well, let's pretend that it
24	doesn't matter anymore.
25	O. So is it your testimony what SCE&G should

	227
1	have done is not hold Westinghouse to the promised
2	schedule?
3	A. No.
4	MR. COX: Object to the form.
5	BY MR. CHALLY:
6	Q. Do you believe they should have held
7	Westinghouse to the promised schedule?
8	A. My belief is that they should have taken the
9	Bechtel input into account.
10	Q. Is it your opinion, as you sit here today in
11	2018, that SCE&G should have extended the
12	Westinghouse schedule in its requests to the PSC?
13	A. Whatever wherever the chips fell should
14	have been what they did.
15	Q. Even if that meant alleviating pressure on
16	Westinghouse?
17	A. I think so. Because you can put pressure on
18	Westinghouse regardless of what the schedule is. You
19	could still bring pressure to bear on Westinghouse.
20	And, in my mind, at least, it would be much better to
21	know when you're actually going to finish the project
22	than this goes back to the original argument was,
23	oh, it's all on the EPC contractor, we don't have to
24	worry about or do anything, and that's not the case.
25	There's too many, too many other factors

228

- 1 that enter into the project completion that you need
- 2 to factor in. And if it costs more money, then you
- 3 argue that with the contractor. If the schedule is
- 4 going to be -- if the actual schedule is going to be
- 5 delayed, you argue that with the contractor. You
- 6 don't put blinders on and proceed on the basis of not
- 7 knowing where you're going.
- 8 Q. So what you think should have been done in
- the March 12, 2015 filing is, one, it delayed; and
- 10 two, ultimately, the request for more money put in?
- 11 A. No. What I believe is that they should have
- 12 taken the Bechtel assessment seriously and done a
- 13 serious evaluation of what Bechtel was telling them;
- 14 that's what I --
- 15 Q. What if they did precisely that and reached
- the same conclusions? What if they did precisely
- what you're saying, they took seriously Bechtel's
- schedule analysis and ultimately decided to pursue
- 19 the same path that they did, which is seek recovery
- 20 of the cost that Westinghouse had committed to
- complete the projects for, is that all fine, from
- your perspective?
- 23 A. As long as -- I mean, if they had the
- 24 realization of when the project was going to be
- completed, I think they would have had the

	229
1	information that they needed then to all these
2	ancillary things that I'm talking about that they
3	need to know, they would have known those, and they
4	could have pursued bad word continuing to beat
5	up on Westinghouse to meet the original requirements.
6	They could have done that, and that would have
7	been that would have been okay.
8	Q. If the PSC had approved costs for an
9	elongated schedule, how do you believe SCE&G could
10	have held Westinghouse to its original estimate?
11	A. Contractually. They didn't change the
12	contract.
13	Q. It would have alleviated pressure on
14	Westinghouse though, wouldn't it?
15	A. No, because, contractually, they're still
16	committed to it.
17	Q. Contractually, they had been committed to
18	certain requirements previously, and then through
19	change orders and the like, they altered those,
20	right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. So you, as we sit here today, are you aware
23	of Bechtel having more information regarding the
24	status of the project than you had in 2015?
25	A. I am not aware. There's a couple of minor

	230
1	areas that I saw that they dug some stuff out. But I
2	think, in general and I have never argued the
3	assertion that most of the issues that Bechtel
4	identified were in fact known by us; that's true.
5	But knowing the issue does not get you to the point
6	of knowing the impact on the scheduling budget. Just
7	knowing the issue does not get you there.
8	Q. But you knew as much, as we sit here today,
9	you knew as much as Bechtel did regarding the status
10	of the project; and you also knew, did you not, the
11	assumptions that existed related to expectations for
12	future performance?
13	MR. COX: Object to the form.
14	THE WITNESS: I can't say what
15	Bechtel knew. I don't know what Bechtel knew. I
16	don't know what they found out. They did very
17	in-depth interviews with people, below the level
18	of people that we usually talk to. So if the
19	people at the level that we talk to were
20	withholding information and other people weren't,
21	maybe they found out more than we did. I don't
22	know. I can't speak to what Bechtel knew.
23	BY MR. CHALLY:
24	Q. I understand. But you have now reviewed
25	various different documents in connection with

	231
1	discovery in this case, you are expected to testify
2	in the PSC proceeding, and you have submitted your
3	pre-file testimony, and as we sit here today, you
4	can't identify a piece of information that Bechtel
5	had indicated it was relying on that you didn't also
6	have related to the status of the project, right?
7	MR. COX: Object to the form.
8	THE WITNESS: I think that you
9	know, I will get back to being able to generate
10	their own schedule, as preliminary as it may be.
11	They had that capability, and that's a piece of
12	information that I didn't have and wasn't charged
13	with having as to generate my own schedule. I
14	was relying on the schedule provided to me by
15	SCE&G.
16	BY MR. CHALLY:
17	Q. So evaluating the schedule was certainly
18	your responsibility, right?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And to evaluate a schedule, we have
21	discussed that Bechtel would need information
22	regarding the status of the project, right? They
23	would need certain information regarding expectations
24	of future performance, right?
25	A. Or make assumptions with regard to future

	232
1	performance, correct.
2	Q. So those are the two pieces to a schedule
3	analysis of the detail that Bechtel applied here,
4	right?
5	A. I mean, there is more than that. Like I
6	say, they had unit rates which I can't definitively
7	state, but I believe they disagreed with the unit
8	rates being used by Westinghouse, and they had their
9	own productivity factors that they put in. So they
10	had other information that varied in their schedule
11	analysis.
12	Q. Other than unit rates and productivity
13	factors that they relied on, are you aware of
14	additional information they had?
15	A. No, I am not specifically aware of other
16	information.
17	Q. Are unit rates the kind of thing that is
18	knowable in the industry?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. So can you call someone at Sargent & Lundy,
21	for instance, and obtain information related to unit
22	rates?
23	A. I could, but you couldn't.
24	Q. Right. And productivity factors, are you
25	able to we already discussed that you had all

	233
1	information related to historical productivity
2	factors on the project, right?
3	A. I had I won't say all, but I will agree that
4	I had historical information and current information
5	on productivity.
6	Q. So are you aware that Bechtel used
7	productivity factors different than the historical
8	productivity factors on this project?
9	A. I'm not aware of what they were. I'm aware
10	that Bechtel identified that they used different ones
11	than historically. Because, again, everyone was
12	expecting increased productivity out of Fluor.
13	Q. So it's just an assumption; productivity
14	factor is ultimately an assumption?
15	A. Yes. Well, until it's reported. It's an
16	assumption to generate the schedule. It's not an
17	assumption when you report it, that what actually
18	happened.
19	Q. Fair enough. Fair enough. Okay.
20	So Bechtel had information related to the
21	status of the project that in substance was similar
22	to what you had. Bechtel had information related to
23	unit rates, unit rates that you could have received
24	if you had called someone at Sargent & Lundy. And
25	Bechtel had information related to the productivity

	234
1	factors that we all acknowledge to be an assumption,
2	right?
3	A. Well, again, I mean, you're assuming that
4	I'm going to generate the schedule. I'm not going to
5	generate the schedule. So, I mean, what you're
6	speculating is if I had been charged with generating
7	a schedule, I will have brought scheduling people in
8	and we would have done some of the things that you're
9	talking about.
10	Q. Okay. Why didn't you?
11	A. I had no reason to.
12	Q. Why did you have no reason to?
13	A. Because I'm not charged with generating the
14	schedule of the project.
15	Q. Westinghouse was charged with that, right?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. Okay. And you were relying on Westinghouse?
18	A. I was relying on South Carolina Electric &
19	Gas who relied on Westinghouse. Although it's
20	somewhat of a misnomer because, in point of fact,
21	SCE&G never agreed with the raw schedule they got
22	from Westinghouse. There was always changes,
23	manipulations, whatever. We were never really privy
24	to what those were, whether they made it better,
25	worse, whatever, but we all we were aware that

		235
1	they neve	er accepted, as provided, a schedule from
2	Westingho	ouse.
3	Q.	You've reviewed the Bechtel report, haven't
4	you?	
5	Α.	I have read the Bechtel report, yes.
6	Q.	You're aware that the Bechtel report
7	identifie	es what Bechtel describes as certain problems
8	with the	Consortium, correct?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	These are problems that you were aware of at
11	the time	that you were consulting with the ORS at the
12	project,	right?
13	Α.	We would have to go through them in more
14	detail.	But, in general, as I said, the issues
15	involved	were not known to us.
16	Q.	Is there any issue that you recall Bechtel
17	identify	ing that you didn't know?
18	Α.	There were a couple of minor things that I
19	don't red	call specifically what they were, but they
20	were thir	ngs they found. One that I do recall that we
21	weren't a	aware of is the turnover in, I think it was
22	field nor	n-manual supervisors, and that the
23	granulari	ity of the information we had didn't go down
24	to that I	level and never prompted a question from us
25	because i	it was never brought up as an issue. But I

	236
1	think Bechtel identified that as an issue, that there
2	had been a lot of turnover of non-manual supervision.
3	Weren't really aware of that.
4	Q. What exactly does that mean to you?
5	A. I mean it was an issue that's important but
6	not earthshattering.
7	Q. That's the only thing
8	A. That's the only thing I can recall. I know
9	there were several, but I don't recall them right
10	now. But, I mean, I can characterize it in general.
11	Most of the issues at Bechtel identified we were
12	aware of.
13	Q. What I want to do is get as complete of an
14	answer to that question as I can. So let's look at
15	Exhibit
16	A. In my testimony, you're looking at?
17	Q. Your testimony.
18	A. Yep.
19	Q. G
20	A. I was hoping you'd go there.
21	Q CJ-246.
22	A. Okay.
23	Q. What I want to do is give you a chance to
24	look at this, and then you tell me what information
25	conveyed in this exhibit you didn't know.

	237
1	A. There is a more concise exhibit.
2	Q. Well, I'm referring to this one specifically
3	because this is the February 5, 2016 project
4	assessment report.
5	A. Okay. And you're talking about where it
6	starts listing the issues?
7	Q. Yeah.
8	A. Talking about on page 50?
9	Q. Well, we can look there, but wherever
10	A. Wait, wait, I'm sorry, no. There is one
11	before that. There is a PM in Engineering. I
12	skipped too far. Sorry.
13	Q. What I was looking at was page one.
14	A. Yeah. Okay. Let's go to page one. All
15	right. Wait.
16	Q. But I'm not intending to limit you. So
17	if you know, you can look at Section 2-2 of the
18	report, "Observations and Recommendations."
19	A. Wait a minute, wait a minute, I have lost
20	you. You're talking about page one of the report but
21	not page one of the exhibit?
22	Q. Correct.
23	A. Okay. So that's okay. That's page eight
24	of the exhibit. Okay. All right.
25	Q. Yeah. So what I want to refer you to is

	238
1	specifically the "Executive Summary" on page eight,
2	and then in more detail the "Observations and
3	Recommendations" that are conveyed on page 13.
4	A. Okay.
5	Q. And I want you to identify for me any of
6	these issues that you weren't aware of, if there are
7	any.
8	A. In some of these cases, I would say they put
9	into words things that we would not necessarily
10	like a lack of shared vision, goals, accountability
11	between the owners and the Consortium. Okay. We
12	would have said that, you know, there is conflict
13	that exists there. So I would say that one was
14	known, but if you had asked me to put it in those
15	words, I would not have, but that's
16	Okay. So the bulleted items on that are
17	page one, is that what you're talking about?
18	Q. We can start there, sure.
19	A. And there is none of those that we weren't
20	aware of. But, as I said, we probably would not word
21	it the way that they did, but
22	Q. Okay.
23	A. Where do you want to go now?
24	Q. Well, I don't want to limit you. I'm
25	interested in knowing what you believe was conveyed

	239
1	in this report that you didn't know.
2	A. Okay. I can tell you that. The things that
3	were conveyed in this report that we didn't know were
4	the recommendations for fixing stuff.
5	Q. So let's go to that.
6	A. And
7	Q. Page 13.
8	A. And we, the ORS and me, I believed that a
9	lot of these actions, we were somewhat optimistic at
10	the time because we believed that SCE I'm going to
11	put this in the vernacular, I guess, but they had
12	finally seen the light, realized that they had to
13	take more charge of the project than they had been,
14	and they were implementing these actions due to their
15	own recognition of the issues.
16	One of the disappointing things for me was
17	to see that they were implementing Bechtel
18	recommendations, and they were not conclusions that
19	they had come to on their own.
20	So that's why the recommendations are
21	important, because they were and why the Bechtel
22	report is important, because almost all of these
23	recommendations got implemented. So it would have
24	been nice to know that the recommendations for
25	improvement came from Bechtel, and it would be nice

	240
1	to know what they recommended to do for the issues.
2	Q. Let me make sure I understand. It's your
3	testimony that all of the recommendations that
4	Bechtel had suggested were actually implemented by
5	SCE &G?
6	A. No, not all.
7	Q. Almost all?
8	A. Most. Most.
9	Q. Any of them that you recall not being
10	implemented?
11	A. Now, there is again, we would have to go
12	through each one, one by one, which ones were, which
13	ones weren't. But most of the Bechtel
14	recommendations were in fact implemented, and at the
15	time we thought they were generated because Fluor had
16	come on board and because SCE&G had had the
17	recognition that they needed to do these things.
18	Q. So to make sure I understand, as we sit here
19	today, you can't recall a specific recommendation
20	from Bechtel that hadn't been implemented by SCE&G
21	is that right?
22	A. No. I would have to go to the there is a
23	summary of all the recommendations and how the
24	status of them, and some were to be implemented later
25	because they involved operations and pre-op

	241
1	activities that weren't yet under way so they
2	couldn't be implemented.
3	So there's variations in this thing that
4	when you say the Bechtel recommendation was not
5	implemented, it's because they didn't get to that
6	stage of the project.
7	Q. So let me ask it this way: Are you
8	criticizing SCE&G for its failure to adopt any of the
9	recommendations that are considered in this report?
10	A. I never reviewed it on that basis. I
11	never I never looked at it as, okay, why didn't
12	they do this one or why didn't they do that one. My
13	criticism was did they keep them from us.
14	Q. And what's important, from your perspective,
15	is that Bechtel had reached its conclusion; is that
16	right?
17	A. What's important would have been to have
18	known that Bechtel had reached this conclusion and
19	provided these recommendations. That would have been
20	nice to know.
21	Q. But it's not the substance of the
22	recommendations or the substance of the efforts to
23	adopt those recommendations that matters to you; it's
24	that Bechtel had made these recommendations?
25	A. Again, I did not review these in detail to

	242
1	determine which ones because, as I said, we didn't
2	get this report until after the project was
3	abandoned. So why would I waste the effort doing
4	that?
5	So I can't tell you whether or not some of
6	these that weren't implemented should have been
7	implemented. What I can tell you is, at the time
8	they were made, they should have been presented to
9	ORS and we should have been a participant in the
10	discussions about what was going to happen.
11	Q. So in your 2018 testimony, you are saying
12	that SCE&G should not be entitled to certain costs.
13	And then do I understand your testimony correctly
14	today to say that you're not in any way basing your
15	opinion on what costs SCE&G should be entitled to on
16	the question of whether it implemented any of these
17	recommendations?
18	A. What I am basing my conclusions on is at the
19	time they started deception and misleading ORS. You
20	can look that's where it is. And from that point
21	on, everything is imprudent.
22	Q. So everything is imprudent simply because
23	you believe they misled the ORS?
24	A. That's what I believe.
25	Q. The basis for you contending that they

	243
1	misled the ORS is because they didn't tell you the
2	significance of the assessment?
3	A. You have got to go back. They didn't tell
4	us the assessment was being performed.
5	Q. Mr. Jones, that is not true. You have
6	already testified multiple times today that you
7	personally were aware that an assessment was being
8	performed.
9	MR. COX: Object to the form.
10	BY MR. CHALLY:
11	Q. That they specifically told you that.
12	A. I am talking about no, I never said they
13	specifically told me that.
14	Q. Skip Smith told you that.
15	A. No, he didn't specifically tell me that. We
16	found out when the guy from Bechtel stood up and said
17	he's done an assessment. Skip told me that there was
18	no report and that he couldn't provide any written
19	information to us and that the results were at a
20	higher level than he said. That's not specifically
21	telling me they did an assessment. I had to find
22	that out we had to find that out ourselves.
23	Q. And you did.
24	A. Yes. In October, we found that out. I'm
25	talking about I'm talking about at the beginning,

	244
1	based on the March from that point on, and that's
2	the point that we start, that's where the deception
3	started and only got worse, it got worse.
4	Q. So your testimony is that SCE&G should have
5	told you five months earlier that Bechtel was doing
6	an assessment?
7	A. No. They should have told me that they were
8	going to have Bechtel an assessment.
9	Q. They inquired as to who you would recommend
10	for that purpose.
11	A. What does that mean? That means nothing.
12	If I recommend somebody, they don't have to take the
13	recommendation. I don't know that they did it.
14	Q. Okay.
15	A. How do I know that they did it? I didn't
16	know that they did it.
17	Q. So you agree with me that the problems that
18	were identified in the Bechtel report that you have
19	attached as an exhibit to your testimony were known
20	to you throughout the project?
21	A. I would not testify that I knew all of them.
22	I will testify that, from what I have reviewed, I
23	knew most of them; that is true, I have never denied
24	that. But knowing the problems is not developing a

schedule and a completion date on the project.

25

245

- 1 And you also testified that you were aware 2 of most or almost all of these problems, and that 3 SCE&G had actually implemented the recommendations that Bechtel had conveyed, right? 5 Α. I wouldn't say -- I would say they were implementing or in the process of implementing. of them were ongoing and some of them were in the 7 So in many cases, they were in fact 8 9 implementing Bechtel's recommendation. 10 And it isn't anything about the failure of 11 SCE&G to provide you with the information Bechtel 12 disclosed or the failure of SCE&G to implement the 13 recommendations that Bechtel suggested that leads you 14 to believe that SCE&G shouldn't be entitled to the 15 costs it seeks past March 12th of 2015, right? 16 I'm confused by that question, because the 17 assumption that you make is that we knew all this We didn't know this stuff until the project 18 19 was abandoned. 20 You said you knew of the Q. No, no, no. 21 problems that Bechtel had identified.
- had identified them. I knew of the issues on the project. Had nothing to do with Bechtel identifying

I knew of the issues, not that Bechtel

22

Α.

No.

25 them. We found -- we found these out through our own

	246
1	devices.
2	Q. You didn't need Bechtel to figure those
3	points out, right?
4	A. I didn't no, I didn't need Bechtel to
5	identify the issues.
6	Q. Nor did SCE&G, did they? They knew these
7	issues, too?
8	A. Yes, they did.
9	Q. And they disclosed them to the PSC, correct?
10	A. I wouldn't say they disclosed all of them,
11	but, in general, the issues were known. It's not a
12	question of the issues, as I keep emphasizing. As I
13	keep emphasizing, it's not knowing the issues. It's
14	knowing the impact of the issues, how they're going
15	to impact the budget and schedule of the project that
16	is the issue.
17	Q. Okay.
18	A. How are you going to implement not
19	modifications changes mitigation, that's the
20	word I was looking for mitigation plans in order
21	to resolve them.
22	Q. Okay.
23	A. That's the that's the important part of
24	this whole thing, not knowing the issues.
25	Q. And on that point, on what would be done to

	247
1	implement these changes, your testimony is today that
2	you're not aware of something that SCE&G that's
3	described in the Bechtel report that SCE&G didn't
4	ultimately implement or take steps to implement?
5	A. I'm not aware but I haven't reviewed it on
6	that basis.
7	Q. So those two points, the issues identified
8	in the Bechtel report, and the recommendations, do
9	not in any way inform your testimony that SCE&G isn't
10	entitled to costs after March 12th, 2015?
11	A. As I said, I can't address the
12	recommendations because I haven't done any real study
13	that indicates which ones they implemented and which
14	ones they didn't.
15	Q. Well, if you haven't done the study, it
16	certainly isn't the basis for the testimony you've
17	providing to the PSC already, is it?
18	A. Why isn't it? If you don't disclose
19	that's the basis of my testimony is it wasn't
20	disclosed. It was withheld, and purposefully
21	withheld.
22	By far the most important thing in this
23	whole discussion is the schedule information. I know
24	you're trying to discount the schedule. But to have
25	a schedule assessment come from one of the most

	248
1	prestigious nuclear constructors in the business
2	needs to be considered. That's the most important
3	thing, that the schedule was not disclosed, was
4	ignored, was hidden, and it was imprudent activities
5	on SCE&G's part to withhold that both from the ORS
6	and from the Public Service Commission. That's the
7	basis of my testimony.
8	Q. So that's the only imprudent activity that
9	you can identify; is that right?
10	A. No. We have gone through this before. The
11	first imprudent activity was never telling us you
12	were going to do an assessment. And why that is
13	imprudent is because it would have impacted the
14	entire project from then on. And the reason for that
15	is because it would have delayed the hearings until
16	after the Bechtel assessment was completed. And if
17	Bechtel had done what they actually did I don't
18	know what would have happened if the Bechtel
19	assessment scope had been different or whatever; I'm
20	going on the basis of what they actually did.
21	If they had done the same thing, first off,
22	it could have been advanced much faster. And it
23	didn't have to start in August, it could have started
24	in March. There was no reason for not doing that.
25	Then that assessment would have then generated both

	249
1	ORS evaluation, and we would have had to have had
2	SCE&G defend the schedule that they had. Why is this
3	schedule now, you're saying you're going to complete
4	this in 2019, Bechtel says it may be 2021 for it.
5	So if that could have changed the entire
6	complexion, and the project at that time could have
7	been found to be uneconomic. Now, under the BLRA,
8	that supposedly wouldn't have made any difference,
9	but it certainly would have. If it would have been
10	shown that this project would be a burden on the
11	ratepayers of South Carolina and would never be
12	economic to be operated, that its construction dates
13	were, one, beyond the production tax credits which
14	would have been a \$2.2 billion hit; two, that it was
15	going to take much longer than anybody thought, I'm
16	fairly certain that the political pressures that you
17	see now would have been just as great to do something
18	different with the project.
19	So that failure to disclose colors the
20	entire project from that point on. It's just not you
21	take them in discrete steps and say, well, you didn't
22	do this one but you later did that. That would have
23	changed the whole entire complexion of how the
24	project was done.
25	Q. So

	250
1	MR. COX: John, whenever you get a
2	chance, I would like to ask for a break,
3	whenever.
4	MR. CHALLY: I'm about done.
5	BY MR. CHALLY:
6	Q. But you didn't do a single thing after you
7	learned of the existence of the Bechtel assessment in
8	October of 2015, other than have two conversations
9	with SCE&G employees?
10	MR. COX: Object to the form.
11	THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say we
12	didn't do a single thing. We, again, tried to
13	get AIR requests, but it I can say you
14	know, this may get a little personal, but I had
15	my trusts violated. The people that I was
16	talking to and established a relationship over a
17	number of years, and if they told me something, I
18	believed them. I would, in general, try to
19	validate it in some way, but there was no way to
20	do this with the Bechtel report.
21	So when they told me there was a
22	no-nevermind, I believed them. And we had larger
23	fish to fry with the Westinghouse amendment
24	coming in at the same time. The whole
25	contractual structure of the project changed,

	251
1	massive changes in many of the terms and
2	conditions of the project.
3	So that's what we concentrated on
4	was, okay, how is this change in the EPC contract
5	going to affect the rest of the project? The
6	fact that Fluor was coming on was hailed as a
7	great achievement with great expectations. So I
8	did not pursue further on the Bechtel report
9	because I trusted the people that told me what
10	they told me.
11	BY MR. CHALLY:
12	Q. And they told you that there was nothing new
13	found by Bechtel during the assessment, right?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. What exactly was new found by Bechtel in the
16	assessment that you believe they should have told
17	you?
18	A. I go back again: The primary thing that
19	they should have told us was the schedule that
20	Bechtel had developed.
21	Q. So anything else?
22	A. There may be bits and pieces of other
23	things. But, I mean, the first, first thing is the
24	schedule; the second is the disclosure that it was
25	done. There should have been for example, one of

	252
1	the things that they did is they, "they" meaning
2	South Carolina Electric & Gas, they generated their
3	own document called the Program Assessment Report, or
4	Project Assessment Report, and they basically put the
5	Bechtel recommendations on there and were tracking
6	them. Even that report was never provided to ORS.
7	And they could have easily disguised that, I would
8	say, as a document that could have been provided to
9	us but it was not.
10	Q. So, Mr. Jones, I'm going to ask my question
11	again, just to make sure I got the complete answer.
12	You were told, in October of 2015, that Bechtel had
13	done an assessment, nothing new was found.
14	A. Right.
15	Q. So what I'm asking you is: Now, having
16	reviewed all of this material and preparing and
17	submitting testimony to the PSC, what new did Bechtel
18	find? And the only thing you have identified is the
19	schedule. Anything else?
20	A. I thought I identified the other thing is
21	that I think it should have been disclosed,
22	regardless of what was found, it should have been
23	disclosed. So, to me, the most important thing was
24	the Bechtel schedule; the second was it should have

been disclosed to us that, what the report was, it

25

	253
1	should have been shared with us so it could be
2	discussed and defended if it had been decided that
3	they weren't going to implement the recommendations
4	of Bechtel. But we should have known about the
5	Bechtel recommendations, we should have had the
6	report disclosed, we should have had the schedule
7	disclosed.
8	MR. CHALLY: Okay. Let's take a
9	break.
10	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
11	off the record at 5:14 p.m.
12	(A recess was taken.)
13	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
14	back on the record at 5:22 p.m.
15	BY MR. CHALLY:
16	Q. Okay. Mr. Jones, you received a Subpoena
17	that compelled your appearance for today, correct?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Do you know that that Subpoena included
20	certain documents that we were requesting you to
21	provide?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Can you describe generally the process you
24	followed to identify and produce those documents?
25	A. Computer files. Basically I file e-mails in

	254
1	a file on my computer. All the ones that I want to
2	keep that are sent are submitted to me in a file
3	that's like SCE Regulatory or something like that.
4	There's an ORS file, so I keep all those in one spot.
5	So I provided back to the dates January 2015, I
6	believe was the date in the Subpoena. I think that
7	was it. All files in that file, and that's, as I
8	said, that's where I keep all the e-mails associated
9	with my assignment on this project.
10	In addition to that, documents themselves on
11	my computer file, I keep a couple of files. One was
12	associated with the docket number one's associated
13	with the docket number here. The other was a file
14	designated as the whole file is designated SCORS,
15	and the pertinent documents associated with this were
16	in the couple of files, sub-folders within that. So
17	I provided all the documents associated with that.
18	And then I had also hard copy documents that
19	included my detail, what I call detail invoices,
20	which you provided a couple of examples of. Letter
21	invoices, which is what I actually submit for payment
22	now, those go together. And handwritten notes that
23	date or that record notes that I take when I am
24	reviewing various documents, because I'm a fairly
25	visual person and writing stuff down helps me. It's

	255
1	not necessarily that I ever go back to them, but it
2	helps to have it there.
3	And I don't recall exactly the date now, it
4	was recorded but I don't recall the date that I went
5	back to, but it was not my it was not a complete
6	file of everything that has ever been generated,
7	because my basic practice was to throw my written
8	files away after a year. I changed it a little bit
9	when the project started getting into the
10	questionable state. So it's the files that I
11	provided go back a little further than a year, but
12	that's basically it.
13	Q. Okay. So, in summary, you collected both
14	e-mails, hard copy files that you knew to exist, and
15	you transmitted all of those over to ORS's counsel;
16	is that right?
17	A. It was e-mails and document, there were some
18	that documents I had also.
19	The things that I didn't provide that didn't
20	make any sense to me to provide were the hard copy
21	documents that SCE&G had sent to me associated with
22	this, and the CDs. I did not provide copies of
23	those. I stated that those were not provided. It
24	
	just didn't make any sense to me to try to and it

	256
1	to do that.
2	Q. Any other information of any kind that would
3	be responsive to the Subpoena that you didn't
4	provide?
5	A. No. I mean, I kept everything in separate
6	files and kept separated, so it wasn't
7	MR. CHALLY: Okay. That's all the
8	questions for you. Thank you.
9	THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. Thank
10	you.
11	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
12	off the record at 5:27 p.m.
13	(Off-the-record discussion.)
14	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
15	back on the record at 5:28 p.m.
16	EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. EVANS:
18	Q. Mr. Jones, I'm Jerry Evans. I represent the
19	plaintiff ratepayers in this action. It's been a
20	long day for everybody, and so I'm going to try and
21	be brief.
22	A. Thank you.
23	Q. Mr. Jones, who had the ultimate
24	responsibility for the proper execution of the EPC
25	contract and the construction of the project?

	257
1	MR. CHALLY: Object to form.
2	THE WITNESS: Who had the ultimate
3	responsibility? My opinion would be SCE&G had
4	the ultimate responsibility.
5	BY MR. EVANS:
6	Q. And would that include responsibility for
7	quality control and quality assurance?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Are you generally familiar with the Public
10	Service Commission Order of March 2nd, 2009,
11	approving the application to construct?
12	A. Generally, yes.
13	Q. Well, are you aware that the language
14	regarding the ultimate responsibility of SCE&G is
15	actually expressly in that Order?
16	A. I can't say that I was specifically aware of
17	that but it doesn't surprise me.
18	Q. You have talked a lot about the schedule,
19	and I think in your 2018 testimony, pre-file
20	testimony, you said an integrated resource loaded
21	construction schedule is the most important input
22	into determining the cost of a nuclear power plant;
23	is that correct?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. I want to make sure I'm clear. When did you

	258
1	first see a fully integrated resource schedule for
2	this project?
3	A. Point of fact, we never did.
4	Q. You asked for one?
5	A. Yes. Repeatedly, yes.
6	Q. Repeatedly? At what point let's go back
7	in time to the beginning of the project. At what
8	point in time should a fully integrated resource
9	schedule have been in place?
10	A. I want to there's stages you go through
11	in a nuclear project. But what was initially
12	submitted was, let's call it an integrated schedule.
13	Okay?
14	Q. Okay.
15	A. That identifies the activities and the
16	precursors and the successors. So it lays out the
17	basic logic of the schedule and gives you how you're
18	going to do it. The difference and that is
19	usually provided in the early stages of the project,
20	because if you haven't started construction, there is
21	really no use in having a fully a resource loaded
22	schedule.
23	So once you get others may disagree, but
24	where I think it becomes very important is when you
25	actually start the nuclear construction, and that

	259
1	would have been with the nuclear concrete pour.
2	Because at that time, you then start adding labor to
3	the project, and that's where the resource loading
4	part comes in.
5	Q. And for this project, that would have been
6	approximately what date?
7	A. I think the NI was in the NI concrete
8	pour was in 2000 at least these two dates, I
9	always get mixed up. We got the COL in it was a
10	little after a year that we got the COL, I think the
11	COL came in 2013, I think the it may be '12. It
12	would be nice to maybe I've got my timeline here.
13	No, it doesn't go back that far. But in the 2013
14	time frame, I would say, and that, really, you should
15	have started developing that schedule in preparation
16	for that activity, so that's really what drives it
17	from that point on.
18	Q. You mentioned that when you received the
19	scheduling reports that you did have to look at.
20	They were, I think you described them as 90-day
21	lookaheads?
22	A. For the most part, yes.
23	Q. But if I understood you correctly, you
24	received those in like a PDF or a hard copy and not
25	through actual software?

	260
1	A. Correct.
2	Q. Would it have assisted your review to have
3	had access to the software?
4	A. No, it would not, because I don't have the
5	software capability anyway, and I don't have the
6	computer power to do that either.
7	Q. Do you know if SCE&G was monitoring the
8	schedule by way of looking at the software?
9	A. What I do well, they did get they did
10	get a copy of the software, the software run and the
11	schedule itself, and they had a scheduling group of
12	their own that looked at that basis.
13	And I know it gets confusing, but there was
14	always a schedule, 250,000 or 400,000 items in it.
15	Q. Right.
16	A. But what it wasn't, it wasn't properly
17	updated to reflect what was going on on the project,
18	and it wasn't properly updated to reflect resource
19	loading.
20	Q. Do you think that there was a fully
21	integrated resource schedule that you just never got
22	to see?
23	A. At this point, I really don't think they
24	ever got to the point of having a resource loaded
25	schedule. I think they did have an integrated, a

	261
1	complete integrated project schedule, but I don't
2	think they ever got to the point where it was updated
3	and resource loaded to the point that we were talking
4	about.
5	Q. Who at SCE&G was responsible for I will
6	use the word monitoring for monitoring
7	Westinghouse's scheduling work?
8	MR. CHALLY: Object to the form.
9	THE WITNESS: Specifically talking
10	about scheduling work, I mean, you know, it
11	impacted many people, I mean, a lot of people
12	were interested in the schedule. I don't know
13	which phase you're talking about, but the
14	construction manager is definitely interested in
15	it.
16	BY MR. EVANS:
17	Q. Was there someone at SCE&G who was
18	responsible for there being a schedule?
19	MR. CHALLY: Same objection.
20	THE WITNESS: I mean, ultimately,
21	I think it rolls up to the lead guy on the
22	project. And then, too, you can say, you know,
23	it's either the site vice president or ultimately
24	it rolls up to that responsibility.
25	

	262
1	BY MR. EVANS:
2	Q. Well, what are you aware of, actions SCE&G
3	was taking toward the folks at Westinghouse, to
4	ensure that a schedule was up-to-date?
5	A. There were we did see numerous
6	correspondence trying to get an updated schedule.
7	Westinghouse, in fact, did submit a monthly update,
8	but, as I said, it never got to the point where it
9	fully reflected the status of the project, what was
10	happening on the project, and an integration, a
11	resource loading of those activities.
12	Q. And whose responsibility was it to provide
13	information on the schedule, integrated schedule, to
14	you?
15	MR. CHALLY: Object to the form.
16	THE WITNESS: I can't say
17	specifically what it came it came to us in the
18	form of the status reports that we received. So
19	we received the 90-day updates through the weekly
20	status reports, also through the Westinghouse
21	status reports. So there were various venues
22	that we got copies of schedules, but I can't tell
23	you specifically who it was that provided that.
24	BY MR. EVANS:
25	O. Do you know what a critical path report is?

	263
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Did you have access to critical path reports
3	with this project?
4	A. We did have access to them per request. We
5	could get critical path reports. In many cases, the
6	critical path was not a critical path report but the
7	critical path was identified on the schedule
8	summaries that we got. So you would, like, for
9	example, one that stayed on the critical path for
10	many, many months was the critical path would be
11	through the shield building erection, and that would
12	be identified as specifically saying the critical
13	path on the project, even in the quarterly reports
14	that identified the critical path that said critical
15	path is shield building erection, then in the
16	containment, and on from that.
17	Q. Were there particular aspects of critical
18	path reports that indicated to you problems with
19	keeping on schedule with the project?
20	A. Yes, at various times there were issues that
21	prompted questions from me that we would discuss at
22	the status meetings. Examples I can think of is, in
23	some cases, the duration at the the durations of
24	end activities of the project, like start-up testing,
25	like pre-op testing, those types of things would be

	264
1	shortened from what they were previously, and the
2	date would the completion date would remain the
3	same. And when I saw that, I said, you know, how
4	does this come about, how are you going to do this?
5	And in some cases we would have discussions
6	of, well, we have mitigation plans to do this and
7	this and this, in some cases they actually changed it
8	when they realized that there is no way we're going
9	to get start-up testing done or pre-op testing done
10	in five months, so they go back and change it and do
11	a mitigation someplace upstream from that in order to
12	also
13	Q. Was this a frequent occurrence?
14	A. Fairly frequent, yes.
15	Q. I want to ask you about a few specific
16	things you talked about in your 2012 testimony before
17	the PSC.
18	A. Okay.
19	Q. You cited some fabrication delays in
20	structural modules coming from Lake Charles. Do you
21	recall that?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And that proved to be an enduring problem;
24	is that fair to say?
25	A. That is fair to say.

	265
1	Q. In your testimony and if you need to see
2	it I can show it to you but if you recall, you
3	said that, regarding the structural modules from Lake
4	Charles, significant and appropriate corrective
5	actions have been taken by Stone & Webster, WEC, and
6	SCE&G. Do you recall generally that testimony?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. I wonder if you could share with me the
9	corrective actions you recall, and I want to pick
10	these apart, done by Stone & Webster.
11	A. Well, Stone & Webster included Shaw at that
12	time. Shaw was the guy that actually owned the Lake
13	Charles facility. They were the owners, and it was
14	Shaw, Stone & Webster.
15	Corrective actions that I'm aware of in that
16	time frame: There were massive management changes,
17	they changed out the management of the plant, they
18	changed out welder qualifications, and they tried to
19	institute an electronic quality document tracking
20	system to reduce the paperwork involved and to speed
21	up the process of getting the modules completed.
22	They reconfigured their shop to make it more
23	efficient to fabricate the pieces.
24	One of the problems that they had was,
25	before they made these changes, they would pile up

	266
1	these very, very large sheets of metal, four times as
2	large as this table, and they would stack them on top
3	of each other, then they would have to go the one
4	that they wanted would be at the bottom and they
5	would have to move everything. So they changed how
6	they stored them, improved that area.
7	So these are some of the changes. There
8	were other changes, but those are the ones that come
9	to mind right off the top of my head.
10	Q. Do you recall and again, talking about
11	the structural modules. Do you recall actions taken
12	by Westinghouse to corrective actions?
13	A. Some corrective actions that Westinghouse
14	did is they assigned engineers to the fabrication
15	facility in order to expedite changes. So they
16	provided, essentially, resident engineers in order to
17	expedite the changes. And that was Westinghouse's
18	responsibility was design, and that's the changes
19	that they made.
20	Q. And then finally SCE&G, because you included
21	them in the parties that were doing corrective
22	actions.
23	A. Yeah.
24	Q. What do you recall SCE&G specifically doing?
25	A. SCE&G also assigned resident engineers to

	267
1	the Lake Charles facility in order to keep track of
2	what was being done and expediting the modules for
3	the shop.
4	Q. Do you know how many engineers they had at
5	Lake Charles?
6	A. How many SCE&G had?
7	Q. Yes.
8	A. No. It was it was one or two, but it
9	wasn't a massive amount of engineers. Because their
10	job was pretty much oversight and expediting, so you
11	didn't they didn't really participate in the
12	engineering design, so you didn't need a lot of
13	engineers there to do that.
14	Q. And did those corrective actions, did they
15	solve the problem in short order?
16	A. No, sir, they did not. They resulted in
17	some improvement but they did not solve the problem.
18	The modules, the shipments from the modules continued
19	to be delayed. And, in fact, I don't remember the
20	timing exactly, but the NRC, in their inspection of
21	the Lake Charles facility, found major issues
22	relative to quality at some time, and I can't place
23	it relative to my testimony there, but I think it was
24	after they found significant problems, and a lot of
25	recovery efforts had to be expended by the Lake

	268
1	Charles shop. They actually stopped work, and a lot
2	of activity had to be expended by Lake Charles to get
3	the facility back online.
4	Q. You also addressed in your 2012 testimony a
5	need for increase in staffing, particularly in the
6	quality control area. Do you recall that?
7	A. I don't specifically recall that but I know
8	there was an issue there.
9	Q. In your testimony, you stated that the SCE&G
10	quality control people, they had seven people on the
11	job at the time and they were requesting an increase
12	of 20 more.
13	A. Right.
14	Q. What brought that in? That's a pretty
15	dramatic increase, isn't it?
16	A. My recollection is the primary reason for
17	that increase was receipt inspection. And receipt
18	inspection is when you receive a piece of equipment
19	on site, you do inspections to determine that it's
20	the right thing, that you know what it is and it has
21	the proper paperwork, and that it had the proper
22	examinations provided to it.
23	So this it became problematic for the
24	SCE&G QC inspector to make these inspections because
25	there was more and more equipment coming on site than

	269
1	they could handle, so they had to staff up in order
2	to do that.
3	Now, QC inspectors also do field inspections
4	of welding and that kind of thing. But my
5	recollection is, at this time, the major problem was
6	receipt inspections.
7	Q. Did SCE&G assign any quality control
8	personnel to Lake Charles?
9	A. You know, I don't recall that specifically.
10	There were assignments made to Lake Charles. I don't
11	remember if they were solely resident engineers or if
12	they also sent QC inspectors there. Because one of
13	the things that could have been done, and I don't
14	remember whether it was or not, is to do some of the
15	at least preliminary receipt inspections in advance
16	before the item was shipped, but I don't remember
17	whether they did that or not.
18	Q. And how quickly did the 20 additional
19	approved hires come on board?
20	A. I can't address that. I don't know. We
21	know that there was an increase, but we didn't track
22	the hiring.
23	Q. Let me move to your 2018 testimony that we
24	have talked about a lot. On page seven.
25	A. Page seven. Okay.

	270
1	Q. Okay. In the middle paragraph, the last
2	sentence, it says, "The EPC contracting approach
3	appeared to be driven more by cost reduction concerns
4	than by quality and productivity and created deep
5	animosity among the Consortium partners and the
6	owners," correct?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. That EPC contracting approach, that had
9	been that had been present since the beginning of
10	the project, correct?
11	A. In yes, in form it changed with the
12	amendment, but that same general EPC approach had
13	been in place.
14	Q. And in your review in 2018, did it seem to
15	you that the approach driven more by cost reduction
16	concerns than quality, did that apply to a
17	several-year period?
18	A. Yes. There were I mean, the change in
19	construction contractors was evidence of that, that
20	the construction contractors wanted out of the
21	project desperately.
22	I can give you a very specific example, and
23	that was based on my facility site visit to Oregon.
24	Vigor and Greenberry, and what we what I
25	discovered during that visit is that, at that time,

	271
1	CB&I was not providing their fabricator with design
2	changes because of a contract dispute with
3	Westinghouse, that they weren't getting paid for the
4	changes. So CB&I elected, at that time, to just stop
5	processing design changes. So the fabricator and
6	this was in place for nine months before we really
7	found out about it.
8	Q. Do you recall the time frame of that?
9	A. Not specifically but I could identify it. I
10	have a written trip report, and I have I think my
11	calendar is still active, too. But the written trip
12	report that I provided included this information.
13	Q. Do you believe it was prior to 2015?
14	A. I cannot be certain. I cannot be certain of
15	that. I would have to
16	Q. What did SCE&G do to correct this tension
17	between the other two companies?
18	A. Well, I mean, in this specific instance, I
19	was accompanied on that trip by Alan Torrez, and he
20	brought the issue to the front rather rapidly and got
21	CB&I and Westinghouse to work out an agreement. I
22	don't know the details of how they worked it out, I
23	just know it was resolved and those changes were
24	provided to the fabricator.
25	O. You listed for Mr. Chally a number of items

	272
1	that I want to get the wording correct here, so
2	let me get my notes. He asked you to list the
3	materials that you did not receive from SCE&G that
4	you thought you should have received, covered a
5	period of time.
6	A. All right.
7	Q. And one of the categories you cited were
8	communications between the owners that revealed
9	concerns about the project.
10	A. Uh-huh.
11	Q. Can you expand on that, please.
12	A. In the process of well, I had, I would
13	say, very little contact with Santee Cooper
14	throughout the project. And it was somewhat a
15	surprise in the discovery to find out that they had
16	been much more active than we had known. And so
17	there were they had been fairly vocal in
18	expressing their displeasure with the Consortium and
19	with SCE&G in the overall status of management and
20	the project. So there were several instances, and I
21	can't bring to mind any specific one, but there were
22	several instances of that in my exhibits.
23	Q. You sited in your testimony on page 14
24	this is the 2018 testimony.
25	A. Okay.

	273
1	Q. Actually, I'm referring to a sentence that
2	starts at the bottom of page 13.
3	A. Okay.
4	Q. You cite some correspondence between from
5	Mr. Carter of Santee Cooper, and then on the top of
6	14 you're quoting his correspondence. "My sense is
7	that neither owners, nor the Consortium, have any
8	real confidence that the proposed roll-out schedule
9	that the Consortium shared with the owners on
10	August 1st is achievable."
11	Is that an example of the type of
12	communications that you had access to later that you
13	believe you should have had access to at the time?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And this, if you look at the bottom of
16	page 13, the date of this communication is
17	September 8th, 2014, correct?
18	A. We must have different pagination or
19	something. Where is oh, I'm sorry. Oh.
20	Q. Double-sided.
21	A. Okay. September 8th, yes.
22	Q. So that and that predates the March 2015
23	date that your testimony is focused on, correct?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. So there were instances of what you consider

	274
1	to be significant omissions that predate the
2	March 2015 date, correct?
3	MR. CHALLY: Object to the form.
4	THE WITNESS: I would say there
5	was information that we believe should have been
6	provided to us, yes.
7	BY MR. EVANS:
8	Q. And you considered this significant
9	information?
10	A. Yes, I would say so, yeah.
11	Q. And there was language of no confidence in
12	correspondence predating this; is that correct?
13	A. I can't specifically cite that, but I
14	believe there has been that we have identified, yes.
15	Q. Let me just point you to another exhibit in
16	your vast Exhibit Number 1.
17	A. In 1 or 2? Exhibit Number
18	Q. Exhibit 1 is the entirety of your
19	A. Oh, okay. I'm sorry.
20	Q. And I would ask you to go almost to the very
21	back of it.
22	A. Where are we going?
23	Q. Exhibit 12, GCJ12, which is itself a
24	247-page exhibit. And I direct you to page 251 of
25	274.

	275
1	A. Okay. Twelve and what page?
2	Q. 251.
3	A. 251. All right. Okay.
4	Q. Okay. This is an interoffice communication
5	from Lonnie Carter, President and Chief Executive
6	Officer of Santee Cooper; is that correct?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And I would direct you to the bottom of this
9	page in the discussion of the modules. It states,
10	Kevin and I and Kevin, if you look at the first
11	sentence, refers to Kevin Marsh of SCANA.
12	A. Uh-huh.
13	Q. Says, "Kevin and I went on to note that we
14	have received so many new schedules that they are
15	meaningless. We have no real confidence in their
16	ability to provide modules as scheduled."
17	Did I read that correctly?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. So this is another example, would you agree,
20	of an expression of no confidence that you did not
21	have access to at the time?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And you consider this an important piece of
24	information that you would have liked to have had?
25	A. Yes.

	276
1	Q. On page going back to your pre-filed
2	testimony from 2018.
3	A. Okay.
4	Q. It's late in the day. I'm trying to give
5	people some exercise.
6	A. Okay. Where are we going?
7	Q. Page 29.
8	A. Okay.
9	Q. At the bottom of the page.
10	A. Not there yet. Okay.
11	Q. At the bottom of the page in bold is the
12	question: "In your professional opinion, did SCE&G
13	properly manage"
14	(Interruption.)
15	A. Okay.
16	Q. I'll read the question again. "In your
17	professional opinion, did SCE&G properly manage this
18	project?"
19	Can you tell what your answer was?
20	A. Well, my answer now is that, from the
21	information that has come about with discovery, I
22	would say no.
23	Q. And
24	A. Or did you want me to read it exactly? I
25	paraphrased. Sorry.

	277
1	Q. Why don't you read it exactly for the
2	record.
3	A. "Based on the documented record recently
4	made available as part of the discovery associated
5	with this filing, I must emphatically say no."
6	Q. And there were instances of mismanagement,
7	in your view, that predates March of 2015; is that
8	correct?
9	A. I think they could be classified that way.
10	And I give some examples. The whole issue of going
11	backwards gets somewhat muddled, because on any
12	project you can expect issues to occur. So is that
13	mismanagement? Maybe, maybe not, but so I I
14	would say probably there are instances of
15	mismanagement, but I still tie mine to the deception
16	that started with March.
17	Q. You've used the term "prudency" in your
18	testimony today, as well as in the pre-file testimony
19	related to the nuclear project. Do you have a
20	definition for prudency?
21	A. I think the definition, although I realize
22	that it was in the new, the new law, I thought it was
23	a good definition, but it's basically taking actions
24	that are based on the information that you have at
25	the time, they are correct and honest actions that

	278
1	you're taking to, in this case, complete the project.
2	Q. And you include honest communications as a
3	component of that?
4	A. Yes, I do.
5	MR. EVANS: Excuse me, excuse me
6	just a moment.
7	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
8	off the record at 6:03 p.m.
9	(A recess was taken.)
10	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going
11	back on the record at 6:12 p.m.
12	BY MR. EVANS:
13	Q. Thank you, Mr. Jones. Taking a little break
13 14	Q. Thank you, Mr. Jones. Taking a little break helps me to shorten my questioning.
14	helps me to shorten my questioning.
14 15	helps me to shorten my questioning. MR. HAMM: We're going to hold you
14 15 16	helps me to shorten my questioning. MR. HAMM: We're going to hold you to that.
14 15 16 17	helps me to shorten my questioning. MR. HAMM: We're going to hold you to that. BY MR. EVANS:
14 15 16 17 18	helps me to shorten my questioning. MR. HAMM: We're going to hold you to that. BY MR. EVANS: Q. You expressed in your testimony that ORS had
14 15 16 17 18 19	helps me to shorten my questioning. MR. HAMM: We're going to hold you to that. BY MR. EVANS: Q. You expressed in your testimony that ORS had recommended an expanded hands-on role by SCE&G in
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	helps me to shorten my questioning. MR. HAMM: We're going to hold you to that. BY MR. EVANS: Q. You expressed in your testimony that ORS had recommended an expanded hands-on role by SCE&G in managing the project, correct?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	helps me to shorten my questioning. MR. HAMM: We're going to hold you to that. BY MR. EVANS: Q. You expressed in your testimony that ORS had recommended an expanded hands-on role by SCE&G in managing the project, correct? A. (Witness nodded head.)
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	helps me to shorten my questioning. MR. HAMM: We're going to hold you to that. BY MR. EVANS: Q. You expressed in your testimony that ORS had recommended an expanded hands-on role by SCE&G in managing the project, correct? A. (Witness nodded head.) Q. Are you aware of any discussions within

	279
1	aware that well, outside management, no.
2	Q. And SCE&G never did, to your knowledge,
3	bring in any third party to oversee management of the
4	project, correct?
5	A. To my knowledge, no.
6	Q. You testified earlier today that you thought
7	SCE&G had a responsibility to be transparent in the
8	materials it was providing to ORS in discovery
9	materials, correct?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Do you also think SCE&G had a responsibility
12	to be transparent in information it was giving to the
13	public?
14	A. In general I would say yes, but, I mean, you
15	get into details of should they have disclosed
16	intimate details of the project, I would say no,
17	but
18	Q. Well, how about do you think they had a
19	responsibility to be truthful in information that was
20	provided to the public?
21	A. I would say that is definitely true.
22	MR. EVANS: All right. That's all
23	I have. Thank you.
24	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
25	

	280
1	EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. COX:
3	Q. Mr. Jones, Jim Cox representing the ORS
4	again. Just wanted to ask you a few follow-up
5	questions.
6	There was some talk early in your testimony
7	about whether the ORS could have assumed a different
8	productivity factor and come up with its own
9	scheduling cost estimate. Is it true that a cost
10	estimate depends on factors besides just the
11	productivity factor that's assumed in the
12	calculations?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. There was also talk about Mr. Byrne's
15	testimony about it being not in the best interest of
16	the owners to use a more pessimistic productivity
17	factor. You went back to this later in your
18	testimony, but is it your testimony that the
19	information that the company, SCE&G, provides to the
20	PSC, wouldn't have affected the rights that SCE&G had
21	vis-a-vis Westinghouse under the EPC contract?
22	A. I would say that's true, that whatever
23	happened to the at the PSC did not necessarily
24	affect the contractual arrangements that they had
25	with Westinghouse.

	281
1	Q. And isn't it true that in the March 2015
2	filing, SCE&G was actually saying these are
3	Westinghouse's new cost estimates, but we're not
4	saying we're obligated to pay them; in fact, we're
5	actually disputing whether we have to pay some of
6	these costs?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. There was a lot of talk about or there
9	was a lot of talk in your testimony about you not
10	being aware at the time of the March 2015 filing of
11	the fact that the owners were considering or that
12	SCE&G was considering retaining Bechtel.
13	In the March 2015 filing, you were also not
14	told by SCE&G what the actual cost estimate they had
15	come up with that they thought was the more likely
16	estimated completion cost versus what Westinghouse
17	had come up with, right?
18	MR. CHALLY: Object to form.
19	THE WITNESS: What I had become
20	aware of during the discovery process is a cost
21	estimate that was prepared by Ms. Carlette Walker
22	that was different from that prepared by the
23	Consortium, and we were not privy to that
24	information.
25	

	282
1	BY MR. COX:
2	Q. And is that information that you feel that
3	SCE&G should have informed you about back in
4	March 2015?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. There was some discussion about the
7	information that Bechtel obtained in producing its
8	conclusions, and I think at several different points
9	you discussed several pieces of information that they
10	had.
11	Is it true that the interview summaries that
12	they produced of their interviews with employees of
13	SCE&G and Westinghouse, you did not have that
14	information in 2015?
15	A. That's correct.
16	Q. Would you have liked to have known in 2015
17	that one of the senior executives with SCE&G
18	expressed some concern about going to jail over the
19	project?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. If that had occurred in an interview, you
22	would have been interested in that information?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. And would you have been would you have
25	felt like you needed to know in March 2015 during the

	283
1	time of that filing that one of SCE&G's own employees
2	who was submitting testimony in that docket felt
3	pressured to submit that testimony and wasn't
4	comfortable with the testimony?
5	MR. CHALLY: Object to form.
6	THE WITNESS: I would have
7	liked I would have liked to have known that
8	information, yes.
9	MR. COX: I have no further
10	questions. Thank you, Mr. Jones.
11	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
12	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This video
13	deposition is concluded at 6:19 p.m.
14	MR. COX: The witness will read
15	and sign.
16	(The deposition concluded at 6:19 p.m.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	284
1	STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
2	COUNTY OF GREENVILLE
3	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
4	I, Rebecca L. Arrison, a Notary Public in and for
5	the State of South Carolina, do hereby certify that
6	there came before me on the 5th day of October, 2018,
7	the person hereinbefore named, who was by me duly
8	sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the
9	truth of his knowledge concerning the matters in
10	controversy in this cause; that the witness was there
11	upon examined under oath, the examination reduced to
12	typewriting under my direction, and the deposition is
13	a true record of the testimony given by the witness.
14	I further certify that I am neither attorney or
15	counsel for, nor related to or employed by, any
16	attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto or
17	financially interested in the action.
18	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand,
19	this 15th day of October, 2018.
20	
21	Resecrat arrison
22	
23	Rebecca L. Arrison, Notary Public
24	My Commission Expires: 3/28/2027
25	

	285
1	A-T-T-E-S-T-A-T-I-O-N
2	In Re: Lightsey, et al. v. SCE&G, et al.
3	Deposition of: Gary Jones
4	Date Taken: October 5, 2018
5	Taken Before: Rebecca Arrison
6	
7	Having read my statement, no changes are necessary.
8	Signed:
9	Having read my statement, I make these corrections.
10	PageLineCorrection
11	PageLineCorrection
12	PageLineCorrection
13	PageLineCorrection
14	PageLineCorrection
15	PageLineCorrection
16	PageLineCorrection
17	PageLineCorrection
18	PageLineCorrection
19	PageLineCorrection
20	PageLineCorrection
21	PageLineCorrection
22	Sworn to and subscribed before me this day of
23	,County, South
24	Carolina. My commission expires
25	

	160:6	l aggantange	273:10	271:11
A	166:13	acceptance 159:4	achieve	272:16
A-T-T-E	202:8	194:15	116:9	activities
285:1	219:12	accepted	117:5	16:20
a.m4:8 7:2	226:8	176:3	143:2	20:16,17
56:24 57:2	275:16	235:1	197:1	•
abandon		access 41:14	achieved	20:18 25:9 27:18
10.23,23	able 10:17	44:15		
167:3	38:14,19	60:14,17	119:25 196:13	28:17 50:13,15
179:21	40:25 41:4	-	achievement	50:13,13
180:25	40:25 41:4	64:22,24		
184:11	43:13	65:6,12,15 65:17	251:7	51:11 52:19,22
220:15	44:22 61:4		achieving 127:1	241:1
abandoned	64:18	66:12,19 114:15		248:4
14:6 16:3	76:17	130:22	acknowledge 152:3	258:15
16:12 22:5	79:21	140:21	176:13	262:11
79:8				263:24
185:16	116:18	223:16,17	234:1	
242:3	130:22 137:3	260:3 263:2,4	acknowle	activity 50:14
245:19	145:23	273:12,13	202:18	248:8,11
abandonment	152:19	275:12,13		•
23:8 48:3	155:16		219:11 acknowle	259:16 268:2
61:2 79:14	165:20	accessing 44:18	151:18	actual 20:21
79:16,21	180:7,10	219:5	act 134:21	31:20 89:3
95:6,10,15	182:9		acted 195:2	112:19,19
101:1	195:25	accompanied 136:17	action 41:3	121:17
106:9	201:20	271:19	179:17	123:3
165:11	231:9	Accompan	189:3	129:13
166:21,25	232:25	111:7	193:22	218:8
168:15,19	Abney 5:12	accomplish	195:22	226:13
100.0	absent 41:25	206:18	256:19	228:4
100:11	absolutely	account 31:9	284:17	259:25
104.7	86:17	51:2,9	actions	281:14
193:17	109:4	148:1	120:21	add 37:16
195:8	186:24	226:11	178:9,14	162:12
abide 158:19	201:19	227:9	178:14,17	added 200:5
ability 29:4	absolved	accounta	178:18,21	adding 200:7
40.10,19	140:4	238:10	179:13	259:2
40:20,21	absorb 156:4	accurate	239:9,14	Addison's
11.21 13.1	158:20	11:20,25	262:2	159:23
45:10	accept	22:2 122:4	265:5,9,15	addition
107.22	115:25	130:2	266:11,12	35:5 37:6
132:24	143:19	159:21	266:13,22	44:8 45:16
136:20	211:18	achievable	267:14	60:3 89:8
137:21,25	acceptable	124:25	277:23,25	254:10
156:4	108:22	199:5	active	additional

				201
37:10,10	269:15	144:9	7:4,6	225:22
47:20 50:4		165:9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	advanced		285:2,2	250:23
64:4,7	165:16	180:5,14	Alan 77:9	270:12
71:22	204:11	194:2,5	90:16	amount 16:7
73:14	248:22	211:7	97:17 99:5	16:11
81:19	advantages	218:15,18	100:24	51:18
82:25 91:3	137:4	233:3	101:6	165:17
93:21	advertised	244:17	271 : 19	267:9
112:23	177:15	275 : 19	align 155:25	amounts 24:3
120:20	advice 36:16	Agree-135	alleviated	196:14
134:5	advise 42:24	6:8	161:12,14	analysis
145:3	advised	agreeable	229:13	12:24 13:7
157:1	144:16	36:8	alleviating	14:4 20:13
161:21	146:20	agreed 138:6	227:15	79:20
166:7	149:25	190:18	allow 30:11	86:21 , 25
200:4,7	affect 251:5	234:21	41:11	87:7,19,22
204:14	280:24	agreement	167 : 15	140:13,17
216:7	affiliated	134:10	allowable	140:22
220:20	36:25	135:16	200:9	141:10
232:14	102:3	138:2,14	allowed	145:15
269:18	105:24	138:17,22	122:13	216:10,11
address	107:13	146:18,23	157 : 20	218:16,17
11:16	afford 16:22	149:23	192:8	220:6,8
115:1	agenda 5:13	150:10,11	197:24	221:6,14
140:19	35:3 77:11	150:12	198:4	221:22
146:2,22	85:17,18	156:22	216:7	222:13,24
146:23	88:23,25	159:4	allowing	223:9
247:11	89:8 90:7	162:16	107:21	226:6
269:20	90:10,25	172:23	188:21	228:18
addressed	99:2,7,10	226:3	alluded	232:3,11
98:17	99:12	271:21	166:20	analysts
268:4	aggressive	agreements	Allyn 6:1,18	61:12
adhere 40:16	118:14	146:21	43:15	
	ago 11:9	226:18	43:15 69:15	ancillary 229:2
adherence	89:1	ahead 165:19	84:15	and/or182:8
administ	182:17,18	183:22,24	159:19	animosity
128:25	184:22	AIR 95:16,19	altered	270:5
administ	agree 22:21	95:23 96:2	229:19	announced
35:21	22:24	96:7 98:8	amended	84:10,24
Admiral 21:1	66:18	113:11	154:3	214:8
adopt 241:8	118:10	250:13	amendment	announce
241:23	121:9,13	airfare	49:16	141:23
advance	121:16	33:21	94:15	answer 9:25
85:20	123:18	AIRs 6:2	103:18	43:13 45:6
146:21	134:22	127:24	122:8,13	47 : 25
200:6	140:8	al 1:6 5:12	222:11	108:4
	l		l	l .

				288
236:14	105:3	74:21	Arrison 1:23	219:13
252:11	141:7	118:19	4:8 7:12	assessing
276:19,20	168:24	149:7	284:4,23	59:20,20
answers 9:13			285:5	assessment
	application	167:5,19		
9:22 10:16	257:11	168:9,14	arrive 26:7	62:3,5
10:23	applied	168:18	articulates	63:3,4,17
Anthony	25:10	169:3	39:10	72:2 74:16
27:10	166:22	175:19	aside 155:9	74:19,21
67:20 68:1	232:3	181:3	225:19	80:1,12
69:14	apply 51:3	187:19	asked 39:9	81:7,20,25
163:9	134:8	197:4	39:20 62:2	83:1,15
Anthony163	270:16	203:4,5	63:3,18,23	84:4,11
6 : 18	applying	206:24	64:11 65:5	85:1,8,10
anticipated	115:16	229:8	68:13 80:4	85:24 89:5
151:17	appreciate	269:19	80:11 81:6	89:13,16
199:11	9:23	approving	92:15	89:19,21
anybody	approach	257:11	176:8	89:24 90:3
249:15	26:20	approxim	184:19	90:17
anymore	28:14	12:18	194:19,25	91:18 , 20
171 : 2	165:9,12	149:19	218:2	91:21 92:1
226:24	165:14,15	259:6	238:14	92:7,7,10
anyway 260:5	176:25	April 5:22	258:4	93:1,4,9
AP 150:17	177 : 2	6 : 13	272:2	93:10,13
176:18	184:24	125:15	asking 11:6	93:18
apart 196:3	270:2,8,12	133:14	61:24 81:4	94:11,19
265:10	270:15	architect	81:9 90:16	95:9,14
apologize	approaches	15:17	107:15	96:9,17
68 : 2	178:2	area 51:8	160:13	97:12,21
app 57:7	appropriate	151:24	162:12	99:1,15,24
appear 109:2	104:3	223:3	182:25	99:25
124:24	120:22	266:6	188:18	100:19,22
157:19	156:20	268:6	204:12,23	101:1,18
178:9	158:7	areas 110:13	205:18	102:4,5,9
appearance	160:7	224:13	252:15	102:17,20
2:1 253:17	200:18,20	230:1	aspect	103:2,7
appeared	265:4	arena 224:1	146:24	104:7,11
162:6	approval	argue 228:3	aspects	108:21
176:23,24	122:8	228:5	263:17	173:9,17
178:23,24	129:25	argued 230:2	asserted	174:17
270:3	153:13	argument	47:15	183:20
appearing	197:2	227:22	178:6,7	184:23
7:23 8:1,4		arises 93:20	180:9	185:1,5,11
·	approve			
appears 11:8	103:23	arrangement	assertion	185:20,22
11:11	139:16	135:2	123:1	185:25
87:11 88:23	approved 40:17,17	arrangem 280:24	230:3 assess	186:3,9,13 186:16,17

				209
186:25	252:3,4,13	139:7,9	attachment	182:2,2
187:3,7,9	assessor	158:24	33:24	August 6:6
187:10,11	154:11	170:25	34:24,25	25:3 76:14
187:12,17	assign 269:7	assumed 45:8	attainable	76:19
187:24	assigned	57:14 90:1	197:24	
	_			83:14,18
188:1,2,10	18:17	90:2 119:7	attained	133:2
188:16,21	266:14,25	139:25	125:2	248:23
188:25	assignment	204:2	129:23	273:10
189:2,8,10	25:19	280:7,11	attempt	authorized
189:17,20	28:15,20	assuming	214:13	165:18
189:24	28:23	57:23	attempting	automati
190:2,3,5	60:24	234:3	21:24	181:1
190:20,22	254:9	assumption	attend 42:23	availabi
190:25	assignments	112:12	43:24	29:12
191:4,8,9	269:10	210:3	attended	available
191:10,12	Assist 5:10	233:13,14	35:4 42:11	28:16
191:14,16	assistance	233:16,17	42:14 84:8	41:10
191:20	84:25	234:1	171:24	44:15 47:1
192:1,5,10	164:2	245:17	attendees	47:24
192:12,13	assistant	assumptions	35:2,6,8	53:14,22
192:16	128:25	112:6,11	77:8 136:5	62:22 63:2
193:14,21	assisted	113:1	159:13	63:7 65:10
194:1,3,7	260:2	118:6	attenders	65 : 18
194:12,21	associated	211:22	100:3	70:16 79:4
195:4	17:18,20	217:21	attending	93:15
211:24,25	23:16	230:11	39:8	103:16
212:1	25 : 25	231:25	attention	104:4
213:22,24	52 : 22	assurance	199:3	125:4
214:3,8,10	59:16,19	159:9,9	Attestation	126:17
216:5,17	86:8 119:8	160:15	6 : 22	130:4
218:9,11	131:1	165:19	attorney	145:20
218:25	134:5	257 : 7	3:19,20	158:11
220:2	140:15	assurances	7:15 8:10	178:8,10
221:17	142:13	159:5,8	36:13	222:1
222:18	150:17	161:8,12	284:14,16	223:6,20
223:2	166:4	assured	attorney	223:22,25
228:12	167:16	158:18	36:20	224:3
237:4	177:13	161:4	attorneys	277:4
243:2,4,7	180:21	Atlanta 2:20	30:7 67:23	await 187:23
243:17,21	204:15	attached	audit 40:8	award 150:5
244:6,8	254:8,12	11:22	40:10,11	aware 24:1,5
247:25	254:12,15	129:14	40:10,11	24:6 25:12
248:12,16	254:17	163:12	43:17,20	25:14
248:19,25	254 : 17 255 : 21	244:19	60:19	47:22 48:1
250:7	277:4	attaches	67:23	48:4,9
251:13,16	assume 133:4	163:16	181:22	61:2,9
201.10,10	assume 100.4	100.10	101.22	U1.2,9

				270
60 0 65 0	005 6 10	050.10	150.14	
63:3 65:8	235:6,10	259:13	153:14	30:20
71:10	235:21	264:10	158:8	31:12
74:10,10	236:3,12	268:3	159:3	49:10
76:25	238:6,20	274:21	161 : 7	51 : 12
79:25 80:3	243:7	276:1	178:7,10	56:16
82:22	245:1	278:11	179:15	64:23 66:1
83:17 85:7	247:2,5	280:17	187:18	67:19 , 25
86:15	257:13,16	282:3	195:12,24	85:19
89:24 90:1	262:2	background	199:10,14	112:20
92:17,21	265:15	11:17 25:8	201:15	113:4
92:24 93:3	278:22,25	26:10 29:2	203:14,19	114:1,9,16
93:5 96:8	279:1	backwards	205:1	118:4
96:14 99:5	281:10,20	277:11	206:12,21	123:3
109:12,22		bad 114:24	207:10	126:2,4,7
109:25	В	184:9	217:1,22	129:24
111:14,18	B 3:1,1,10	199:25	221:13,17	135:3
111:21	B-E-R-G	229:4	221:22	142:18
112:5,14	26:6	badged 65:3	222:19	143:4
112:15,17	back 21:2	badging	223:8	156:13
114:18	31:2 46:25	65:15	244:1	183:5
116:11	57:2 61:18	ballpark	270:23	191:23
129:19	64:12 75:5	55:6 56:10	277:3,24	197:7
133:23	75:17	bankruptcy	bases 112:18	205:5
134:16,20	98:25	179:25	basic 165:6	206:25
140:13,16	100:22	Bar 18:15,16	166:25	208:15
141:23	107:3	22:16	255:7	221:20
143:10	115:22	Barnwell 2:7	258:17 258:17	222:6
168:9	124:16			
	154:18	base 17:13	basically	223:1
171:9,13	163:3	123:1	22:19 35:3	228:6
171:20		201:22	52:15 81:6	241:10
182:3	176:6	206:5	120:18	242:25
201:4	181:23	220:9	145:8	247:6,16
203:25	183:19	based 60:12	164:4	247:19
207:14,16	187:21	68:22	168:12	248:7,20
207:18,21	201:2	70:15	172:4	260:12
209:8	205:13	85:21	195:20	Bates 105:9
210:6,9,10	213:2	103:15	223:3	bear 227:19
210:14	227:22	104:4	252:4	beat 229:4
218:25	231:9	110:23	253 : 25	Bechtel
219:4,10	243:3	112:6,8	255 : 12	61:23,25
219:18	251 : 18	117:13,23	277 : 23	62:1,3,5
222:5	253 : 14	123:2,6,24	basics	63:17 71:3
229:22,25	254 : 5	125:4	162:18	71:7,10,18
232:13,15	255:1,5,11	126:16	basing	72:1,4,12
233:6,9,9	256 : 15	130:22	242:14,18	74:4,16,19
234:25	258:6	147:4	basis 26:11	74:20
	l	l	I	I

				2/1
77:23	105./ 17	2/8.16 17	153.2 7	174.5 10
	195:4,17	248:16,17	153:3,7	174:5,10
80:17	195:18,21	248:18	166:25	174:14,20
84:12,17	196:3	249:4	199:7,8,10	175:17
85:3,8,12	205:12	250:7 , 20	205:4	179:9,20
85:24,24	212:1	251:8,13	206:5	179:21
85:25 86:9	213:4,20	251:15,20	221:5	180:14
86:10,12	213:22	252:5,12	227:8	183:9
86:14,19	214:3,8,13	252:17,24	beliefs	184:13
86:20	215:7	253:4,5	153:2	187:3
88:10 89:5	217:7,16	281:12	believe	189:3
89:24	219:1,4,10	282 : 7	12:19 14:8	190:21
92:25 93:6	219:18,24	Bechtel's	14:9 15:20	195:21,24
94:18	220:6,11	92:17 95:8	15:21	196:4,9,13
95:14,17	220:24	213:6	17:21	196:13,15
95:21 96:3	221:1,6	217:1,25	26:18	196:16,19
96:8,17	222:12	217:1,23	29:15	196:23,25
97:9,21	223:13,25	221:9,22	31:21	197:9,11
98:16,20	224:15	222:13	36:20	197:23
98:24 99:1	225:9,14	228:17	38:24 40:4	197.23
99:14,24	226:6,11	245:9	42:13	190:3,11
	227:9		49:20	
99:25		began 16:4		201:7,18
101:21	228:12,13	107:7	58:10	203:3
102:1,5,15	229:23	176:14	68:16	204:2,10
102:17,20	230:3,9,15	beginning	70:14,15	204:11
103:6	230:15,22	7:2 86:2	70:19,21	205:5,7,8
104:13,14	231:4,21	199:4	70:24	205:11,15
106:10	232:3	243:25	71:12	205:19
140:19	233:6,10	258 : 7	72:14,17	206:3,10
154:20	233:20,22	270:9	72:19 73:1	206:10
173:12,22	233:25	begins 11:15	74:4,18,20	207:25
183:10,19	235:3,5,6	22:25	74:24 , 25	216:3,12
183:24	235:7,16	111:1	75:1,5,21	227:6
184:3	236:1,11	121:5	76:10 , 18	228:11
185:5,11	239:17,21	136:13	78:3,6,21	229:9
185:13,20	239:25	behalf1:6	81:16	232:7
185:22	240:4,13	5:16 7:17	87 : 21	238:25
186:8,12	240:20	7:24 8:2,4	113:8	242:23,24
186:15 , 25	241:4,15	8:12,18,20	120:9	245:14
187:2,7,24	241:18,24	23:11	140:4,18	251:16
188:1,10	243:16	24:24	140:20	254:6
188:16,19	244:5,8,18	28:12 32:6	144:6	271:13
188:20	245:4,11	107:19	154:10	273:13
189:8,11	245:13,21	108:15	165:1,3	274:5,14
189:16,20	245:22,24	109:3	166:20,22	believed
193:14,16	246:2,4	belief 77:19	170:15,20	28:1 80:16
194:1,3	247:3,8	152:24	170:13,20	99:12
101.1,0	217.070	102.24	1 / 0 • 2 2]]] • ± 2

				292
120:20	63:5 67:17	bold 131:7	67:13	132:17,24
137:12	74:15	276:11	bring 21:2	196:18
152:18	145:3	borne 118:18	82:13	207:6
162:14	157:19	138:20	170:11	230:6
196:12	167:7	bottom 266:4	189:15	246:15
197:18,22	199:20	273:2,15	227:19	budgetary
216:17	249:13	275:8	272:21	40:13
239:8,10	big 11:2	276:9,11	279:3	build 51:11
250:18,22	181:25	bought 18:22	bringing	51:21,22
believes	bill 32:2	Boulevard	99:17,20	building 2:4
137:1	billion	2:4,10	278:23	159:13
believing	16:10	boundaries	Brittany	176:25
197:3	249:14	199:6	128:23,24	177:3
205:25	billions	bounds	Brittany128	263:11,15
206:3	23:18	200:21	6:3	built 50:7
Beltline	bit 9:19	Box 3:21	Brittany133	155:9
2:10	32:16	Boyd 4:5	6:6	bullet
benefit	108:25	Braidwood	BRLA 123:19	122:24
118:2	213:5	15:25 17:5	broached	123:15
221:6,8	255:8	17:12,15	99:11	124:5,16
Benjamin	bits 251:22	17:12,13	broad 93:15	169:23
159:10,16	blinders	17:13,20	broader	bulleted
Bergstrom	228:6	break 10:6,7	75:20	238:16
26:4,15	BLRA 40:8	56:17,22	brought 21:2	bullets
27:2 28:1	45:23	57:11	42:24	123:10
28:5,12	124:7	106:14,22	99:16,19	burden
29:6	164:23	162:21	101:11,12	119:19
best 9:22	165:6,22	212:22	170:7	249:10
10:4 28:14	167:3,14	250:2	194:17	Burgess
83:5 130:3	168:10,18	253:9	234:7	113:9
147:4	168:23	278:13	235:25	business
151:19	169:2,3,7	breakdown	268:14	11:15
152:7,13	169:8,21	33:21	271:20	31:10,10
178:10	197:25	34:10,23	Brown 174:23	248:1
280:15	198:4	breaks 34:4	175:1,9,14	butchering
better 24:19	211:18	breakthr	Bryon 15:24	192:2
32:16	249:7	176:19	Bryony 2:21	buy-in
147:1	BLRA's	BRICKMAN 2:3	8:13	175:20
155:24	167:11	2:6	bubble	187:19
157:21	board 18:20	bridge	135:23	206:23
173:6	155:21	134:22	budget 25:10	211:21
196:12	170:7,11	brief 256:21	27 : 18	212:6
224:22	240:16	briefing	39:17	BWR5 13:19
227:20	269:19	67:22 68:9	108:20	Byrne 5:16
234:24	boiling	68:10 , 12	117 : 5	76 : 12
beyond 39:16	13:17,19	briefings	120:19	110:14
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l	l

				293
		 	l	l
111:25	155:8	249:11	categories	171:3
112:2	candidates	252 : 2	74:23	177:6,13
159:20	80:12	284:1,5	75:16	184:3,6
197:8	81:18	285:24	184:2,12	197:9
198:11	capabili	carry 29:16	272:7	229:18
200:24	26:12	41:11	category	231:23
204:20	27 : 24	44:24 45:4	18:16	235:7
Byrne's 77:1	223:15	161:5	205:14	242:12
111:13	224:2	carryover	212:9	249:16
116:12	capability	117:19	cause 7:6	253:20
117:1,8	29:11	Carter 273:5	128:3	271:14,14
119:22	231:11	275 : 5	198:12	certainly
148:13,22	260:5	case1:2 7:4	207:19	32:1 47:19
201:2	capable 28:2	22:19 52:7	216:12	107:15
280:14	29:15	65:8 86:5	284:10	142:5
Byron 17:6	capacity	101:13	caused 16:15	190:8
	107:21	111:22	20:3 28:11	191:10
С	capital 40:7	121:15	151:3	197:15
C 6:15,16	40:17	140:20	causes 151:6	224:6
cable 19:21	149:7	143:10	189:3	225:16
19:22,23	153:24	145:25	190:2,21	231:17
50:24	car 33:21	146:13	CB&I 76:15	247:16
222:21	career 54:24	166:19	111:15	247:10
223:24	86:2,7	168:24	154:5	certainty
calculat	Carlette	169:15		165:17
280:12	78:9	170:22	271:1,4,21 cc 113:9	
calculator				166:4,10
57:5,7	281:21	172:16	CDs 255:22	166:13
-	Carolina 1:1	176:4	Central 3:14	169:17
calendar	1:10,12,14	180:8	8:8	182:10
271:11	1:19 2:12	186:10,11	cents 36:2	certificate
call 34:3	2:16 3:14	187:22	37:4,7,8	6:21
76:5	3:19,21	206:4	certain 9:14	177:11
181:13	4:7 7:5,8	215:16,17	11:3 24:8	284:3
232:20	7:11,24	227:24	37:24 42:5	certify
254:19	8:10 25:16	231:1	60:1,4	284:5,14
258:12	25 : 20	278 : 1	77:24	Chad 113:9
called 50:9	28:16	cases 51:5	89:20 , 25	Chain 6:10
93:9,10	31:22 39:4	61:11 67:8	120:10	challenge
138:3	69:4 70:5	68:11	121:6	116:20
233:24	75 : 15	171:20	122:16,17	118:1,7
252 : 3	105:19	238:8	123:9	197:13
calls 35:6,7	124:1	245:8	131:1,20	challenges
Camperdown	156 : 25	263:5,23	133:20,24	122:17,18
2:14	162 : 7	264:5,7	134:17	124:18,23
Canal 3:6	163:21	cast 155:9	152 : 15	132:11
canceled	234:18	225:19	167:15,24	171:4
		l	l '	l

				<i>2)</i> T
177 : 25	243:10	165:8	55:18	classified
201:3,5	250:4,5	194:3	231:12	277:9
challenging	251:11	198:7,12	234:6,13	clean 9:20
118:5	253:8,15	249:5,23	234:15	cleanup
205:25	256:7	250:25	charges	14:12
206:2	257 : 1	255:8	33:20 34:4	clear 10:10
Chally 2:18	261:8,19	264:7	charging	71:6
5:4 7:21	262:15	265:17,18	31:24	100:22
8:19,19	271:25	266:5	Charles	107:20
9:2 36:22	274:3	270:11	264:20	116:25
36:23 38:8	281:18	changes	265:4,13	117:2
42:19	283:5	15:14 21:4	267:1,5,21	127:22
43:12	chance 78:25	165:10	268:1,2	132:22
56:21 57:3	98:6 99:23	168:21,22	269:8,10	160:18
73:21	137:13	175:18	Charleston	212:10
83:22	208:1	177:21	25:20	257:25
96:20	236:23	198:9		clearer
103:3	250:23	234:22	Chicago 29:9 Chief 275:5	109:1
103:3		234:22		
106:13,16	change 23:4 32:22,25	247:1	chipping	clearly 203:9
		251:1		215:25
107:4,11	33:1,7,14		chips 227:13	
108:6,10	33:15	265:16,25	choice	CLECKLEY 1:5
108:11	36:25	266:7,8,15	156:20	client 55:19
115:21	37:19,23	266:17,18	171:1	clients
116:3	115:3	271:2,4,5	211:18	54:20
124:3	137:2	271:23	choices	close 91:24
127:13	149:11,16	285:7	80:16	220:16
156:16	175:19	characte	chose 99:9	221:12
162:23	176:2,2	22:3 75:12	chosen 114:1	closer
163:6	187:4,19	106:6	Chuck 2:4	220:12
166:2	190:2,6,9	characte	chunk 10:5	co-ops 172:1
167:9,22	190:13,17	23:7 38:7	Churchman	COL 177:11
181:10	190:21	48:17	66:2	259:9,10
184:16	191:17	75:11	Churchman's	259:11
186:14	197:15,19	118:12	66:10	colleague
188:8	198:7	142:15	cite 203:15	25:15
193:1,24	206:20	216:14	273:4	159:19
201:21	211:20	236:10	274:13	colleagues
208:16	212:5	characte	cited 132:18	223:9
212:21	215:20	99:22	201:23	collect
213:3	229:11,19	charge 12:11	202:2	41:10
216:2	251:4	30:19	211:16	169:5
219:17	264:10	54:19	264:19	181:2
227:5	270:18	239:13	272 : 7	collected
230:23	changed 38:5	charged	CJ-246	68 : 22
231:16	68:8 126:6	37 : 17	236:21	112:23
	l		I	I

				293
255.12	0.510	20.4	016.10	157.10
255:13 color 50:4	251:6	39:4	216:19	157:10 161:20
	264:20	commodities	220:4,18 220:19	189:20
colors	268:25	222:22 224:13		
249:19	comment		compelled	198:19
Columbia	97:14,15	Common 1:1	253:17	199:13
2:10,23	129:15	7:7	compete	213:24
3:11,17,22	130:25	commonly	152:25	216:25
4:6 7:10	133:22	39:1	competitor	221:18
107:14	137:12	Commonwe	86:3,8	222:5
combination	179:5	12:7 20:25	154:20	226:19,20
34:5 200:6	220:10,11	communic	competitors	228:25
combined	comments	36:14	86:7	248:16
207:3	67:15	129:4	complete	265:21
come 47:20	84:18	273:16	10:23	completely
71:1 74:6	133:13	275 : 4	11:25	22:7,10
78:5	164:3	communic	16:22	completes
102:17	205:22	36:19 75:4	18:17 19:3	157 : 22
131:17	206:1	75:7 , 8	23:2 28:2	completing
146:1	207:17	77:24 , 25	29:5 45:8	111:9
157:9	commercial	184:4	51:19	178:23
189:12	45:25	272:8	77:14	completion
203:14	177:18	273:12	78:24	14:8 51:15
205:13	commission	278:2	109:15,21	51 : 17
206:10	11:5 40:2	companies	111:17	103:24
221:2	70:5	5:10 81:7	115:13	114:22
239:19	103:22	81:16	136:21	128:8
240:16	104:6,10	82:20	137:3,21	131:12
247:25	108:24	271:17	138:25	136:24
264:4	138:24	company 1:10	143:20	137:16
266:8	140:23	1:20 7:5	144:24,25	138:10
269:19	149:8	14:21	161:5	145:4
276:21	157:20	40:24 63:5	168:3	149:12,16
280:8	171:17	80:17	177:14	151 : 13
281:15,17	248:6	86:11	180:7,10	155 : 17
comes 31:20	257 : 10	144:18	228:21	157 : 4
31:21 32:9	284:24	280:19	236:13	175:10,15
61 : 22	285:24	company's	249:3	199:13
110:6	Commissi	40:16,19	252 : 11	208:21
259 : 4	177:10	40:20	255 : 5	218:5
comfort	commitments	136:20	261:1	220:13
161:20	120:20	137:20	278:1	221:10,11
comfortable	committed	compare	completed	221:11
283:4	144:25	221:9	18:2 19:6	224:11
coming 29:9	228:20	compared	22:8 49:15	225 : 7
220:12	229:16,17	220:13	50 : 17	228:1
250 : 24	Committee	comparison	84:12 85:8	244:25
	l	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>

				270
264:2	284:9	228:16	113:3	consider
281:16	concerns 6:2	239:18	confirma	191:3
complex	20:21,21	242:18	21:7	considered
48:18	29:4 75:13	282:8	confirmed	28:22 43:3
49:21	127:23	concrete	111:25	64:16
complexion	129:10	16:14	223:8	176:18
249:6,23	132:23	222:21	confirms	198:5
compliance	143:1	259:1,7	32:10	241:9
21:3,11	144:16	conditions	conflict	241.9
· ·		251:2	238:12	274:8
complicated	156:3,15			
22:23 50:2	156:18	conduct	confused	considering
component	161:12,14	83:15	245:16	80:1,4
153:4	172:9	179:6,9	confusing	81:21,25
278:3	200:25	182:11	260:13	281:11,12
components	202:7,10	219:6	confusion	consistent
151:5	202:11	conducted	126:25	44:1
comprehe	207:17	93:4 94:11	127:4	Consortium
189:17	270:3,16	95:14 96:9	connect	46:2 48:16
computer	272:9	97:21	24:25	65:20 66:5
145:9,15	concise	104:11	connection	78:19
253:25	237:1	125:15	23:14 30:4	109:13,19
254:1,11	concluded	133:10	30:25	111:14
260:6	98:3	189:3	34:21	112:6
concentr	103:21	219:20	38:15	114:1
226:10	104:1	conducting	60:15	116:9,18
251:3	132:9	96:17	63:19	119:19
concept	143:22	conference	110:2	127:2
166:6	164:23	35:6,6	151:10	134:17
168:9	215:19	confidence	172:12	147:25
conceptual	283:13,16	131:12	175:2	149:23
6:8 135:15	concluding	132:17	178:15	150:1
concern 29:8	97:24 98:2	183:15	195:7	151:21,23
128:3	216:6	202:19	230:25	152:8,14
135:1,7	conclusion	203:10,16	Conrad 9:5	152:20
137:25	89:25	203:10,10	consequence	160:2
158:12	93:14	204:3,8,21	66:11,18	162:10
180:19	123:6,9,12	204:3,0,21	consider	174:3,12
198:13	126:20,24	273:8	79:21	175:20
282:18	128:15	274:11	138:14,16	176:3,23
concerned	146:1	275:15,20	140:6,9	177:19,21
120:18	201:22	confident	273:25	183:14
136:20		83:9,11		187:20
	241:15,18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	275:23	
137:20	conclusions	confiden	consider	196:10,18
175:23	89:20	61:10	79:7	196:18,20
211:19	159:3	64:17	consider	196:24
concerning	219:24	confirm	189:7	201:8,18
	1	1	1	1

T				
201:19	26:11	249:12	81:13,15	contractor
204:22	27:18	256:25	94:14	13:20,22
204:22	28:17	257:21	98:18	15:19,20
211:21	29:10	258:20,25	99:20	15:21 18:7
212:6	39:16 40:6	261:14	101:3	18:8 20:5
			187:5	86:11
219:6	40:13,17	270:19,20		
235:8	44:13	constructor	189:6	138:1
238:11	49:25	139:14	continue	227:23
270:5	52:12	154:23	16:15	228:3,5
272:18	64:22	construc	115:6	contractors
273:7,9	81:17 86:5	248:1	128:2,7	18:20
281:23	86:6,11,16	consultant	129:16	85 : 12
Consorti	92:18	19:9 31:1	169:5	270:19,20
76:3 114:5	93:17	120:9	178:7	contractual
198:17	94:11 95:7	204:13	180:4	35 : 20
Consortiums	109:14,20	consultants	continued	206:25
76:1	111:3,7,16	95:18,22	19:19	250:25
constitu	111:23	97:9	107:23	280:24
152:16	122:21	consulting	174:11	contract
construct	126:12	60:2,25	185:15	229:11,15
257:11	127:12	235:11	267:18	229:17
construc	128:6	contact 27:4	continues	contribu
22:22	136:19	35:20	122:20	151:6
construc	140:15	272:13	124:9	control
5:20 12:4	142:14	contacted	130:8,9	257 : 7
12:13,14	149:6,11	28:10	134:14	268:6,10
12:20,25	150:18,21	contacts	137:1	269:7
13:2,3,5	150:22,24	68:1	continuing	controversy
13:11,24	153:24	contained	16:16 79:6	284:10
14:1,5,10	155:4,5,24	99:6	229:4	conversant
15:10,12	157:10,22	124:13	contract	127:11
15:13,14	158:1	containment	31:20	conversa
15:15	166:17	13:18	122:9	28:12
16:13,17	167:16	263:16	154:3	80:19,25
16:20 17:3	168:4,11	contempl	158:20	81:1 82:16
17:11,13	178:15	145:22	176:22	83:6 92:12
17:14 18:1	180:25	contempo	170:22	95:3 96:13
18:14,17	187:14	205:21	180:1	96:24 97:2
18:14,17	200:7	contending	225:12	101:9,15
		_		
20:11,14	215:14	191:23	229:12	conversa
20:15	217:1	242:25	251:4	36:16
21:25 22:9	218:3,8	content	256:25	102:17
22:17,25	221:3	32:14	271:2	250:8
23:2,15	222:19	185:21	280:21	convey 37:22
24:14,21	223:19	CONTENTS 5:2	contracting	46:21
25:9,22,23	224:1	context	270:2,8	66:22 70:2
'		1	1	ı

				490
83:24	3:14 39:5	84:19,21	162.10	278:20
		•	163:18	
121:19	69:4,11,18	85:4,14	164:24	279:4,9
138:24	69:20	87:20 89:9	165:1,24	282:15
190:24	102:4	89:10 90:4	166:11,12	Corrected
conveyed	104:21	91:13 92:5	166:14	6:16
43:4,7	105:19,25	92:19 93:2	167:17,18	Correction
66:13,20	163:21	93:4,11	169:19	285:10,11
84:23	172:9,18	95:11 , 25	172:14	285:12,13
96:11	173:6,8,15	97:23 98:9	173:23	285:14,15
133:14	174:5,8	98:10 99:8	174:13 , 19	285:16,17
134:24	Cooperat	106:12	174:20	285:18,19
144:12	69:16	112:7,13	177:3,7,16	285:20,21
148:23	copied 163:9	112:16	179:12	corrections
159:1	copies 49:4	115:3,19	180:4,12	285:9
171:16	255:22	118:20	180:18,20	corrective
193:12	262:22	122:18	181:3 , 12	265:4,9,15
209:5	copy 15:25	123:8	182:1	266:12,13
236:25	26:22 30:1	126:19	183:5,11	266:21
238:3,25	35:3	127:18	185 : 15	267:14
239:3	105:10	128:3	188:14	correctly
245:4	153:19	129:21	192:8,19	242:13
conveying	188:18	130:2,23	195:5,20	259:23
95:2	254:18	132:24	197:4,5,10	275:17
conveys	255:14,20	133:15	198:20	correlation
142:12	259:24	134:23	199:14	115:5
190:22	260:10	137:8,18	202:23	correspo
207:25	Corporation	137 : 22	203:1,6,7	78:19
208:3	1:11,20	139:19,20	205:3	262:6
Cook 21:14	2:17,22	140:7	208:19	273:4,6
22:6 23:21	correct	142:6,14	217:17	274:12
Cooper 1:5	11:23,24	143:9,14	219:3	cost 16:7,20
3:9 8:6	19:8,11	145:24	232:1	40:18
25:18 75:4	23:13,24	147:2	234:16	55:11
101:17,25	25:3,4	148:15,24	235:8	56:10
102:1	32:13 34:8	149:3,8,24	237:22	58:25 78:6
159:15	34:10,11	150:8,13	246:9	78:11,14
180:3	38:16,22	150:22	253 : 17	109:15,21
272:13	39:2 40:14	151:5	257 : 23	111:8,10
273:5	42:4 47:4	153:9,10	260:1	111:16
275:6	57:24	154:8,12	270:6,10	114:7
Cooper's	58:24 70:7	155:21	270:0,10	115:9,13
75:13	70:20	157:23	271 : 10 272 : 1	115:18
Cooperative	74:17	159:6	273:17,23	116:2
3:14 8:8	76:14 77:3	161:11	274:2,12	110:2
69:7	79:12,15	162:3,4,10	274:2,12	118:3,15
	79:12,13	162:3,4,10		118:22
cooperat	19:24	T Ω \ ; T T	277:8,25	110:22

				299
110.7 0	168:9,14	285:23	162:21	263:2,5,6
119:7,8 138:18	168:17		166:1	
		couple 9:12		263:6,7,9
139:17,18	169:3,5,10		167:6,21	263:10,12
139:24,25	169:13	64:14	181:4	263:14,14
142:20,25	173:16,21	70:21,23	184:15	263:17
143:11,19	181:15,17	74:9	186:5	criticism
149:7,19	181:23	117:11	188:3	241:13
149:23	191:24	128:5	192:22	criticizing
150:6,7	192:7	229:25	193:18	241:8
151:22	194:4	235:18	201:10,13	cumulati
153:7,8,12	196:4	254:11,16	208:12	210:19
156:5	197:3,20	254:20	215:22	current
157:1	203:5	coupled	219:14	31:15
161:21	204:14	136:18	227:4	46:23 47:2
165:16	209:23	course 175:7	230:13	117:25
168:16	212:14	187:4	231:7	128:8
183:16	216:7,13	190:2,7,10	243:9	181:18
184:7,10	228:2	190:13,17	250:1 , 10	233:4
197:5,6	229:8	190:21	280:2,3	currently
200:17	242:12,15	191:17	282:1	10:19
202:19	245:15	195:7,14	283:9,14	71:10
203:10,23	247:10	195:16	craft 129:17	cut 53:23
204:21	281:6	207:10	148:14,24	54:8,12
209:17,20	Couick	court 1:1,24	create 55:7	55:8,23
209:24,25	102:11,14	4:9 7:7,12	143:19	56:10
210:16,25	104:20,24	8:21 9:17	208:18	59:11
211:1	105:18	42:16	created	CV 11:24,25
228:20	172:5	88:18	49:21 50:5	CVs 26:19
257:22	counsel 2:1	covered 24:2	55:11	0.020.13
270:3,15	7:14 8:14	24:4,8	78:14	
280:9,9	34:13	194:4	140:14	d 3:5 89:4
281:3,14	83:14	272:4	177:18	D.C21:14
281:16,20	255:15	covers 40:3	270:4	22:6 23:21
costs 23:14	284:15,16	Cox 2:13 5:6	creating	daily 183:4
23:16,24	count 21:23	7:23,23	209:13,15	damaged
24:1,8,9	country	36:10 38:4	credit 137:4	19:22
118:18	93:18	43:9,11	credits	damages
123:19	County 1:2	56:17	249:13	155 : 16
132:19	7:8 12:7	73:16	249:13 crew 153:5	208:19,21
145:3		83:19	189:16	data 111:7
	12:16			date 12:1
150:4	13:23	96:19	216:22	33:17
151:9,13	14:16 15:4	106:23	critical	
153:24	20:24	107:6	51:13	51:15
158:6	21:23 22:5	123:21	166:16	71:13
166:14,25	23:22	127:8	216:6	76:19 83:4
167:15,19	284:2	156:8	262:25	90:19
	1	1	1	1

				300
105:15	day 4:7 10:4	180:16,25	definiti	department
109:16	10:6 24:22	183:21	140:24	5:17 182:2
114:22	31:7 56:5	212:13	141:14	dependent
131:25	57:18,20	213:19,21	232:6	168:10,15
132:6,6,7	64:10	dedicated	degree	168:19
136:24	139:9,11	54:4 55:10	203:16	depending
137:14,16	256:20	56:3,14	delay 147:16	21:22
139:2,3,11	276:4	160:24	213:23	depends 52:7
146:19	284:6,19	218:5	220:20	53:11
140:19	285:22	deep 270:4	delayed	217:19
171:11	days 11:9	defend 249:2	155:9	280:10
199:13	56:7 57:20		157:6	
	58:9 72:9	DEFENDANT		deployed
208:21		3:4,9	228:5,9	54:1
213:18,20	154:18	Defendants	248:15	deponent
221:10,11	deal 108:6	1:13,19	267:19	8:22
221:11	162:6	2:16 3:14	delays	deposition
244:25	dealing	4:5 7:6	140:15	1:18 4:4
254:6,23	61:12	defended	142:13	7:2,3,9
255:3,4	152:13,20	253:2	147:7	9:6,10,16
259:6	debatable	defense	148:2,5	107:22
264:2,2	19:2	194:14	149:2	120:5
273:16,23	debriefing	deferred	150:15,17	283:13,16
274:2	66:6,25	155:8	151:2,3	284:12
285:4	67 : 6	deficien	177:6,9,13	285:3
dated 5:9,12	December	211:17,23	182:7,13	depth 191:5
5:15,18,19	104:21	deficiency	264:19	describe
5:22 6:1,4	137:13	211:25	deleted	27:14
6:6,13,18	deception	212:4	214:18	32:15
72:8 87:13	196:14,16	deficient	215:4,7,18	65 : 22
122:8	242:19	211:12,14	deletion	69:21
125:11,11	244:2	212:19	214:12	127:16
141:6	277 : 15	define 50:8	delivery	164:18
dates 71:11	decide 49:15	defines	147:11	165:14
103:24	225:12	51:12,13	demand 47:16	177:25
131:24	decided	definitely	demands	253:23
132:12	16:22 36:5	87:15	47:14	described
138:10,25	79:8 180:3	116:21	demonstr	11:16
149:16	220:15	165:7,10	148:14,24	33:12 55:4
155:18	228:18	193:3,10	151:16	66:12
157 : 5	253 : 2	201:5	217:23	93:12,19
199:16	decision	207:5	denials	100:21
201:20,25	16:24 90:6	261:14	65 : 16	102:20
249:12	167:3	279:21	denied 65:16	116:25
254:5	168:3	definition	244:23	123:10
259:8	179:21	277:20,21	denominated	164:16
Dawley 2:4	180:12,15	277:23	95:24	210:2
		1	l	l

				301
211:6	238:2	217:15	248:19	104.10 14
222:13	241:25	developed	249:18	124:12,14 146:25
		_		
225:1	254:19,19	123:16	273:18	179:18
247:3	detailed	164:7	280:7	258:23
259:20	33:16,20	211:5	281:22	disagreed
describes	34:9,23	225:4,16	282:8	232:7
235:7	35:11 , 16	251:20	differen	disappoi
descript	36:9 37:24	developing	30:17	239:16
52:9	38:2 105:6	224:16	differently	disclose
design 12:11	105:8	244:24	186:1,4	140:5
13:4 15:12	216:16	259:15	207:20	247:18
16:1 26:1	details	development	difficul	249:19
26:10	19:18	84:20	219:5	disclosed
144:19	33:25	121:1	difficulty	174:2
145:6,7,9	182:4	166:17	127:1	195:23
145:13,14	271 : 22	developm	150:21	200:24
145:17	279:15,16	85:21	dime 226:2	212:9
150:17	determinant	121:18,21	direct 6:14	245:12
176:18	191:19	164:19,22	6:16 62:10	246:9,10
177:14	determin	devices	100:1	247:20
266:18	165:23	246:1	115:5	248:3
267:12	169:13	devote 224:4	159:22	252:21,23
271:1,5	194:17	difference	199:3	252:25
designate	determine	205:25	214:13	253:6,7
35:8	38:20	218:10	274:24	279:15
designated	130:22	249:8	275:8	disclosure
11:24	139:23	258:18	directed	194:6,8,10
15:16	142:16	differences	35:15	211:23
34:24 35:2	191:11,13	171:20	62:11	214:15
254:14,14	222:24	different	direction	251:24
desperately	224:10	23:7 52:9	35:18	discount
270:21	242:1	72:5 97:18	284:12	225:9,10
despite	268:19	114:21,22	directly	225:12
150:3	determining	115:18	14:16 46:2	247:24
162:1	32:14	141:20	65:19	discovered
164:22	40:24	171:15	67:16	214:3
177:24	184:11	184:24	73:23	270:25
detail 26:1	191:15	189:23	160:2,18	discovery
52:20	257:22	195:7,14	223:22	48:6 71:2
64:10 69:9	develop	195:7,14	director	74:8 75:3
	_		55:14	
171:19	53:23 55:3	205:24		78:5
196:2	112:25	207:12	65:25	112:24
213:5	120:24	210:21,21	67:11,12	182:14
224:18	122:24	221:20	67:23	183:7
	123:15	230:25	disagree	201:17
232:3			_	
232:3	139:5,15	233:7,10	121:22	206:9

				302
207:4,11	63:12	181:23	219:8	Dominion 3:4
214:21	64:18 80:7	281:5	documented	8:4
219:9	80:10 90:5	divide 26:20	277:3	donned 84:12
231:1	90:8,9,11	division	documents	85:1,3
272:15	90:12,14	25:20 26:7	11:3 44:14	Double-s
276:21	90:20,23	26:9	44:16	273:20
277:4	90:20,23	docket 104:2	145:13,14	doubt 85:5
279:8	91:10 92:3	146:15	182:16	112:1,24
281:20	92:22	151:10	223:10	113:2
discrete	93:25	158:7	230:25	download
249:21	94:21,24	161:10	253:20,24	219:19
discuss	95:1,17	172:19	254:10,15	
	97:6 98:11			downtown
69:15		186:20	254:17,18	66:7 67:4
90:14	98:14,15	188:13,22	254:24	dozens 210:7
91:19	98:18,19	197:21,21	255:18,21	Dr 162:18
95:21	98:22 99:2	197:22	doing 53:16	170:8
141:9	99:5,13	202:23,25	53:17	draft 6:2,8
263:21	100:24,25	203:8	56:15 70:8	72:8
discussed	101:3	205:6	74:16,19	135:16,17
35:11	113:19	206:12	86:25	146:11
95:13 96:5	121:6	212:15	89:18	148:7
97:25 99:1	137:11	254:12,13	108:2,5	176:2,10
99:14	217:6	283:2	118:2	176:10
103:9,11	247:23	document	125:21	197:25
135:25	256:13	30:22	135:8	198:14,24
158:11	275:9	85 : 21	173:23	200:10
175:14	282:6	88:22	183:20	drafted
184:1	discussions	105:17	185:25	176:12
212:3	37 : 13	125:10,14	186:15	dragged
216:3	67 : 20	128:20	187:3	76:23
231:21	82:19 95:8	133:4,9	188:1,10	dramatic
232:25	192:11	134:3	213:22	268:15
253:2	242:10	135:12,22	218:10,11	driven 270:3
282:9	264 : 5	136:11	242:3	270:15
discusses	278:22 , 25	142:12	244:5	drives
89:5	disguised	146:8	248:24	259:16
120:10	252 : 7	208:11	266:21,24	driving
discussing	displeasure	252:3,8	dollar36:2	101:16
50:16	272:18	255 : 17	37:4,14	due 144:16
91:21 97:4	dispute	265:19	dollars	187:17
100:21	62:19	document	23:18	239:14
151:13	137:19,23	25:24	59:10	dug 230:1
175:9	142:1,3	75 : 19	142:20	Dukes 5:19
discussion	155:20	103:15	210:24	6:12 27:12
36:24	271 : 2	201:16	211:2	66:16 67:4
59:25	disputing	203:15	219:2	67:16 68:1
	I	l	l	l

				303
68:12 , 15	67 : 7,7	efforts	electronic	140:19
68:19 94:3	79 : 25	49:24	265:19	213:20
120:6	80:22,23	116:5	element	engaged
125:11	82:23 83:6	210:1	124:8	23:11
129:2,8,10	83:11	241:22	155:12	24:24 25:3
Dukes125	133:2	267:25	164:23	28:6 32:19
5:21	258:19	eight 56:12	165:5	68:4 154:6
duly 8:25	280:6	57:15,18	169:22	185:11,14
284:7	earthsha	57:20 58:9	eliminated	engagement
duration	236:6	58:12,16	167:20	25:6 29:19
157:20	easier36:5	178:4	Ellerbe 3:15	29:22,25
218:19	36:6	237:23	8:7,7	30:1,3,10
263:23	easily 252:7	238:1	elongated	39:10,18
durations	East 2:14	eight-hour	229:9	engineer
263:23	3:2,6	56:5	else's 97:15	12:8,10,11
	easy 89:12	either 20:20	Email 5:9,12	15:6,17
E	123:5	21:24 23:1	5:21 6:1,3	153:3
E 2:13	economic	27:1 37:17	6:6,10,12	154:22
e-mail 87:11	249:12	186:7	6:18	220:9
87:13 88:9	economical	196:17	embarras	engineering
125:10	176:24	260:6	28:9,11	12:14
128:23	ECSC 69:11	261:23	emphasizing	14:18
129:11,11	102:8	elapsed	246:12,13	15:11 18:5
129:14	172 : 18	222:2	emphatic	18:20 86:4
141:3	Edison 12:8	elected	277 : 5	86:12
163:8,11	20:25	271:4	employ	93:17
e-mails	edits 163:12	electric	116:21	94:10
253:25	educational	1:10,19	employed	154 : 25
254:8	11:17	2:16 3:14	284:15,16	155:1,2
255:14,17	Edwards	3:14 7:5	employees	218:3
EAC 111:10	170:24	8:8 13:17	174:23	237:11
114:1	effectively	31:22	250:9	267:12
earlier	15 : 3	75 : 15	282:12	engineers
23:19 66:6	efficient	102:4	283:1	266:14,16
108:16	176:24	104:21	employment	266:25
153:4	178:23	105:18	221:3	267:4,9,13
156:3	265:23	156 : 25	enable 50:11	269:11
158:23	effort 51:18	163:21	enacted	enhanced
184:3	51:25 53:8	172:1	168:25	127:1
185:4	53 : 15	234:18	encountered	ensue 208:21
194:11	55:10 56:4	252 : 2	178:19	ensure 262:4
218:1	57:15 68:4	electrical	enduring	ensures
244:5	209:4	19:21 39:5	264:23	169:23
278:23	216:21	69:4,6,11	Energy 3:4	enter 138:2
279:6	220:5	69:16	39:4	188:21
early 66:24	242:3	172:18	engage	226:17
		ı	I	ı

				JUT
220.1	260.10 25	218:4	231:17	125:20
228:1 entered	268:18,25 equivalence	220:13,14	evaluation	exact16:10
	217:4	•		
161:16		221:13,18	103:14,18	17:12
172:23	equivalent	221:19	172:13	71:13
176:23	216:22	229:10	173:3	91:23
188:13	erection	280:9,10	228:13	exactly
entire 13:11	263:11,15	281:14,21	249:1	20:17
211:1	Eric 26:4	estimated	Evans 2:3	70:24 71:7
218:25	28:19	150:4	5:5 7:17	84:23
248:14	29:10	151:13	7:17	100:7
249:5,20	Errors 37:6	175:10,15	256:17 , 18	125 : 25
249:23	escort 65:4	281:16	257 : 5	201:7
entirely	65 : 7	estimate	261:16	205:11
189:23	escorted	111:10	262:1,24	220:17
221:20	65 : 13	estimates	274 : 7	225 : 15
entirety	escrow	40:18 78:6	278:5,12	236:4
274:18	144:19	78:11,14	278:17	251 : 15
entitle	145:6,7,17	79:5 111:8	279:22	255:3
208:18	essential	112:5,8	event 155:16	267:20
entitled	124:8	114:7	events 22:25	276:24
121:17	164:23	139:17,18	23:4	277:1
163:17	169:22	176:4	179:19	examination
169:4	essentially	184:7,8,10	eventuality	5:3 9:1
181:2	13:6 15:25	187:18	145:19	256:16
216:13	18:16	202:20	146:2	280:1
242:12,15	52:21 63:6	203:11	eventually	284:11
245:14	77 : 22	204:22	12:9 16:20	examinat
247:10	101:5	206:22,23	16:25 19:4	268:22
entity 84:4	121:12	211:21	28:19	examined
154:9	198:5	212:6,7	76:23 79:4	284:11
environment	220:20	281:3	125:20	example
169:23	221:20	et 1:6 5:12	220:14	30:22
EPA 122:1	222:9,12	7:4,5	everybody	165:11
EPC 103:18	266:16	285:2,2	256:20	251:25
122:13	established	evaluate	evidence	263:9
154:3	155 : 20	79:22	178:8	270:22
158:19	199:6	87:18,22	207:11	273:11
176:22	207:14,16	139:18	270:19	275:19
180:1	250:16	140:14	evident	examples
227:23	estimate	231:20	121:10	254:20
251:4	78:8	evaluated	150:15	263:22
256:24	112:19,21	142:8	151 : 2	277:10
270:2,8,12	115:18	evaluating	evolution	excavation
280:21	139:24,25	5:10	125:24	12:23
equipment	184:8	133:19	evolved	exceptions
151:5	209:25	210:11	67:12 68:8	182:1
L				

				305
	İ	l	Ī	I
excluding	5:21 6:1,3	272 : 22	expedite	278:18
100:24	6:6,8,10	exist 74:10	266:15,17	282:18
152:15	6:12,14,14	255:14	expediting	expressing
exclusively	6:16 , 18	existed	267:2,10	272:18
25 : 17	10:25 11:3	62:13 , 18	expended	expression
119:15,16	11:11 87:2	62:21	210:14	275:20
164:1	87:5 , 10	74:11	267:25	expressly
179:6	88:14 , 17	121:6	268:2	257:15
excuse 24:18	88:21	174:12	expenditure	extend
44:7 67:2	104:25	230:11	40:7	157:19
117:15	105:3	existence	expendit	extended
138:1	110:17,20	250 : 7	40:13	200:15
150:6	113:5,8	exists 124:7	expense	227:11
169:4	120:2,5	238:13	33:20,23	extensive
181:16	125:7,10	exited 154:6	expenses	183:1
184:9	127:19,22	expand 29:21	30:16,18	extensively
198:16	128:17,19	51:6	30:20,21	103:9
199:12	133:5,7	272:11	30:22,25	extent 79:19
278:5,5	135:9,11	expanded	31:3,4,7	111:25
executed	140:25	278 : 19	31:10,10	167:13
122:8	141:3	expands	33:22,23	191:6
execution	143:25	52:20	34:5,7	200:11
256:24	144:3	expect 94:20	105:15	extremely
executive	146:3,6,25	122:7	experience	22:23
67:11	153:16,18	205:2	11:17	
158:18	163:4,8	211:8	29:10 41:9	F
159:1,10	176:6	220:1	53:13	fabricate
238:1	198:21	277:12	103:16	265:23
275:5	219:23	expectation	121:17	fabrication
executives	236:15,25	24:7	215:13	264:19
67:8,9,10	237:1,21	expectat	222:20	266:14
159:18	237:1/21	230:11	223:19	fabricator
189:11	244:19	231:23	experienced	271:1,5,24
282:17	274:15,16	251:25	148:2	face 124:22
exercise	274:17,18	expected	164:19	faces 124:17
57:10	274:23,24	109:15,20	expert 27:24	facilitate
133:20	exhibits 5:7	111:16	expires	173:3
134:18	11:4,10	148:9	284:24	facilities
138:4	201:23	200:11,15	285:24	166:11,18
143:8,12	203:15,20	200:11,13	explain 81:9	169:19
157:5	204:6	221:2	explaining	181:1
204:15	204:0	231:1	175:18	facility
276:5	200:8	expecting	express	145:18,21
exhibit 5:8	207.4	111:22	82:10	167:17
5:9,12,14	200:2,3,23	150:6	expressed	265:13
5:16,17,19	211:3	233:12	82:12	266:15
	211.0	200.12	02.12	

				300
0.67.1.01	250.2	151.16.01	0.64.14	015.1
267:1,21	258:3	151:16,21	264:14	215:1
268:3	262 : 7	199:24	272 : 17	237:3
270:23	267:19	200:7	faith 201:19	fee 31:15
fact 10:16	281:4,11	203:25	207:5	58:8 219:1
23:6,10	factor 46:14	204:19	fallen 22:7	feel 282:2
29:6 38:2	47:3 48:10	207:15,15	22:10	fees 30:16
44:22 45:2	112:12,15	227:25	fallout	30:18 , 19
45:11 85:7	112:25,25	232:9,13	226:21	30:19
86:18 90:3	113:25	232:24	falls 212:8	31:11 32:6
94:22	114:6,21	233:2,7,8	false 70:11	34:4,7
95:13 96:8	114:25	234:1	70:14,15	feet 152:21
96:14 97:8	115:2,12	280:10	familiar 9:8	Felkel88
98:19	115:17,19	facts 127:16	19:20	5:12
112:2	116:1,6,19	factual	24:11	fell 227:13
132:16	118:14,23	220:12	32:17 49:1	felt 19:3
143:1	118:24	failure	49:24 52:9	27:23
148:8	119:9,14	158:10,25	52:11	282:25
150:3	129:20,24	208:17	85:25	283:2
152:3	139:1,8,9	226:1	154:14	field 15:14
154:2	152:9	241:8	168:21	105:15
158:4	199:12,14	245:10,12	257:9	235:22
162:1	199:20	249:19	familiarity	269:3
166:20	216:24	fair 9:8	86:14	figure 57:9
174:15	228:2	10:15	154:16	141:21
175:25	233:14	21:21	215:18	188:20
183:20	280:8,11	24:15	far 43:6	207:24
187:2,4	280:17	30:10	46:24 89:6	246:2
188:18	factors	31:11 38:9	109:23	file 44:15
189:2	46:17,20	38:13	151:16	44:16,19
190:1	46:21 47:1	64:21	178:8	44:23 45:3
194:15	47:2,8,23	70:22	179:16	45:7,12
197:18	48:5	123:18	210:1	205:8
198:10	113:20	127:14	237:12	253 : 25
200:14			247:22	
	114:12,15	164:7,20	259:13	254:1,2,4
205:20	114:19	167:12		254:7,11
206:13	116:18	174:9	faster	254:13,14
211:8	117:5,13	182:6	248:22	255:6
212:5	117:24	233:19,19	faulty	filed 60:9
216:14	118:1	264:24,25	193:10	149:6
218:21	119:4	fairly 26:9	feasible	153:23
220:11	121:6,9	34:23	23:1	187:18
230:4	123:4	66:17	February	203:1
234:20	127:11	117:2	71:15,15	205:6
240:14	139:23	159:21	71:17 72:6	207:8
245:8	142:17	249:16	74:2	files 30:2,7
251 : 6	143:23	254 : 24	213:15	131:2
	l	l	l	l

				307
253:25	284:17	135:11	flip 11:7	253:24
254:7,11	financing	136:17	105:9	following
254:16	165:16	138:18	110:24	27:5 38:9
255:8,10	167:15	157:18	117:7	84:16 85:5
•			-	94:3
255:14	169:24	158:17	126:8	
256:6	find 76:17	163:11	134:2	130:25
filing 122:7	90:21	164:9	136:10	133:20
132:18,20	92:14	169:22	157:17	134:8,18
134:6	189:9	171:1	flipping	144:6
183:22	243:21,22	178:5	124:16	158:13
185:7	252:18	187:8	Floor 3:11	follows 8:25
205:7	272:15	189:9	4:6 7:10	footnote
211:11	findings	191:3	Flour's	122:6
212:18	100:16	192:9	155:1	Fore 3:25
213:12	191:12,21	214:23	Flowers	7:13
222:6	fine 45:13	248:11,21	159:17	forecasted
228:9	106:17,19	251:23,23	Fluor 80:17	158:20
277 : 5	228:21	258:1	129:16	forego 37:14
281:2,10	finish 9:22	275:10	131:17,18	foremost
281:13	9:24	fish 250:23	154:6,9,14	71:2
283:1	227:21	five 21:22	154:17,19	form 5:18
filings	finishing	56:7 57:20	154:25	26:17 38:4
108:20	157:1	58:9 89:4	157:9,22	43:9,11
131:1	fire 152:21	136:10	158:1	62:21
final 5:13	firm 2:9,14	169:9	159:17,18	73:16,18
6:19 13:7	55:12,13	244:5	221:3	83:19
13:9 14:3	86:5,6	264:10	233:12	96:19
51:15 76:5	107:13	fixed 103:19	240:15	123:22
76:6	108:1,5	119:10,13	251:6	127:8
132:18	firms 80:16	122:14	Fluor's	166:1
161:13,15	93:17	133:21	155:11	167:6,21
163:10,12	94:11	134:18	focused	184:15
164:4	first 7:15	138:4,5,6	158:25	186:5,7
213:14	8:25 11:13	138:14,23	178:23	188:3
215:14	12:6 14:19	140:4,6,10	273:23	192:22
finally	20:24 54:8	140:4,6,10	folks 262:3	192:22
_		· ·		
239:12	54:12 55:8	143:17	follow 98:5	201:14
266:20	55:23	145:3	100:10	208:12
financial	56:10	155:14	123:5	215:22
61:11,12	59:10 62:6	156:19	130:12	219:14
119:18	68:16 71:2	157:5	follow-up	227:4
144:17	72:3 96:16	161:8	113:11	230:13
156:4	108:4	162:15	280:4	231:7
180:21	128:22	172:13	followed	243:9
financially	129:15	226:3	90:6,25	250:10
180:6,9	130:17	fixing 239:4	202:25	257 : 1
	ı	ı	1	ı

261:8 262:15,18 262:15,18 270:11 270:13 271:3 133:19 43:17 122:2 39:19,21 272:3 281:18 157:12 281:18 157:12 281:18 157:12 281:18 157:12 281:18 157:12 281:18 157:12 281:19 175:23 281:10 175:23 281:19 175:23 281:19 175:23 281:10 175:10 281:10					300
262:15,18 101:4 40:23 75:15 33:12 39:19,21 274:3 134:1 further 156:25 72:3 77:7 72:3 77:7 281:18 157:12 64:17 93:3 234:19 93:12 238:15 175:23 98:17,18 252:2 108:16 108:16 6crl2,17,18 25:12 108:16 6crl2,17,24 257:9,12 253:23 108:16 6crl2,17,24 257:9,12 255:6 6crl2,17,24 257:9,12 255:12 36:4 257:9,12 233:10 36:4 257:2,13 36:4 257:2,13 36:4 257:2,13 36:4 257:2,13 36:4 257:2,13	261 • 8	frame 80.5	40.11 11	31.22	19.13 22.2
270:11 133:19 43:17 122:2 39:19,21 281:18 157:12 64:17 93:3 234:19 93:12 283:5 175:23 98:17,18 252:2 108:16 format 36:6 179:3 99:13 GCJ12 274:23 216:20 formatting 265:16 103:17 Gene 42:14 253:23 format 20:8 271:8 140:15,19 42:17,24 257:9,12 forms 205:5 212:17 frank 3:15 142:12,13 45:12,13 26:16 forms 205:5 8:7 149:1 83:13 36:4 forms 205:5 8:7 149:1 83:13 36:4 forthcoming 205:4 freely 44:3 174:16 135:24 233:16 fossil 25:17 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 234:4,5 26:11 frequent 181:23 9:11 13:17 generate 89:17 friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 76:7,15 18:22 208:2 283:9 42:3 43:15					
274:3 134:1 further 156:25 72:3 77:7 93:12 93:15 72:3 77:7 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 93:12 24:21 93:12 216:20 93:12 216:20 216:21 216:21 217 217 218 140:15,19 42:17,24 257:9,12 265:6 6 26:11 43:21 42:17,24 257:9,12 265:6 6 271:7 23:13 149:1 83:13 36:4 36:4 313:3 36:4 36:4 36:12 36:12 23:10 23:10 23:10 23:10 23:10 23:10 23:11 <th>-</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	-				
281:18 157:12 64:17 93:3 234:19 93:12 175:12 175:123 98:17,18 252:2 108:16 format 36:6 164:4,5 259:14 103:17 GCJ12 274:23 216:20 216:20 formatting 265:16 121:16 42:17,24 257:9,12 25					
283:5 175:23 98:17,18 252:2 108:16 format 36:6 179:3 99:13 CGJ12 274:23 216:20 formatting 265:16 121:16 259:14 42:17,24 257:9,12 former 108:4 forms 205:5 212:17 frank 3:15 142:12,13 65:12,13 generate forthcoming 138:13 149:1 83:13 36:4 generate fossil 25:17 26:11 freely 44:3 174:16 99:18 233:16 223:10 fossil 25:17 26:11 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 234:4,5 generate fossil 25:17 26:11 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 234:4,5 general 3:20 236:4,4 5 general 3:20 234:4,5 general 3:20 221:0 43:22 76:7,15 78:6,8,11 79:6 68:11 79:6 68:11 79:6 68:11 79:6 68:17<					
format36:6 164:4,5 259:14 99:13 GCJ12 274:23 216:20 formatting 109:8 259:14 103:17 Gene 42:14 253:23 former 108:4 Frank 3:15 140:15,19 43:21 265:6 generate forms 205:5 212:17 frankly 159:5,8 97:17 223:10 223:10 forsil 25:17 26:11 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 231:9,13 found 75:4 41:22 204:3 27:16 23:16 22:20 49:3 89:17 Friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 78:6,8,11 79:6 85:17 91:22 41:22 208:24 283:9 27:16 22:20 49:3 181:23 71:1 251:8 35:25 78:6,8,11 79:6 85:17 181:22 208:24 283:9 27:16 22:20 49:3 181:23 71:1 79:6 85:17 79:6 85:17 79:6 85:17 181:23 79:12 79:1 1 79:6 85:17 79:6 85:17 79:6 85:17 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>					
164:4,5 259:14 103:17 Gene 42:14 253:23 formatting 265:16 121:16 42:17,24 257:29,12 265:6 former 108:4 frank 3:15 140:15,19 65:12,13 generate forms 205:5 frankly 159:5,8 97:17 223:10 forthcoming 205:4 freely 44:3 164:18 99:18 231:9,13 205:4 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 23:19,13 4cound 75:4 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 23:19,13 89:17 frequent 181:23 27:16 22:20 49:3 89:17 Friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 78:6,8,11 91:22 front 180:23 25:11 39:12,14 39:12,14 181:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:25 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 188:6,25 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 249:7 56:15 GA2:20					
formatting 265:16 271:8 121:16 140:15,19 42:17,24 43:21 65:16 65:12,13 257:9,12 265:6 forms 205:5 212:17 forthcoming 205:4 Frankly 159:5,8 138:13 97:17 164:18 223:10 fossil 25:17 26:11 freely 44:3 frequent 177:22 181:23 general 3:20 9:11 231:9,13 231:9,13 found 75:4 89:17 41:22 264:13,14 264:13,14 264:13,14 264:13,14 261:1 226:7 263:1 33:22 9:11 76:7,15 27:16 22:04 99:3 88:7 found 75:4 89:17 Friday 7:11 264:13 251:8 264:13,14 251:8 255:11 251:8 271:20 284:14 284:15 284:14 284:14 284:15 284:16 284:16 284:16 284:16 284:18 284:16 284:18 284:19 284:18 284:19 284:18 284:19 284:19 284:19 284:19 284:11 284:11 284:18 284:19 284:19 284:11 284:11<					
109:8 271:8 140:15,19 43:21 265:6 forms 205:5 8:7 142:12,13 65:12,13 36:4 212:17 frankly 159:5,8 97:17 223:10 forshcoming 205:4 138:13 164:18 99:18 231:9,13 233:9,13 fossil 25:17 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 234:4,5 generated found 75:4 41:22 204:3 27:16 234:4,5 generated 89:17 Friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 generated 22:20 49:3 181:22 208:24 234:4 5 generated 22:20 49:3 181:22 208:24 238:9 21:13:17 79:6 85:17 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:24 46:7 79:6 85:17 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 235:20 178:5 249:7 245:8 114:23 252:12 <t< th=""><th>•</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>	•				
former 108:4 forms 205:5 8 Frank 3:15 8:7 149:1 159:5,8 97:17 83:13 36:4 36:4 forthcoming 205:4 forsil 25:17 fershly 205:4 fossil 25:17 fershly 26:11 frequent 3:20:11 frequent 4:12 2 23:18 freely 44:3 freely 44:3 frequent 5:11 frequent 4:12 2 204:3 27:16 22:20 49:3 27:16 23:10 23:10 23:10 20:10:20 23:10 20:10:20 23:10 20:10:20 23:10:10:	_			•	•
forms 205:5 8:7 149:1 83:13 36:4 forthcoming 205:4 138:13 164:18 99:18 231:9,13 205:4 223:18 174:16 135:24 233:16 fossil 25:17 26:11 freely 44:3 frequent 177:22 general 3:20 234:4,5 found 75:4 84:7 89:14 41:22 22 204:3 27:16 22:20 49:3 89:17 57 friday 7:11 front 180:23 255:11 25:18 35:25 76:7,15 78:6,8,11 91:22 18:22 208:24 208:24 208:24 283:9 42:34:34 23:12,14 79:6 85:17 79:6 85:17 188:6,25 19:32 1,23 full 111:1 front 18:8 74:12 79:6 85:17 78:6,8,11 79:6 85:17 193:21,23 20:6:8 15:17 full 111:1 11:1 18:8 74:12 20:24:25 78:6,8,11 79:6 85:17 207:4 20:6:8 17:13 20:24:25 16:6:6 248:25 184:7 145:15 200:16,21 23:23:24:25 full 11:1:1 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 235:20 23:25:20 23:25:20 245:8 108:19 25:22 255:6 248:25 243:16,24 25:25:25 full 45:14 63:24			·		
212:17			•		_
forthcoming 138:13 164:18 99:18 231:9,13 205:4 freely 44:3 174:16 135:24 233:16 fossil 25:17 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 234:4,5 found 75:4 41:22 204:3 27:16 22:20 49:3 84:7 89:14 Friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 76:7,15 89:17 Friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 78:6,8,11 91:22 front 180:23 255:11 39:12,14 79:6 85:17 181:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:22 187:8 271:20 284:14 43:24 46:7 79:6 85:17 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 24:45:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 235:20 178:5 GA2:20 115:14 generating 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 gentleman <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>					
205:4 223:18 174:16 135:24 233:16 233:16 fossil 25:17 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 234:4,5 generated found 75:4 41:22 204:3 27:16 234:4,5 generated 89:17 Friday 7:11 226:7 34:22 76:7,15 78:6,8,11 91:22 front 180:23 255:11 39:12,14 79:6 85:17 181:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:22 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 85:12 183:21,23 full 111:1 18:8 74:12 216:21 206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 233:20 178:5 249:7 6A 229:19 Galbby 43:18 6adsen 3:16 generating 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 GA2:20 142:11 generating 257:23 58:9 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:		_	•		
fossil 25:17 freely 44:3 177:22 general 3:20 234:4,5 found 75:4 41:22 204:3 27:16 22:20 49:3 84:7 89:14 41:22 204:3 27:16 22:20 49:3 89:17 Friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 78:6,8,11 79:6 85:17 91:22 front 180:23 255:11 39:12,14 79:6 85:17 181:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:22 187:8 271:20 284:14 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 full 11:1 118:8 224:24 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 235:20 178:5 245:8 108:19 252:22 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 224:5 249:7 56:3 63:23 Gary:18 44:4 5:3,21 165:79,12 84:9 271:7					•
26:11 frequent 181:23 9:11 13:17 generated found 75:4 41:22 204:3 27:16 22:20 49:3 84:7 89:14 41:22 204:3 34:22 76:7,15 89:17 Friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 78:6,8,11 91:22 front 180:23 255:11 39:12,14 79:6 85:17 181:22 front 180:23 255:11 39:12,14 79:6 85:17 181:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:22 187:8 271:20 284:14 43:24 46:7 145:15 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 full 111:1 118:8 74:12 216:21 206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 233:16,21 172:10 245:8 18:11 224:2 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 34:2 251:13,15 fully 50:19 6aby 43:18 6acy 14:18 165:14,15					
found 75:4 41:22 204:3 27:16 22:20 49:3 84:7 89:14 264:13,14 226:7 34:22 76:7,15 89:17 Friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 78:6,8,11 91:22 front 180:23 255:11 39:12,14 79:6 85:17 181:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:22 187:8 271:20 284:14 43:24 46:7 145:15 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 full 111:1 118:8 74:12 216:21 200:4 167:13 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 235:20 178:5 249:19 6 114:23 255:6 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gazy1:18 165:9,12 gentime 207:7:7 56:3 63:23 6:16,7:3 230:2 gettime		_			•
84:7 89:14 264:13,14 226:7 34:22 76:7,15 89:17 91:22 front180:23 255:11 35:25 78:6,8,11 91:22 front180:23 255:11 39:12,14 79:6 85:17 181:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:22 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 full 111:1 118:8 74:12 216:21 206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 235:20 178:5 243:16,24 219:19 6236:19 114:23 255:6 generating 243:16,24 219:19 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gadsden 3:16 Gactor 23:14 96:8 115:14 gentleman 267:21,24 54:4 55:9 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 17:3 235:14 172:9 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 255:9		_			
89:17 Friday 7:11 251:8 35:25 78:6,8,11 91:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:22 187:8 271:20 284:14 43:24 46:7 145:15 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 full 111:1 118:8 74:12 216:21 206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 230:16,21 172:10 245:8 108:19 252:2 235:20 178:5 6A2:20 126:7 234:6,13 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 251:13,15 fully 50:19 Gabby 43:18 142:11 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gary 1:18 165:9,12 gentleman 267:21,24 54:4 55:9 Gary 1:18 165:14,15 172:9 271:7 56:3 63:23 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 20:22 2					
91:22 front 180:23 255:11 39:12,14 79:6 85:17 181:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:22 187:8 271:20 284:14 43:24 46:7 145:15 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 full 111:1 118:8 74:12 216:21 206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 230:16,21 172:10 245:8 108:19 252:2 235:20 178:5 6 249:7 56:15 6A2:20 126:7 234:6,13 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 224:5 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 6adsden 3:16 65:9,12 84:9 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 6adsden 3:16 65:14,15 9enuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 165:14,15 9enuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 6		· ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
181:22 208:24 283:9 42:3 43:15 85:22 187:8 271:20 284:14 43:24 46:7 145:15 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 full 111:1 118:8 74:12 216:21 206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 230:16,21 172:10 245:8 108:19 252:2 235:20 178:5 249:19 6 115:14 generating 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gabby 43:18 Gadsden 3:16 65:9,12 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gary1:18 165:9,12 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 132:16 222:3 285:3 2		_			
187:8 271:20 284:14 43:24 46:7 145:15 188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 full 111:1 118:8 74:12 216:21 206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 230:16,21 172:10 245:8 108:19 252:2 235:20 178:5 114:23 255:6 243:16,24 219:19 G 115:14 generating 245:25,25 full-time 6236:19 126:7 234:6,13 251:13,15 fully 50:19 Gabby 43:18 142:11 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gadsden 3:16 165:9,12 84:9 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 203:8				,	
188:6,25 fry 250:23 future 112:7 48:22 60:8 184:7 193:21,23 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 230:16,21 172:10 245:8 108:19 252:2 235:20 178:5 6 114:23 255:6 243:16,24 219:19 6 115:14 generating 245:25,25 full-time G236:19 118:11 224:5 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gabby 43:18 142:11 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gacyl 18 165:9,12 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Garyl 18 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 6:16 7:3 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 20	181:22	208:24	283:9	42:3 43:15	85 : 22
193:21,23 full 111:1 118:8 74:12 216:21 206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 230:16,21 172:10 245:8 108:19 252:2 235:20 178:5 114:23 255:6 243:16,24 219:19 G 115:14 generating 245:25,25 full-time G236:19 118:11 224:5 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gabby 43:18 142:11 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gary 1:18 165:9,12 84:9 267:21,24 54:4 55:9 Gary 1:18 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 6:16 7:3 235:14 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 27:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21			284:14	43:24 46:7	
206:8 158:17 230:12 90:20 240:15 207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 230:16,21 172:10 245:8 108:19 252:2 235:20 178:5	188:6,25	fry 250:23	future 112:7	48:22 60:8	184:7
207:4 167:13 231:24,25 106:6 248:25 230:16,21 172:10 245:8 108:19 252:2 235:20 178:5 219:19 31:24,25 108:19 255:6 243:16,24 219:19 31:24 255:6 325:20 249:7 56:15 323:20 126:7 234:6,13 324:6,13 251:13,15 5ully 50:19 324:40 324:11 324:6,13 325:14 324:6,13 326:10 324:6,13 326:10 324:6,13 326:10 324:6,13 326:10 324:6,13 326:10 324:6,13 326:10 324:6,13 326:10 326:10 326:10 326:10 326:10 326:10 326:10 326:10 326:22 326:10 326:22 326:21 326:21 326:21 326:21 326:21 326:21 326:21 326:21 326:21 327:13 326:21 327:13 326:21 327:13 327:14 327:13 326:21 326:21 327:13 327:14 327:13 326:21 327:14 327:13 326:21 327:14 327:13 327:13 327:14	193:21,23	full 111:1	118:8	74:12	216:21
230:16,21 172:10 245:8 108:19 252:2 235:20 178:5 6 114:23 255:6 243:16,24 219:19 6 115:14 generating 245:25,25 full-time G236:19 118:11 224:5 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 251:13,15 fully 50:19 Gabby 43:18 142:11 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gadsden 3:16 165:9,12 gentleman 267:21,24 54:4 55:9 Gary 1:18 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 260:20 262:9 Gary146 6:14 General's 57:5,7 6:0 4:4 5:3,21 66:14 66:12	206:8		230:12	90:20	
235:20 178:5 ————————————————————————————————————	207:4	167:13	231:24,25	106:6	248:25
243:16,24 245:25,25219:19 full-time 56:15G GA2:20115:14 126:7generating 234:6,13249:7 251:13,15 252:13,22 267:21,24 271:753:1,9,24 56:3 63:23 96:8 111:3Gabby 43:18 Gadsden 3:16 6ary 1:18 6:1,3,6,12 6:16 7:3 8:24 9:5165:14,15 166:6 230:2 166:6genuinely 84:920:9 48:2 57:23 58:9 168:1 20:18:1 132:16 20:22:3 20:18 20:20 20:20 20:20 26:1 26:1 26:1 26:20 26:206:16 7:3 8:24 9:5 285:3 285:3 285:3 250:18 270:12 271:3 270:12 271:3 271:3 271:3 271:3 271:3 271:3 271:3 271:3 271:3 271:3 271:3 271:424:4 5:3,21 6:16 7:3 8:24 9:5 236:10 246:11 255:9 250:18 270:12 271:3 270:12 271:325:21 271:3 279:14 271:326:1 20:29 functionGary146 6:14 gas1:10,193:19 8:1068:12			245:8	108:19	252 : 2
245:25,25 full-time G236:19 118:11 224:5 249:7 56:15 GA2:20 126:7 234:6,13 251:13,15 fully 50:19 Gabby 43:18 142:11 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gadsden 3:16 165:9,12 84:9 267:21,24 54:4 55:9 Gary 1:18 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 General's 57:5,7 68:12	235:20	178:5		114:23	255:6
249:7 56:15 GA 2:20 126:7 234:6,13 251:13,15 fully 50:19 Gabby 43:18 142:11 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gadsden 3:16 165:9,12 84:9 267:21,24 54:4 55:9 Gary 1:18 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 260:20 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary146 6:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12	243:16,24	219:19	G	115:14	generating
251:13,15 fully 50:19 Gabby 43:18 142:11 gentleman 252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gadsden 3:16 165:9,12 84:9 267:21,24 54:4 55:9 Gary 1:18 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 260:20 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary146 6:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12	245:25,25	full-time	G 236:19	118:11	224:5
252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gadsden 3:16 165:9,12 84:9 267:21,24 54:4 55:9 Gary 1:18 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary1466:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function 3:19 8:10 68:12	249:7	56 : 15	GA 2:20	126:7	234:6,13
252:13,22 53:1,9,24 Gadsden 3:16 165:9,12 84:9 267:21,24 54:4 55:9 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary146 6:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12	251:13,15	fully 50:19	Gabby 43:18	142:11	gentleman
267:21,24 54:4 55:9 Gary 1:18 165:14,15 genuinely 271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary146 6:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12	252:13,22		Gadsden 3:16	165:9,12	84:9
271:7 56:3 63:23 4:4 5:3,21 166:6 178:22 four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary146 6:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12	I .		Gary 1:18		genuinely
four 16:3 96:8 111:3 6:1,3,6,12 230:2 getting 20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary1466:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12			4:4 5:3,21		
20:9 48:2 116:21 6:16 7:3 235:14 172:9 57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary1466:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12			6:1,3,6,12		
57:23 58:9 168:1 8:24 9:5 236:10 206:22 128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary146 6:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function 3:19 8:10 68:12					
128:1 219:12 159:17 246:11 255:9 132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary1466:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12			8:24 9:5		
132:16 222:3 285:3 250:18 265:21 203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary1466:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function 3:19 8:10 68:12	128:1		159:17		
203:8 258:1,8,21 Gary's 270:12 271:3 266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary1466:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function 3:19 8:10 68:12	132:16		285:3		265:21
266:1 260:20 163:12 279:14 give 10:23 four-year 262:9 Gary1466:14 General's 57:5,7 16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12	203:8		Gary's		
four-year 262:9 Gary1466:14 gas 1:10,19 General's 3:19 8:10 57:5,7 68:12					
16:8 function gas 1:10,19 3:19 8:10 68:12			Gary146 6:14		
	_		_		
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				307
71:16	147:20	106:24	252:10	2:15 284:2
	158:14			
75:10,12		107:2	253:3,10	ground 9:13
76:22	165:19	115:6,9	253:13	group 60:20
78:24	176:6	117:22	256:11,14	211:1
81:13,19	177 : 5	119:3,4	256:20	260:11
85:23	192:9	120:4	258:18	GSCDs 157:19
86:24	201:2	132:11	260:17	GSD 136:23
91:15	208:2	141:24	264:4,8	GSD's 136:21
94:14	209:12	155:5,9	274:22	GSDs 137:21
101:8	235:13,23	162:24	276:1,6	138:1
117:15	236:20	163:2,7	277:10	guarantee
160:1	237:14	167:7	278:7,10	103:23
171:21	238:23	173:9	278:15	138:18
173:5	239:5	176:7	282:18	156:23
182:4	240:11,22	179:16	good 10:5	guaranteed
189:12	243:3	181:23	81:7,7,14	103:23
206:24	243:3 251:18	183:19		136:23
			82:5,8	
226:7	254:22	186:9,12	161:19	137:16
236:23	255:1,11	187:9,16	162:6	138:10,24
270:22	258:6,10	191:2,3,8	164:11,13	155:17
276:4	259:13	191:9	165:13	157 : 4
277:10	264:10	194:12	166:5,6,9	guarantors
given 9:6	266:3	196:1,25	180:22	156:25
70:18	274 : 20	198:2,8	226:12	guess 69:25
117:25	goals 125:2	201:25	277:23	72:7 74:8
171:10	130:10	202:1	gotten	141:20
284:13	198:17	205:13	138:18	156:11
gives 52:18	238:10	206:2	grant 206:25	161:22
224:22	goes 31:9	212:23	granular	190:4
258:17	154:18	213:1,4,22	109:1	214:23
giving 9:10	191:15	214:8,10	granularity	239:11
99:23	227:22	216:25	235:23	quesswork
279:12	going 10:5	218:12	GRAY 3:16	225:20
GJ 105:11	25:21,21	226:13,17	great 198:13	guidance
glitch 44:21	25:22,24	226:13,17	249:17	189:12
go 7:21 9:12	26:2 29:6	227:21	251:7,7	guide 101:14
32:14 36:6	31:23	228:4,4,7	greater	guy 84:23
53:9 57:8	45:20 50:9	228:24	101:8	243:16
65:3 69:15	56:23 57:1		202:11	261:21
		234:4,4		
70:1 75:17	57:6,11	239:10	209:19	265:12
82:2	68:5 70:2	242:10	210:1	guys 26:7
105:13	72:1 74:21	244:8	greatly	Н
106:23	78:7,24	246:14,18	183:21	
124:4	82:2 87:4	248:12,20	Greenberry	habit 68:20
129:12	89:16	249:3,15	270:24	hailed 251:6
130:7	94:16	251 : 5	Greenville	half 23:5
	I .		I	I

				310
	I	l	l	I
33:9	198:10	278:14	139:10,22	58:10,12
halfway	202:1	hereinbe	200:1	58:19
158:17	226:22	284:7	203:25	hover 200:1
hallmarks	242:10	hereto	204:19	hovering
161:1	happened	284:16,18	207:15	129:20
halted 14:11	33:11 88:7	hey 97:8	233:1,4,7	Howell 193:2
Hamm 2:13	112:1	hidden 248:4	historic	Hudson 2:3
8:1,1	175 : 22	hide 214:14	199:25	27:10
107:8,10	185 : 23	high 63:5	233:11	35:19 , 22
107:10,11	233:18	100:18	history	36:13 , 19
107:12,25	248:18	higher	66:23	huh-uh 10:2
108:8	280:23	114:12	86:13	hundreds
278:15	happening	115:17	217:23	142:19,20
Hampton 1:2	106:3	116:2	hit 249:14	Hunter 3:20
7:8	262:10	118:14	Hodges 2:21	8:9,9
hand 87:4	happy 10:7	139:24	8:13,13	
163:7	57 : 5	243:20	hold 122:3	I
225:9	hard 49:4	highly 61:10	152:21	idea 33:3
284:18	165:4	Hill 3:2	162:14	76:2 82:5
handed $11:2$	254:18	14:2,14,16	189:19	82:9 89:14
87:10	255:14,20	15:9 17:2	197:9	93:8 108:1
110:19	259:24	17:11 , 16	227:1	142:1
125:9	hardhat	18:11 22:5	278:15	164:11,13
146:5	84:12 , 17	23:15	honest	165:13
handful	85:1,3,8	hindsight	277 : 25	166:5,6,9
143:23	Haynsworth	207:7,9,10	278:2	180:22
handing	4:5	207:24	honestly	185:20
88:21	head 10:2	221:7,8,9	125:23	186:24
105:2	191:18	hire 87:18	hope 216:23	identifi
113:7	266:9	115:1	hoping	11:1 87:3
handle 28:15	278:21	hired 39:11	236:20	88:15
224:22	hear 107:25	83:14 93:1	hour 31:14	105:1
226:12	heard 96:16	95:22	31:15,16	110:18
269:1	hearings	97:10	31:25	113:6
handled	213:24	152:25	55:20 , 21	120:3
15:15	248:15	153:3	56:12,12	125:8
24:10 27:3	held 227:6	hires 269:19	57:16,16	127:20
60:18,19	229:10	hiring	57 : 18	128:18
hands-on	help 25:9	269:22	58:14,22	133:6
278:19	27:17 57:6	historical	hourly 30:20	135:10
handwritten	88:18	46:19,24	31:12	141:1
135:21	helped21:9	46:25	33:19	144:1
254:22	helpful	114:12	54:19,23	146:4,9
happen 54:15	82:15	116:6,17	54:24	153 : 17
112:2	helps 254:25	118:24	hours 33:18	163:5
131:18,20	255 : 2	123:25	57:20 58:9	identified
	I	I	I	I

				311
		l	l	l
74:1 75:11	167:4	247:13	200:4	266:20
96:3 121:2	193:3	implemen	266:6	271:12
121:4	immediately	200:6	improvement	includes
169:17	14:15	239:14,17	200:12,16	30:11
178:3	17 : 16	245:6,6,9	239:25	including
179:1	61:22 96:2	implicate	267:17	26:19
182:2,19	impact 10:20	36:20	improvem	67 : 23
183:6	115:6,9	importance	117:4	90:25
195:18,22	142:17,19	161:4	119:23,24	149:12
219:24	143:5	important	126:13	201:24
230:4	151:8	28:22	199:16	incorrectly
233:10	153:6,7,11	41:11	221:2	147:23
236:1,11	183:23	42:23	improving	increase
244:18	197:19	51:14	198:17	114:25
245:21,23	212:13	52:16,21	imprudent	118:15
247:7	225:5	66:9 71:4	242:21,22	151 : 22
252:18,20	230:6	89:17	248:4,8,11	155:15
263:7,12	246:14,15	140:6,9	248:13	268:5,11
263:14	impacted	169:18	in-depth	268:15,17
274:14	177:7	189:14	166:24	269:21
identifies	183:21	194:6	230:17	increased
122:17	198:16,19	196:10	in-house	47:13,16
171:3	248:13	204:17	8:14	115:13
235:7	261:11	226:14	incentive	126:14
258:15	impacts	236:5	151:23	149:19
identify	79:20	239:21,22	incentivize	173:16,21
12:3 13:23	148:11	241:14,17	169:18	233:12
17:3 89:11	implement	246:23	incentiv	increases
122:16	116:22	240.23	166:16	127:5
231:4	245:12	247.22	inception	131:16,17
231:4	246:18	252:23	47:8,11,12	incur 30:21
246:5	247:1,4,4	257:21	include	30:25 32:6
248:9		258:24		
	253:3		56:11	incurred
253:24 271:9	<pre>implemen 119:10,13</pre>	275:23	59:13,15	23:14,16
	•	imposed	59:19 64:6	23:24
identifying	138:13	61:10	77:9 98:25	153:9,12
52:21,25	implemented	201:1	99:9 257:6	169:11,14
235:17	125:1	impossible	278:2	181:17
245:24	178:21	206:3,6	included	191:24
ignored	239:23	impress	35:4 40:15	192:7
248:4	240:4,10	28:13	41:2 86:9	196:4
II 13:18	240:14,20	improve	95:18	197:6
III 3:10	240:24	116:5	205:14	independent
imagining	241:2,5	151:23	253:19	80:1 83:1
56:4	242:6,7,16	199:20	254:19	93:1,18
immediate	245:3	improved	265:11	103:13,17

				312
154:11	92:18	112:23	224:6,7,10	12:22 27:4
169:25	232:18	113:16	224:0,7,10	66:24
170:4	influenced	114:17	229:1,23	218:8
187:12,16	136:18	123:6	230:20	258:11
188:1	influences	125:4	231:4,12	input76:7
189:17	185:22	126 : 17	231:21,23	80:4 85:19
194:20	inform 84:14	130:4,21	232:10,14	88:7 89:2
INDEX 5:7	247:9	133:13	232:16,21	89:3
Indiana 14:3	information	134:24	233:1,4,4	123:17
indicate	32:19	144:11,19	233:20,22	184:20
100:10	37:24 38:3	145:6,7,9	233:25	217:20
128:1	38:6,10	145:11	235:23	225:18
164:10	41:10,14	147:5	236:24	227:9
201:24	44:3 45:7	153:14	243:19	257 : 21
207:5	45:8,12	158:5,8,11	245:11	inquired
indicated	46:5,21,23	160:9,12	247:23	244:9
36:7 63:1	46:24 47:1	171:9,12	256:2	insignif
76:19	47:7,14,16	171:13	262:13	190:6,9
82:14	47:20,22	173:2,17	271:12	194:15,16
124:1	48:1,4,10	174:16	274:5,9	216:8,9
126:23	48:20,23	178:10	275:24	insist
132:10,13	49:3 53:8	179:19	276:21	151:20
I .				
142:18	53:14 61:3	182:8,9,14	277:24	152:7
148:4,7,11	61:11,14	182:15,19	279:12,19	insisting
180:22	61:18,21	182:23	280:19	118:4
204:7	63:10,18	183:1,7,9	281:24	inspection
225:1	63:21	183:13,16	282:2,7,9	267:20
231:5	64:13,19	183:25	282:14,22	268:17,18
263:18	68 : 22	184:2,6,13	283:8	inspections
indicates	69:20 70:2	184:19	informed	268:19,24
122:7	70:16 71:4	188:20	28:10	269:3,6,15
135:24	71:23	190:11,14	82 : 25	inspector
151:19	73:13 , 15	191 : 25	83:13,18	268:24
247:13	74:23	195 : 12	84:3,18	inspectors
indication	75:21 78:1	197 : 12	89:18 90:3	269:3,12
52:18	78:3 79:10	204:2	91:25	install
214:21	79:20	205:2,3,14	93:19	223:20,23
individual	81:20,23	206:19,21	134:11	223:23
26:3 78:18	82:25 84:3	207:22,25	282:3	installed
84:17	85:16 , 20	214:15,20	initial	222:23,24
87:24	90:17	215:18	19:22	224:13,14
individuals	93:21 98:4	217:21	53:23 54:6	instance
34:20 39:1	102:19,21	219:5,11	54:6 64:14	38:15 39:3
113:10	103:1	219:13	113:11	47:4 52:10
industry	104:4,17	221:13,23	209:15,16	69:3
86:16	111:8	222:1	initially	232:21
				<u> </u>

				313
071.10	214.22		101.1	01.1 00.0
271:18	214:22	intimate	121:1	21:1 23:8
instances	interact	279:16	136:3	23:9,9
21:23 22:4	66:5,8	intimately	196:16	25:25
23:12	75:14	121:1	211:23	35:21 36:1
41:21,23	interest	introduce	218:2	36:1 42:23
64:20 65:5	118:4	7:14	235:15	45:25 89:6
70:4 151:1	152:7,13	introduc	240:25	89:11 99:2
272:20,22	176:15	123:10	265:20	120:10
273:25	204:9	invoice 5:14	involvement	121:3
277:6,14	280:15	33:16,24	77 : 20	128:2
institute	interested	34:2,3	107:19	131:1
265:19	28:20 29:1	35:15 36:5	108:3	134:5
instruction	238:25	37:10,23	155:11	136:19
10:9	261:12,14	105:3,6	171:10	147:14
insurmou	282 : 22	invoices	involving	175:10
124:17,23	284:17	32:11,15	122:1	177:18
integral	interests	32:17,20	174:22	180:21
12:23	151 : 20	33:1,6	issuance	181:24
integrated	interface	34:19 35:7	177:10	183:10,12
50:19 53:1	12:12	35:16 36:2	issue 29:13	205:12
53:9,24	interfer	36:9 37:15	79:20 94:4	225:8
63:24	16:19	37:15,16	130:9	230:3
76:13,20	interject	37:17	138:15,16	235:14
111:3	36:11	60:14,17	147:12	236:11
257 : 20	Internat	60:19,23	230:5,7	237:6
258:1,8,12	20:12	105:8	235:16,25	238:6
260:21,25	interoffice	254:19,21	236:1,5	239:15
261:1	275:4	invoicing	246:16	240:1
262:13	interpre	37:19	268:8	245:22,23
integration	40:12	involved	271:20	246:5,7,11
262:10	Interrog	12:5,6,16	277:10	246:12,13
intend 191:1	114:11	12:21	issued 72:20	246:14,24
intended	Interrup	13:25 14:3	72:21,23	247:7
26:20	276:14	18:23	72:24 73:2	263:20
37 : 23	intervened	20:16,23	73:3,19,22	267:21
53:17 94:3	172:19	21:21 23:6	94:15	277:12
100:10	Intervenor	28:23 29:7	106:10	ITACC 49:13
121:18	1:15	41:17 42:1	113:23	item 77:11
173:2	interview	42:5,8	186:19	90:6,13
intending	282:11,21	52:4 53:13	213:15	99:6,12
237:16	interviewed	67 : 21	issues 16:14	269:16
intense	25:11 27:5	78:13	18:19,21	items 90:10
218:16	27 : 8	88:13	18:21	91:1
interact	interviews	94:16	19:19,24	238:16
65:19	230:17	96:23 97:1	19:25 20:2	260:14
interaction	282:12	120:13	20:20,22	271:25
	I	I	l	1

	l	l	l	Ī
J	Jones 1:18	202:13,17	100:18	187 : 25
Jackson 2:7	4:4 5:3,9	June 5:9 6:4	121:3	188:5,9
5:19 120:6	5:14,21	6:4,15	204:9	192:13,18
jail 282:18	6:1,3,6,12	87:13	217:2	192:20,24
James 2:13	6:15,16	128:15	226:16	193:2,4,6
6:18 27:11	7:3 8:24	129:20	232:17	193:8,10
67:21	9:3,5	130:5	256:2	193:13
69:14	10:19 12:3	131:11,25	269:4	194:23,25
163:9	24:12	132:22	kind' 136:17	195:3
January 5:15	36:15 39:9	133:14	kinds 20:13	199:18,23
254:5	56:18 57:4	147:3,6	26:2 30:23	200:23
Jerry 2:3	64:21	149:17	41:6 48:22	201:2
7:17	65:19	junior 55:20	50:25	202:6,10
256:18	78 : 23	55:25	215:14	204:18,18
Jessica 2:9	79 : 25	57 : 15	223:24	204:19
8:11	88 : 22	58:16	224:14	208:17
Jim 7:22,23	108:12		226:21	230:8,9,10
8:3 280:3	109:12	K	KING 2:19	230:15,15
Jimmy 159:23	110:1	K 126:11	Kingsley	230:22
job 12:9	133:9	Katherine	21:2	244:21,23
14:16	135:12	2:18 8:17	knew 70:10	245:17,20
15:17	163:7	keep 35:9	85:10 88:9	245:22,23
127:15	184:1	241:13	97:11 , 20	246:6
131:19	185:2	246:12,13	104:7,11	255 : 14
139:14,16	187:25	254:2,4,8	114:4,8,10	know 10:2,7
204:25	196:19	254:11	114:14,20	13:21 19:1
267:10	205:10	267:1	115:16	19:18 25:7
268:11	207:9	keeping	116:4,8,16	30:3,8
Joe 141:9	213:4	263:19	116:20	34:12,15
jogs 141:2	243:5	Kelvin 43:17	120:9	34:18 36:3
John 2:18	252:10	Ken 174:23	124:21,24	37:6 43:6
250:1	253:16	175:1,9,14	128:12	47:15 , 25
Johnson 63:1	256:18,23	Kenneth 5:19	130:5	62:12 , 17
63:13	278:13	Kenny 120:6	133:23	66:8 68:18
90:15 92:2	280:3	kept 109:23	143:5,7	70:19 82:1
99:3 100:3	283:10	160:12	147:6	82:18
join 66:2	285:3	256:5,6	149:22,25	85:11
joining	Jones' 5:8	Kevin 189:12	151:1	88:13
65:25	JR 2:13	202:18	157:8,8	89:11 , 15
joint 97:16	July 6:7	275:10,10	173:9,12	94:23
97:16	95:6 133:3	275:11,13	182:24	96:18,21
jointly	133:10,18	kind 14:12	185:1,5,6	96 : 22
25:19	134:12	37:8,12	185:10,13	97 : 12
Jon 8:19	141:6	41:4 61:12	185:19	100:9,17
36:10	142:2,6,23	85:10	186:3,15	101:23
	179:22	97:11	186:17	105:22,23
	ı	ı	ı	I

				313
106.1 0 6	0.45 - 1.0	105.05	1	01.04
106:1,2,6	245:18	185:25	lagging 47:6	81:24
112:19	247:23	186:8,11	Lake 264:20	85:15
123:16	248:18	187:6,16	265:3,12	173:22
125:2	250:14	189:7,15	267:1,5,21	250:7
126:23	253:19	193:11	267:25	leaves
129:6,9	260:7,13	213:21	268:2	136:20
135:19	261:10,12	229:3	269:8,10	LeBRIAN 1:5
136:3	261:22	230:4	language	led 21:9
143:24	262:25	235:15	131:9	25:5 41:14
152:22	264:3	238:14	257:13	120:16
157:16	267:4	241:18	274:11	129:6
160:23	268:7 , 20	244:19	large 266:1	138:2
168:5,20	269:9,20	246:11	266:2	left 17:25
170:3,23	269:21	253:4	larger	19:14,16
170:24,25	271:22,23	272:16	250:22	19:17
172:2,7	282:25	282:16	LaSalle 12:7	22:18
173:4	knowable	283:7	12:16	legal 36:16
175:16	232:18	Kyle 101:3	13:23	legislative
178:18	knowing 70:1	101:14	14:15 15:4	168:21,22
179:18	103:5		20:24	let's 7:21
182:5,22	109:23	L	21:23 22:5	13:21 22:4
188:4,16	116:25	L1:23 4:8	23:22	58:8 67:9
192:15,16	185:21	284:4,23	late 276:4	75:17
194:6	189:24	labor 25:21	law 2:9,14	106:23
195:1	217:5	26:8,9	3:1 277:22	124:4
199:21,21	228:7	126:12	lawyer	157:17
208:13,14	230:5,6,7	129:17	215:13	158:14
213:6	238:25	136:19	lawyers 9:15	169:1
213:6	244:24	148:14,24	32:17 97:1	
		259:2		170:3,15
220:5	246:13,14	lack 130:7	lays 258:16	176:6
224:10,24	246:24		LEA 3:1	212:21
226:14	knowledge	130:19	lead 12:8	226:23
227:21	25:5 43:2	136:16	27:3 43:16	236:14
229:3	65:16	151:3	43:21	237:14
230:15,16	130:3	161:13	93:13	239:5
230:22	147:4	202:18	114:21	253:8
231:9	217:1	203:10	115:12,17	258:6,12
235:17	279:2 , 5	204:3	116:1	letter 5:19
236:8,25	284:9	211:20,20	261:21	21:7 26:18
237:17	known 71:22	211:20	leading	26:22,23
238:12	71:24 72:1	238:10	94:10	26:25 27:6
239:1,3,24	74:16,19	lacked	leads 245:13	29:23,25
240:1	74:20	204:21	Leah 3:1	30:1,4,10
241:20	157 : 21	LAFFITTE	8:15	34:3,3
244:13,15	161:24	3:16	learned	39:18
244:16	184:22	lag 128:7	66:11,19	120:5,14
	l	l	1	l

				310
100.17 00	1.1 1075 - 04	100.05	00.1 0 00	1 200.0
120:17,23	liked 275:24	108:25	23:1,2,23	260:8
121:2,5	282:16	174:24	38:14,17	loss 143:19
122:17	283:7,7	181:18,20	38:19	losses 156:5
254:20	likelihood	181:21	139:24	158:20,24
level 52:11	200:25	211:17	181:2	lost 237:19
52:14,15	202:8	213:5	249:15	lot 16:19
52:17 , 17	limit 31:6	225:13	Lonnie 275:5	19:21 21:4
52:19,20	237:16	250:14	look 11:10	139:12
52:24 53:1	238:24	255:8,11	26:2 50:9	223:21
53:9 63:5	limitations	259:10	50:20 , 20	236:2
100:18	31:4 61:3	272:13	51:1 60:23	239:9
116:9	limited	278:13	153:18	257 : 18
161:20	219:12	lives 25:20	170:7,11	261:11
191:5	limits 166:8	LLC 2:3,6	187 : 13 , 14	267:12,24
203:17,18	line 55:1	3:1,16	187:15	268:1
216:20	139:10	LLP 2:19 3:6	191:1	269:24
224:18,20	199:4	3:10	206:17	281:8,9
224:23	203:4	loaded 50:19	226:18	lower 118:22
230:17,19	285:10,11	53:1,10	236:14,24	118:22
235:24	285:12,13	257:20	237:9,17	122:21
243:20	285:14,15	258:21	242:20	136:18
levels 51:1	285:16,17	260:24	259:19	203:17,18
183:15	•	261:3	273:15	lunch 106:22
	285:18,19			
license 13:8	285:20,21	loading	275:10	Lundy 14:17
155:6	lines 63:6	259:3	lookaheads	14:21 17:8
licensed	68:6	260:19	48:21,22	18:6,19
16:1	link 51:10	262:11	77:15,15	21:9 25:15
licensing	linkage	Log 45:25	259:21	53:21 54:2
13:1 49:16	50:12	logic 258:17	looked 11:11	54:18 55:7
145:16	liquidated	logical	135:5	55:13
155:6	155 : 15	106:13	223:9	80:18 86:3
life 54:17	208:18,21	logistical	225:18	154:19,20
60:10 68:7	list11:11	255 : 25	241:11	154:24
light 29:5	78:24	logistics	260:12	232:20
50:6 74:6	95:18 , 22	65 : 17	looking 25:7	233:24
116:17	98:15	logo 85:3	27:17 29:3	Lynch 141:9
150:20	159:21	long 10:8	47:19 59:6	170:8
156:21	272 : 2	17:18 19:5	86:23	Lynch's
174:1,7,15	listed 97:9	50:23,24	109:1	162:18
180:11	97:13	53:18	161 : 25	
194:3	271 : 25	71:19	182:21,22	M
205:20,24	listing	86:13	182:23,24	mailings
220:3	237:6	193:25,25	224:5	30:23
239:12	little 9:19	228:23	236:16	Main 2:22
Lightsey 1:5	32:16 57:4	256:20	237:13	3:2,11 4:6
7:4 285:2	69:8 75:20	longer 16:21	246:20	7:10

maintain	234:23	274:2	267:9	170 : 25
178:7	manner 26:19	277:7,16	mat 17:13	171:12,25
maintained	178:24	281:1,10	material	198:8
23:3	219:11	281:13	44:23 45:3	206:1
maintaining	manpower	282:4,25	136:19	210:21,22
22:22	218:19	Margaret	142:5,9	228:23
161:2	Marble 14:2	5:12	147:17	232:5
major 18:18	14:14,16	Mark 13:18	213:21	234:3,5
29:13 35:5	15:8 17:2	marked 10:25	252:16	236:4,5,10
43:17 86:7	17:11,16	11:3 87:2	materially	244:11
86:11	18:11 22:5	87:5 88:14	204:1	251 : 23
171:20	23:15	88:16,21	materials	256 : 5
172:1	March 5:19	104:25	272:3	261:10,11
176:19	6:13 , 18	105:2	279:8 , 9	261:20
183:23	119:21	110:17,19	math 57:4,9	270 : 18
267:21	124:21	113:5,7	matter 29:11	271 : 18
269:5	144:6,22	120:2,4	29:12	279:14
make-up	148:1	125:7 , 9	107:24	meaning
43:24	163:21	127:19	108:2	12:23
making 87:16	171 : 22	128:17	203:16	15 : 25
manage 205:1	179:4,6,10	133:5	226:24	28:13
276:13,17	179:20	135:9	matters 9:16	51:13
management	181:17	140:25	107:18	98:18
105:16	182:11	143:25	216:4	110:21
135:25	183:2,22	146:3,5	241:23	113:24
158:18	184:23	153:16	284:9	252:1
159:1	185:7,9,10	163:4,8	MCGUIRE 3:6	meaningful
265:16,17	185:25	market	meal 31:6	65:24
272:19	186:11	136:19	meals 31:8	meaningless
278:24	187:6	160:25	33:22	275:15
279:1,3	189:4	161:3	mean 18:1	means 9:18
manager	191:25	marks 203:4	22:11	9:21 15:13
14:17 15:2	192:7,15	Marsh 74:21	24:14	143:24
15:7,8	194:23	189:12	29:21 37:4	179:3
17:9 18:4	196:5	202:18	40:13	181:1
139:13	203:1	203:9,22	47:19	198:9
221:4	211:11	204:10,20	51:21	244:11
261:14	212:18	275:11	53:12	meant 15:9
managers	213:11,17	Marsh's	63:22	156:17
39:22	228:9	203:12	81:15 86:1	227:15
managing	244:1	206:1	98:23	mechanical
59:16	245:15	Martin 2:18	102:16	12:8,10,11
278:20	247:10	8:17,17	104:9	mechanisms
manhours	248:24	massive	142:16	124:25
218:20	257 : 10	251:1	159:8	125:19
manipula	273 : 22	265:16	160:12,14	medication
тантрита	213.22	203.10	100.12,14	INCUTCA CIOII

				310
1000		1	l	1
10:20	159:9,11	ment 6:9	Mike 102:11	46:10
meet 39:3	159:24,25	mention	102:14	48:12 89:1
40:25 41:5	160:3,10	98:20	104:20,21	miscella
69:10	161:23	103:6	104:24	30:22
104:24	172:3	158:22	105:18,18	33:22,22
116:19,23	174 : 22	mentioned	105:21	misleading
119:3	175 : 5	106:15	172:4	205:6,11
122:21	198:6	107:6	milestone	205:15,19
132:12,24	200:25	259:18	45:23	242:19
138:1	207:6,18	messed 57:13	134:11,23	misled196:9
155:17	215:25	met 34:21	155:24	242:23
175:1,3	226:22	114:18	milestones	243:1
198:2	meetings	117:14,24	52:16,18	mismanag
199:16	34:25 35:9	127:5	52:23	277:6,13
201:20,20	35 : 11	128:9	million	277 : 15
202:8	38:20,23	130:10	59:10	misnomer
206:2,6	38:25 39:7	131:13,21	134:12,21	234:20
208:6,9,17	39:22 42:6	133:17	135:2,6	misrepre
208:20,22	42:9,14,20	138:10,25	149:20	214:14
211:4	42:22 43:1	156:6	209:13	missed 68:2
226:1	43:4 44:9	175:6	210:2,16	misunder
229:5	46:11	198:18	210.2,10	87:6,8,14
meeting 6:11	48:13 62:7	201:4,25	millions	mitigate
38:15	62:7,9	206:11	142:20	116:22
42:12 66:2	65:25 66:2	208:1	210:24	158:12
66:3,10	66:19,25	220:22	211:2	mitigated
67:2,4	67:3,22,25	metal 266:1	mind 21:19	143:23
84:4,7,9	69:20 70:1	methodology	30:18	mitigating
84:15,16	77:9	52:10	61:22 71:3	178:1,20
84:24 85:1	104:23	123:19	85 : 5	mitigation
85:6 90:11	105:16	215:20	227:20	49:6 64:6
90:13,18	175 : 22	217:14,14	266:9	116:5,23
92:4 99:7	263:22	217:16	272:21	124:25
100:3,20	mega 215:14	222:14,17	mine 25:15	200:6
100:23	member 65:11	225:2	109:9,10	246:19,20
104:20	members	methods 41:9	277:15	264:6,11
105:17,23	42:25 44:1	metrics 46:6	minor 36:1	mixed 259:9
106:1,4,8	46:3 66:13	Michigan	189:11	modifica
117:25	67:5,17,24	21:15	229:25	21:10
120:19	67:24	mid 187:25	235:18	246:19
136:1,4	69:10,17	188:5	minute 21:18	modified
137:12	193:3	middle 131:5	21:20	35:3 54:16
141:8,9,13	memory 10:20	131:6	36:11	150:9
141:16,18	82:24 83:5	270:1	184:22	modify 64:5
141:22,24	141:2	midway	237:19,19	150:9
142:1	193:9	157:17	minutes	169:10
T 47 • T	1 2 3 • 2		minaces	100.10
L				

				319
148:4	62:7,9	multiple	need 10:6	137:2
264:20	64:23 66:1	16:13	50:21 51:2	273:7
265:3,21	67:1 77:8	19:24 20:2	56:17,19	284:14
266:11	77:22	63:22	62:8 76:17	NELSON 3:10
	85 : 19	65:14,23	138:23	never 22:8
267:2,18	114:18	· ·	140:5	
267:18 275:9,16	123:3	66:8 67:22 68:9 77:7	170:17	42:8,11 65:2 72:24
•				
moment 278:6	126:2,4,7 135:3	77:10 86:13	188:16 228:1	73:2 76:15 76:16,21
Monday 182:17,17	183:5	243:6	229:3	95:13
182:17	262:7			104:6
monetize	months 48:2	multiply 216:24	231:21,23	104:6
180:15	53:25 54:5	210:24	246:2,4 265:1	129:23
	55:9 56:4	N	265:1 267:12	221:12
money 118:25 180:23	58:4 59:9	N.E2:19	268:5	221:12
228:2,10	131:19	name 9:3	needed 21:10	230:2
monitor 25:8	131:19	11:15 26:3	27:23 37:9	230:2
25:9,23	147:12	26:5 68:16	37:11	234:21,23
27:18	187:12	105:22	55:23 64:6	235:1,24
28:17	199:13	170:13	77:19	241:10,11
monitored	203:8	named 284:7	82:12	241:10,11
15:15	203:0	names 38:17	87:23 88:2	243:12
monitoring	210:11,11	82:19	104:16	244:23
12:13	218:6	Nanette	112:13	244.23
39:16 40:6	244:5	170:24	117:4	249:11
260:7	263:10	narrative	120:21	252:6
261:6,6	264:10	76:22	128:7	258:3
month 37:12	271:6	natural	151:17	260:21
47:4,5,6	months'	26:12	183:8	262:8
57:24	216:21	nature 33:13	184:2	279:2
58:10,19	Moody 3:1,1	33:15	192:5	nevermind
58:23,25	8:15,15	38:11	229:1	90:22
68:5 126:5	morning	necessarily	240:17	150:12
134:21	163:13	40:21	282:25	neverthe
135:7	Mount 2:4	71:23	needs 166:21	103:9
month's	move 17:15	189:14	189:19	125:3
51:25	183:21	200:1	192:9	156:19
monthly	266:5	226:15	194:2	new 28:23
34:25	269:23	238:9	248:2	36:4 90:21
41:17,19	moved 17:11	255 : 1	negotiat	91:22
41:20,22	119:19	280:23	133:24	93:20,23
42:1,4	moving	necessary	134:16	94:15
45 : 17	183:24	27 : 21	neighbor	101:6
46:18	muddled	145:16	59 : 7	168:24
49:10 58:8	277 : 11	160:10,12	neither	188:24
60:1,3	MULLINS 3:10	285 : 7	132:19	193:21,22
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I	1

				320
194:1	156:2	161:2	83:19	232:21
251:12,15	notes 42:22	163:18	96:19	obtained
252:13,17	44:8	166:11	107:18,23	282:7
275:14	105:11	167:16	123:21	obtaining
277:22,22	127:22,23	169:18	127:8	13:8
281:3	133:9		166:1	obvious 26:9
Newberg	135:21	176:15,19 177:9		127:6
_			167:6,21	
15:20	144:15 184:9	181:1 198:10	184:15	occasion 69:12
NI 259:7,7			186:5	
nice 239:24	254:22,23	218:3	188:3	occasion
239:25	272:2	248:1	192:22	60:22
241:20	Noticed 9:16	257:22	193:18	68:25
259:12	notwiths	258:11,25	201:13	175:4
nightmare	179:19	259:1	208:12	occasions
255:25	200:14	277:19	215:22	65:21,22
nine 147:20	November	number 7:6	219:14	188:19
271:6	71:12,12	25:16	227:4	occupation
NND 5:17	71:13,16	95 : 20	230:13	11:16
no-never	72:6,9,10	105:10	231:7	occur 23:1,4
91:23	74:1 99:6	118:14	243:9	23:6 33:7
92:16	99:15	129:25	250:10	141:24
101:7	100:20,23	130:13	257:1	148:5
189:1,25	NRC 16:2	155:3	261:8	277:12
250:22	21:3,7,11	191:6	262:15	occurred
nodded	49:14,14	195:22,23	274:3	83:6 85:22
278:21	136:18	198:21	281:18	101:9
nods 10:2	267:20	224:2	283:5	142:2
non-gree	nuclear 6:10	250:17	objecting	179:6,9,20
122:2	12:4,12	254:12,13	36:18	282:21
non-manual	13:24 14:1	271:25	objection	occurrence
235:22	17:3 18:13	274:16,17	123:21	84:14
236:2	20:9 21:24	numbers	261:19	264:13
Norm 170:16	22:22	122:1	obligated	occurring
170:20	24:15 25:8	123:3	281:4	80:20 92:4
North 2:10	25 : 23	127:10	observation	141:22
4:6	26:10	175:21	126:16	October 1:21
Notary 1:25	28:21,24	221:9	129:15	4:7 5:13
4:8 284:4	29:3 49:25	223:5	observat	5:13 6:17
284:23	54:14	numerous	68:14	7:11 62:6
notation	81:16	262:5	133:12	62:13,18
137:10	86:16		237:18	63:17 83:3
note 35:9	92:19	0	238:2	83:3 88:24
107:5	150:21,21	oath 284:11	observing	89:23
275:13	150:23	object 38:4	127:7	98:25
noted 89:6	159:12	43:9,11	obtain 137:3	122:8
137:7	160:24	73:16	218:13	131:23
1 , , ,				101.20
L				

				321
	1	l	I	1
132:4	138:5	148:19,21	274:19	operational
140:12	154:4	150 : 25	275:1,3,4	19:15
157:14	161:24	151:12,14	276:3,6,8	20:20
185:13	170:6	153 : 18	276:10,15	22:22 23:9
188:5,6,6	179:5	158:14,16	old 80:17	23:23,24
188:9,10	184:8	162:23	86:11	operations
192:18,20	198:25	167:10	Oliver 21:1	21:1
193:14	226:23	170:19	omissions	159:12
194:8	227:23	171:8	274:1	240:25
195:3	256:9	176:6	on-site 84:4	opine 182:10
213:8,9	273:19,19	179:5	once 22:25	opinion
215:25	274:19	181:14	85:15	73:17,20
219:22	okay 9:12	184:1,21	95:18	73:24
222:10	10:19	185:8	167:19	150:3
225:11,13	24:22	190:5	168:14,17	153:6,8
243:24	36:22	195:11	258:23	181:14
250:8	43:14	196:1	one's 254:12	205:16,19
252:12	45:16 57:7	202:16	ones 71:10	212:18
284:6,19	57:17	204:10	200:1	225:6
285:4	59:23	212:21	233:10	227:10
Off-the	60:21	214:6	240:12,13	242:15
256:13	71:25 72:3	217:12	242:1	257:3
offer 139:2	79:2 87:4	222:8	247:13,14	276:12,17
139:3	87:25	229:7	254:1	opportunity
176:23,24	105:9,13	233:19	266:8	160:1
offhand	105:14,20	234:10,17	ongoing	204:16
78:20	106:21	236:22	17:14 40:6	opposed
office1:14	108:6,25	237:5,14	66:1 77:16	35:16
2:12 3:1	109:11	237 : 23 , 23	104:7,9	118:24
3:19,20,21	112:22	237:24	147:12	optimistic
7:24 8:2	113:12	238:4,11	180:20	239:9
8:10 24:24	117:18,21	238:16,22	218:9	option 86:20
69:17	118:9	239:2	245:7	103:19
Officer	122:10,16	241:11	online 18:22	119:13
275:6	123:14,23	244:14	19:4 22:20	122:14
offices 66:7	125:13	246:17,22	268:3	133:21
105:17	126:10	251:4	open 25:13	134:18
officially	130:14,20	253:8,16	operated	138:4,6,23
155:8	130:20	255:13	249:12	140:4,7
oh 14:23	131:8	256:7,9	operating	143:9,13
19:16	132:2	258:13,14	13:2,8	143:17
21:18	134:4,4	264:18	20:18	155:15
79:18 87:6	140:11	269:25	22:13,14	156:19
95:16	144:2,15	270:1	operation	157:6
110:15	144:2,13	270:1 272:25	13:14 23:3	161:8
130:14	147:21	273:3,21	145:16	172:13
I	•			

oral 10:1	ORS 5:13,17	172:23	182:18	281:11
68:12	6:2,11	174:6,9,18	overall	201.11
order 41:4	26:15	182:2,7	126:12	P
50:11 51:4	27:11,23	189:18	272:19	P.A 4:5
64:5,5	28:2,10,13	192:20,24	overcome	P.E 6:15,16
116:23	28:25 29:5	204:14	201:6	p.m106:25
117:5	29:16,20	214:15	overloaded	107:3
129:25	29:10,20	223:9	19:23	162:25
		235:11		163:3
132:12	31:6,17,20		129:11	212:24
165:19	31:25 32:7	239:8	overruns	212:24
186:20	35:8 36:13	242:9,19	119:8	
188:13,21	36:13 39:1	242:23	142:21	253:11,14
199:6	39:24	243:1	143:1,11	256:12,15
201:6	40:12	248:5	143:19	278:8,11
223:10	42:15,25	249:1	oversee	283:13,16
246:20	43:8,8,15	252:6	279:3	page 11:15
257:10,15	43:16,20	254:4	oversight	89:4
264:11	43:21,23	278 : 18	267:10	110:24
266:15,16	44:25 45:5	279:8	owned $1:11$	117:17
267:1,15	47:18	280:3,7	265:12	121:5,25
269:1	60:10,20	ORS's 120:8	owner 19:7	121:25
orders	64:7 66:7	255 : 15	19:10	122:6,18
175:19	66:14 67:6	OTC 49:13	21:18 73:2	124:4,6
176:2,3	67:13 , 17	ought 166:25	73:4	126:8
187:19	67:18,24	ourself 65:3	109:20	130:15
206:20	68:10,24	outfall	118:4	131:3
211:20	73:6 82:17	26:12	137:25	134:2
212:5	87:15,18	outline	139:19	136:10
229:19	103:22	120:22	owner's	147:20
Oregon	105:16	191:1	153:3	148:18
270:23	107:9,20	outlined	owners 23:11	151:12,15
organiza	107:24	175 : 25	23:14,16	157:17
161:4	108:15	204:5	23:21 24:2	158:14
organiza	127:17 , 24	outlining	55:13	169:9
21:4	131:11,14	26:18	109:13	171:7
organize	135:25	outset 10:10	111:15	178 : 4
88:17	136:20	165:23	138:3	199:4
original	137:1,20	211:19	166:10	202:12,15
75 : 17	138:2	outside	169:4,18	237:8,13
168:23	140:19	27:24	177:19	237:14,20
169:2,8	146:20	68:23	238:11	237:21,23
214:24	148:9	83:14	265:13	238:1,3,17
227:22	158:19	151:2	270:6	239:7
229:5,10	159:1	278:23	272:8	269:24,25
originally	164:2	279:1	273:7,9	272:23
68:9	170:7,11	outstanding	280:16	273:2,16
	-, 0, 1, 1, 1	- = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =]

				323
274:24	Pardon 43:10	13:14	paygrade	234:7
275:1,9	parent	65:18	63:7	250:15
276:1,7,9	144:18	79:19 99:6	paying	251:9
276:11	Parkin 3:20	117:10	134:21	261:11,11
285:10,11	8:9	129:4	payment	268:10,10
· ·		134:2		276:5
285:12,13	part 12:24	134:2	30:14,16 31:20	
285:14,15	24:10 30:7 31:9 40:24			perform 80:6
285:16,17		136:4	134:11,12	81:7 115:3
285:18,19	41:19,20	263:17	134:13,23	145:19,24
285:20,21	60:10,18	particul	135:2	performance
pages 117:7	66:3 67:1	112:10	155:24	112:7,11
130:25	77:16 88:1	116:17	254:21	128:7
171:7	125:17	156:21	payments	129:20,24
198:20	127:15	268:5	133:20,24	130:8,19
199:1	147:16	parties	134:17	139:10
pagination	153:4	68:10	135:6	151:4
273:18	156:12	266:21	pays 32:6	230:12
<pre>paid 30:11</pre>	161:7	284:16	PDF 259:24	231:24
31:1,17,19	172:22	partners	Peachtree	232:1
60:15	179:24	5:14	2:19	performed
271:3	192:4	177 : 21	pending 10:8	33:17 50:8
panels 148:4	194:14	270:5	79:15 , 17	50:18 63:5
paperwork	205:5	parts 25:23	people 27:11	85:24
265:20	220:18	43:23 89:3	35:1,4,8	170:8
268:21	222:10	154:5	39:5 , 7	243:4,8
paragraph	225:1	party 83:15	43:16,23	performing
111:1	246:23	145:10	51:8 52:4	33:18
117:19	248:5	279:3	52:8,8	148:3
121:11	259:4,22	pass 71:1	54:1,4	period16:8
124:13	277:4	path 51:13	55:9 56:11	19:14
132:9,16	partial 14:7	228:19	57 : 17	68:11
134:9	participant	262:25	58 : 12	270:17
136:13	242:9	263:2,5,6	67:22 77:7	272 : 5
144:15	participate	263:6,7,9	77:10	periodic
148:20	39:23,25	263:10,13	115:1	39:21
157 : 18	267 : 11	263:14,15	170:25	56:16 68:3
158:18	particip	263:18	181:22	periodic
178:6	13:4 20:12	PATRICK 2:3	187 : 13	39:23
270:1	60:11	2:6	191:7,7	48:17 69:1
parameters	159:24	Patterson	198:11	77:20 84:8
167:24,25	particip	3:5 8:3,3	210:7	permit 12:25
168:2	141:12,17	Paul 3:25	217:19	13:2,2
paramount	particip	7:13	218:5	199:16
161:3	87:23	pay 31:8	223:3,14	person 43:20
paraphrased	107:21	226:16	230:17,18	43:21
276:25	particular	281:4,5	230:19,20	84:13
	1-	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				324
101 0	1	l	l	1
101:2	picture	211:24	7:7	points
218:2	161:16	planning	Pleasant 2:4	108:15
254:25	181:25	187:7	please 7:16	122:24
284:7	piece 48:19	189:8	8:22 9:4	123:15
personal	70:2 71:4	plans 41:3	37:15	124:5,16
250:14	79:19	125:1	102:23	246:3
personally	231:4,11	246:20	109:16	247:7
28:23	268:18	264:6	126:9	282 : 8
243:7	275:23	plant 13:3,5	129:2	police 10:4
personnel	pieces 232:2	13:14,16	168:16	political
86:10	251:22	13:17 14:5	209:7	249:16
269:8	265:23	14:6,10	272:11	poor 115:2
perspective	282:9	15:12,23	Plowden	119:8
228:22	pile 265:25	17:6,6,8	107:13,16	148:14,23
241:14	piping 19:25	17:10 20:3	plus 58:25	149:1
pertained	20:1	20:18 21:6	207:4	poorer
183:13	222:21	21:12,14	PM 237:11	115:12
pertinent	223:23	21:18 22:6	<pre>point 10:6</pre>	portrayed
110:13	place 41:3,4	23:21	16:21	193:20
254:15	41:5 94:24	24:15	35 : 23	202:11
pessimistic	109:8	25:10	52 : 20	203:17
151:21	140:10	26:10	76:23	204:8
152:8	148:16	28:24 40:7	83:24	pose 118:1
280:16	258:9	51:6	88:19	position
petition	267 : 22	145:17	126:11	25:10,12
79:15 , 17	270:13	155:3	133:1	25:14
150:8	271 : 6	160:24	137:11	27:20
202:25	plaintiff	161:1,2	178:22	74:12
203:3	256:19	165:20	184:14	79:16
phase 13:11	plaintiffs	170:1	202:3,12	158:6
17:25	1:8 2:2	176:19,25	202:17	197:19
69:13	7:4,18,20	222:23	210:25	positions
261:13	8:12	226:19	230:5	76:3
phases 20:11	plaintiffs'	257:22	234:20	positive
PHILLIP 1:5	7:15	265:17	242:20	155:12
phone 57:7	plan 12:4	plants 23:9	244:1,2	170:1
phrase 10:12	42:3	25:17	246:25	possibil
68:15	189:15	28:21	249:20	143:12
123:11	191:6	81:17	258:3,6,8	possibility
223:2,4	plan-of	86:10	259:17	122:14
physical	42:6,8,11	161:3,6	260:23,24	142:13,25
20:21	44:9 84:7	163:18	261:2,3	143:18,21
pick 265:9	84:16,24	165:18	262:8	144:23
Pickling 2:9	85 : 6	177:3	274:15	145:23
8:11,11	planned	198:10	pointing	147:16
107:6	194:12	Pleas $1:1$	205:21	199:19,24
	I	I	I	ı

				323
200.22	226.10	F0.10	147.2	015.04
200:22 204:13	226:18 257:22	50:10 258:16	147:3 176:10	215:24 242:8
possible	260:6	predate	198:15	presenting
86:22 87:1	practice	274:1	215:2	108:23
154:11	32:23,25	predates	217:7,9,17	presently
156:5	35:10 37:1	273:22	218:18,21	124:7
175:12	37:23	277:7	281:21,22	president
possibly	85:18	predating	preparing	55:14
192:23	146:22	274:12	12:24	261:23
Post 3:21	255:7	preferred	60:11	275:5
postdated	practices	129:12	108:17,21	pressed
221:14,23	37 : 20	preliminary	176:9	64:15
221:25	pre-file	12:24 14:4	252 : 16	pressure
potential	197:14	20:12	prescribed	227:15,17
5:10 119:7	231:3	82:19	28:3	227:19
140:14	257 : 19	213:7	presence	229:13
156:4	277 : 18	219:25	161:2	pressured
158:10	pre-filed	231:10	present 3:24	283:3
160:16	108:18	269:15	39:7 43:18	pressures
224:5	109:2	premature	65 : 12	249:16
potentially	110:1	206:14	66:15 67:5	pressurized
92:25	146:24	225:13	68:10 76:1	15:23 17:7
178:1	152:3	premiere	94:23,24	18:11
pour 259:1,8	153:19	81:16	97:7 270:9	21:15
poured 17:14	276:1	preopera	presenta	prestigious
Powell 5:9	pre-me	17:24	6:19 69:6	248:1
6:1,18	123:25	preparation	163:10,12	presume
43:15,25	pre-op	13:7 14:4	163:16,20	225:10
69:15	240:25	37:17	163:24	presupposed
84:15,18	263:25	39:24 , 25	171:3,22	190:14
85:6 87:11	264:9	52:4	171:24	pretend
94:21	pre-oper	108:23	175:13	226:23
140:18	13:9	120:13,16	213:7	pretty 13:13
141:3,8,17	precedent	146:12	219:23	18:3 21:17
159:19	206:14	259:15	presenta	32:9 44:2
163:9	precisely	prepare 40:1	68:23 69:3	63:14
193:4	27:14,16	163:24	presented	91:24
power 8:8	178:13	164:1	11:4 46:23	122:2
22:20	228:15,16	209:9	108:15	126:4
26:10	preconst	218:4,8	109:13,19	131:20
81:16	166:4	prepared	111:15	267:10
160:24	precursor	51:25 52:3	139:19	268:14
161:2	50:13	89:1,2	140:22	prevents
163:18	51:11	99:7 105:6	147:25	182:9
176:15	52 : 21	129:14	171:13	previous
198:10	precursors	144:5,6	206:15	47:5 135:5
	I	1	l	I

				320
previously	principal	19:12,13	processed	117:24
33:15	55:12	19:20 20:3	109:10	118:1,8,14
38:11	prior 85:13	21:8 22:18	processing	118:24
82:12	88:10 95:6	44:18	271:5	119:4,9,14
90:15		129:10		
	95:10,14		produce	119:23,24
127:2	101:1	174:2,7,12	216:23	122:20
167:5	106:9	177:6,18	253:24	123:3,4,4
176:8	113:23	177:22	produced	126:12,13
181:3	146:19	178:19,25	30:4 34:12	127:1,5,10
229:18	179:1,14	235:7,10	34:16	127:11
264:1	182:11	244:17,24	60:10 62:2	128:2,5,6
price 103:19	271:13	245:2,21	282:12	129:17
119:11,13	priorities	263:18	producing	131:17
122:14	155:25	265:24	210:22	133:17
133:21	private	267:24	282:7	136:17
134:18	36:21	proceed	producit	139:8,9,23
138:4,5,6	privy 61:13	165:20	118:23	142:17
138:14,23	75:6 76:1	187:22	product	143:3
140:4,7,10	78:9	228:6	210:17	148:14,23
143:8,13	234:23	proceeded	production	149:2
143:17	281:23	142:18	50:22	151:15,21
145:3	probably	186:10,13	131:18	152:8
155:15	21:22	proceeding	137:3	198:18
156:19	37:16	162:14	147:11	199:11,14
157:5	38:13	231:2	148:2	199:15,19
161:8	53:25	proceedings	151 : 17	199:24
162:15	55:24	11:5 110:3	216:24	200:3
172:13	65:24 66:9	195:8	249:13	203:25
226:3	80:15	process 9:10	producti	204:18,19
primarily	121:23	48:7 58:4	46:8,13,14	207:14,15
15:9 16:14	126:22	59:6 71:2	46:17,19	217:2
25:17 34:1	166:7	72:23 74:8	46:21 47:1	220:21,21
60:12	182:25	75:3 77:7	47:2,3,8	221:2,17
164:6	238:20	108:17,19	47:23 48:5	223:1
primary	277:14	154:5	48:10	232:9,12
15:21	problem	155:6	112:12,25	232:3,12
34:24	65:13 87:9	176:9	113:20,25	232:24
35:20	106:20	194:17	113:20,23	233:1,3,7
65:11 68:1	119:14	209:8,11	114:0,12	233:13,25
160:15	264:23	211:5	114:13,17	270:4
251:18	267:15,17	218:6	114:24	280:8,11
268:16	269:5	245:6	115:2,12	280:16
Primavera	problematic	253:23	115:17,19	products
48:25	16:18	265:21	116:1,6,10	76:5,6,6
223:16	268:23	272:12	116:17,19	professi
prime 155:1	problems	281:20	117:4,13	30:19 34:4

				341
34:7	48:12	127 : 7	193:17	258:2,7,11
	49:11	129:23	194:21	258:19
276:12,17				
program	51:15,16	130:10	195:8	259:3,5
145:7	51:16,24	132:19	196:5,15	260:17
252:3	52:5 53:10	139:6,13	200:5	261:1,22
programs	53:18,24	139:14	204:15,25	262:9,10
145:9,15	54:14,15	142:10,14	205:1	263:3,13
223:17	54:17 55:2	143:20	207:18	263:19,24
progress	55:14	144:24,25	209:9	270:10,21
15:10	59:16,20	145:5	210:8,12	272:9,14
77:16	59:21 60:2	147:8,14	210:23	272:20
220:25	60:10,16	147:25	211:24	276:18
project 12:4	61:5,14	148:5	213:23	277:12,19
	·			· ·
12:6,8,11	63:19,24	151:3,18	216:16,17	278:1,20
12:14,17	66:6,24,25	151:20	216:25	279:4,16
12:21,23	67:8,11,12	152:7	218:4,9,10	282:19
13:11,24	67:21 68:8	153:4	218:11,24	projected
14:1,8,17	69:13,16	154:6,11	219:19	151:22
14:18 15:2	69:22,24	155:2,7,25	220:25	156:5
15:4,6,7,8	70:6,19	157:1	224:8	projections
16:4,7,16	72:22	161:20	226:13,15	40:25
16:22,25	75:14	165:16 , 23	227:21	projects
17:3,4,5,8	77:21	168:4	228:1,24	15 : 25
17:15,16	78:12 79:6	169:6,23	229:24	18:14
17:19 , 20	79:7 , 8	171:4,10	230:10	20:10,23
17:22,25	80:2,13	172:10	231:6,22	23:5 49:25
18:4,18,22	82:14	173:7,13	233:2,8,21	52 : 12
18:25 19:3	83:15 85:9	173:22,23	234:14	60:25
19:4,6	85:21 93:1	174:1,6,11	235:12	86:13
20:21	93:19,20	174:15	237:3	92:19
24:12,18	94:12 95:7	175:2,7,20	239:13	150:18,22
24:21,22	103:10,11	176:14	241:6	154:22
24:25 27:3	103:10,11	177:7,22	242:2	215:15
	106:7	· ·		228:21
27:15,19 30:8 32:12		177:25	244:20,25	
	109:14,15	178:16 , 23	245:18,24	prominence
32:24	109:21	179:22	246:15	92:17
34:21	110:3	180:4,7,10	248:14	prominent
38:16	111:9	183:2	249:6,10	86:15
39:24	115:10,13	184:10	249:18,20	93:17
41:15 42:1	117:25	185:12,16	249:24	promise
43:14,19	118:2,15	185:23	250 : 25	208:6,8,25
44:4,6,10	119:17	186:9	251:2 , 5	211:4
44:14	120:11,19	187 : 12	252 : 4	promised
45:18 46:6	122:18	188:2	254 : 9	116:9,19
46:10	124:17,22	189:9,17	255 : 9	118:23
47:13 48:3	125:18,24	189:18	256 : 25	119:23,23
	,			l '

129:3 219:7 205:2 182:10 public 1:25 proper 224:20 208:15 277:17,20 4:8 11:5					328
127:2	110.05		1.50.00	I	1
132:24					
143:3					
208:9,14 50:12 159:22 provision 198:15 226:2 68:13 164:3 provisions 30:11 214:15 227:1,7 69:19,23 166:10 30:11 214:15 227:10 160:13 104:16 182:24 promotion 145:10 183:17 165:18 229:18 promotion 155:5 172:11 184:20 153:7,8,12 247:17 235:24 206:19,21 196:20,24 169:23 226:17 260:321 204:6,22 169:12 204:6,22 182:10 public 1:25 256:24 243:18 209:24 prudent 255:24 245:11 210:17 108:22 70:55 108:24 268:21,21 253:21 215:25 150:5 108:24 266:14,17 proposed 225:6,8 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 277:38 33:17 35:5 255:17 202:19 203:10,23 273:8 63:25 64:2 273:8 277:17 273:8 277:17 275:16 241:19 275:16 241:19 203:10,23 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 133:14 133:23 273:8 277:17 70:50 70:51 70:50					
208:22					
226:2 68:13 164:3 provisions 213:12 227:1,7 69:19,23 166:10 30:11 214:15 227:12 165:8 160:13 104:16 182:24 168:6,8,24 227:12 168:6,8,24 229:8 229:8 227:12 168:6,8,24 229:8 224:20 231:2 246:9 246:9 247:17 246:9 247:17 246:22 224:17 267:17,18 165:23 252:17 267:17 269:12 228:20 228:15 169:12 228:20 228:15 277:17,20 4:8 11:5 252:17 260:12 223:18 209:24 279:17,20 4:8 11:5 14:2 40:2 270:5 188:24 129:22 129:22 129:22 129:22 129:22	· ·				
227:1,7					
promises 98:24 182:15,20 165:8 227:12 160:13 104:16 182:24 168:6,8,24 229:8 promotion 145:10 183:17 prudency 231:2 15:5 172:11 184:20 151:9 246:9 prompted 182:8 190:11 153:7,8,12 247:17 235:24 194:20 196:17,18 165:53 252:17 263:21 206:19,21 196:20,24 166:5 264:17 prompting 217:21 204:6,22 169:12 280:20,23 129:3 219:7 205:2 182:10 public 1:25 108:22 243:18 209:24 prudent 4:8:11:5 108:22 243:18 209:24 prudent 14:2:40:2 256:24 245:11 210:17 108:22 70:5 260:16,18 255:22 221:24 179:22,24 171:17 276:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 25:18 11:5					
Tell	227:1,7	· ·			
promotion 145:10 183:17 prudency 231:2 246:9 prompted 182:8 190:11 153:7,8,12 247:17 235:24 194:20 196:17,18 165:23 252:17 263:21 206:19,21 196:20,24 166:5 264:17 prompting 217:21 204:6,22 169:12 280:20,23 proper 224:20 208:15 277:17,20 280:20,23 proper 243:18 209:24 prudent 14:2 40:2 256:24 245:11 210:17 108:22 70:5 268:21,21 253:21 215:25 150:5 108:22 70:5 268:21,21 255:19,20 219:12 158:7 140:22 70:5 260:16,18 255:22 221:24 179:22,24 171:17 248:6 276:14,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 248:6 257:9 26:14,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 284:4,23 291:7					
15:5	160:13	104:16	182:24	168:6,8,24	229:8
prompted 182:8 190:11 153:7,8,12 247:17 235:24 206:19,21 196:20,24 166:5 264:17 prompting 217:21 204:6,22 169:12 280:20,23 129:3 219:7 205:2 182:10 public1:25 proper 224:20 208:15 277:17,20 4:8 11:5 108:22 243:18 209:24 prudent 14:2 40:2 256:24 245:11 210:17 108:22 70:5 268:21,21 253:21 215:25 150:5 108:24 properly 255:19,20 219:12 158:7 140:22 260:16,18 255:22 221:24 179:22,24 171:17 proposal 262:12 235:1 197:3,5 257:9 26:14,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 PSC 5:8 40:2 pulling 25:17 48:20 258:19 102:22 pulling 135:15	promotion	145:10	183:17	prudency	231:2
235:24	15:5	172:11	184:20	151:9	246:9
263:21	prompted	182:8	190:11	153:7,8,12	247:17
prompting 217:21 204:6,22 169:12 280:20,23 proper 224:20 208:15 277:17,20 public1:25 108:22 243:18 209:24 prudent 14:2 40:2 256:24 245:11 210:17 108:22 70:5 268:21,21 253:21 215:25 150:5 108:24 properly 255:19,20 219:12 158:7 140:22 260:16,18 255:22 221:24 179:22,24 171:17 276:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 276:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 276:13,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 proposed provided 255:8,8 169:11 provided:24:4,23 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 provided:22 provided:22 provides:22 providing 135:15 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 providing 19:22	235:24	194:20	196:17 , 18	165:23	252:17
prompting 217:21 204:6,22 169:12 280:20,23 proper 224:20 208:15 277:17,20 public1:25 108:22 243:18 209:24 prudent 14:2 40:2 256:24 245:11 210:17 108:22 70:5 268:21,21 253:21 215:25 150:5 108:24 properly 255:19,20 219:12 158:7 140:22 260:16,18 255:22 221:24 179:22,24 171:17 276:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 276:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 276:13,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 proposed provided 255:8,8 169:11 provided:24:4,23 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 provided:22 provided:22 provides:22 providing 135:15 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 providing 19:22	263:21	206:19,21	196:20,24	166:5	264:17
129:3	prompting	217:21		169:12	280:20,23
proper 224:20 208:15 277:17,20 4:8 11:5 108:22 243:18 209:24 prudent 14:2 40:2 256:24 245:11 210:17 108:22 70:5 268:21,21 255:19,20 219:12 158:7 140:22 260:16,18 255:22 221:24 179:22,24 171:17 260:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 proposal 262:12 235:1 197:3,5 257:9 26:14,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 pSC 5:8 40:2 pull50:24 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 pSC 5:8 40:2 pull1oing 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 pulling 135:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:4,8,10 113:10		219:7		182:10	<pre>public 1:25</pre>
108:22	proper	224:20	208:15	277:17,20	4:8 11:5
256:24		243:18	209:24	prudent	14:2 40:2
properly 255:19,20 219:12 158:7 140:22 260:16,18 255:22 221:24 179:22,24 171:17 276:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 proposal 262:12 235:1 197:3,5 257:9 26:14,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 PSC 5:8 40:2 284:4,23 103:23 33:17 35:5 254:20 91:7 pull 50:24 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 pulling 135:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purchase 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 244:10 <td< td=""><td>256:24</td><td>245:11</td><td>210:17</td><td> -</td><td>70:5</td></td<>	256:24	245:11	210:17	-	70:5
properly 255:19,20 219:12 158:7 140:22 260:16,18 255:22 221:24 179:22,24 171:17 276:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 proposal 262:12 235:1 197:3,5 257:9 26:14,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 PSC 5:8 40:2 284:4,23 103:23 33:17 35:5 254:20 91:7 pull 50:24 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 pulling 135:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purchase 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 244:10 <td< td=""><td>268:21,21</td><td>253:21</td><td>215:25</td><td>150:5</td><td>108:24</td></td<>	268:21,21	253:21	215:25	150:5	108:24
260:16,18 255:22 221:24 179:22,24 171:17 276:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 proposal 262:12 235:1 197:3,5 257:9 26:14,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 proposed provided 252:6,8 169:11 284:4,23 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 psc 5:8 40:2 284:4,23 103:23 33:17 35:5 254:20 91:7 pulling 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 pulling 155:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 45:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 153:20 purposef.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
276:13,17 256:4 231:14 180:12,16 248:6 proposal 262:12 235:1 197:3,5 257:9 26:14,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 proposed 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 PSC 5:8 40:2 pull 50:24 103:23 33:17 35:5 254:20 91:7 pulling 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 64:17 70:4 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
proposal 262:12 235:1 197:3,5 257:9 proposed provided 252:6,8 169:11 284:4,23 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 PSC 5:8 40:2 pull 50:24 103:23 33:17 35:5 254:20 91:7 pulling 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 19:22 155:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 64:17 73:6 75:13 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 168:10 247:20 protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 proved	*			· ·	
26:14,17 275:16 241:19 prudently 279:13,20 proposed provided 252:6,8 169:11 284:4,23 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 psc 5:8 40:2 pull 50:24 103:23 33:17 35:5 254:20 91:7 pulling 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 45:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 247:20 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven<	*				
proposed provided 252:6,8 169:11 284:4,23 25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 PSC 5:8 40:2 pull 50:24 103:23 33:17 35:5 254:20 91:7 pulling 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 19:22 155:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 45:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 158:23 111:24 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 186:11,19 79:22 217:13				-	
25:18 11:15 30:6 254:5,17 PSC 5:8 40:2 pull 50:24 103:23 33:17 35:5 254:20 91:7 pulling 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 19:22 155:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 45:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef. protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 114:6 13	•			_	
103:23 33:17 35:5 254:20 91:7 pulling 135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 19:22 155:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 64:17 73:6 75:13 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:23 114:6		_			· ·
135:15 38:6,18 255:11,23 102:22 19:22 155:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 64:17 73:6 75:13 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:23 114:6					
155:17 48:20 258:19 110:3,22 purchase 202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 64:17 73:6 75:13 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 158:23 111:24 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:23 114:6					
202:19 49:19 262:23 118:19 226:18 203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 64:17 73:6 75:13 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:23 14:6		· ·			
203:10,23 50:21,21 266:16 131:23 purpose 273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 64:17 73:6 75:13 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 proved 112:5 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:23 114:6					-
273:8 63:25 64:2 268:22 132:4,8,10 36:15 proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 64:17 73:6 75:13 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 158:23 111:24 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:23 114:6					
proprietary 64:7 70:4 271:12,24 132:14 113:10 64:17 73:6 75:13 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 217:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6	· ·				
64:17 73:6 75:13 274:6 138:7,9 149:10 145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 158:23 111:24 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 17:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6					
145:11,11 75:19 279:20 140:5,12 159:25 protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 158:23 111:24 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 217:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6					
protect 77:17 provides 146:12,15 244:10 108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 158:23 111:24 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 217:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6				-	
108:9 85:19,20 52:15 153:20 purposef protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 158:23 111:24 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 217:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
protection 89:2 165:22 168:10 247:20 158:23 111:24 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 217:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6			-	· ·	
158:23 111:24 280:19 172:19 purposes proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 217:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6		· ·			
proved 112:5 providing 181:2 24:12 264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 217:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6	_				
264:23 113:16 12:13 185:17 53:18 proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 217:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6					
proven 114:7 82:19 186:11,19 79:22 217:13 135:24 126:2 186:23 114:6			-		
217:13					
	. —				
provide					
- - - - - - - - - -	provide 10:1	148:3	153:1	18/:23	160:3

				329
000 10	00000016	100 1	000 10	1.67.4
209:13	28:2 29:16	100:1	283:10	167:4
217:6	87:21	101:25	quibbling	181:2
226:10	qualify	107:16	179:13,16	217:2
pursue	152:12	108:4	quickly	220:21
100:17,19	quality	124:5	76:17	221:17
228:18	16:14	129:5	269:18	222:20
251:8	18:19,21	135:11	quite 47:25	223:19,22
pursued	20:1,20,20	147:19	138:13	223:24
214:9	20:25 21:3	156:9,13	223:18	232:6,8,12
217:15	23:8,9	158:13	quote 25:23	232:17,22
229:4	128:1	161:22	quoted 206:9	233:23,23
pursuing	151 : 4	170:14	quoting	rattle 45:20
144:19	257:7 , 7	181:5	273:6	raw 234:21
182:3	265:19	184:19		re-evaluate
purview	267 : 22	186:7	R	37:11
24:11	268:6,10	201:11	R 2:18	reach 123:5
167:11	269 : 7	206:15	range 55:18	reached
pushed 226:6	270:4,16	209:21	55:21	89:20,25
put 18:15	qualms 16:24	218:7	93:15	126:20
29:5,16	quantities	222:3	135:6	128:14
44:16,25	217:2	235:24	rapidly	146:19,21
45:5,7	221:19	236:14	223:20	228:15
52:25 55:2	quarter	242:16	271:20	241:15,18
90:6	111:2	245:16	rate 33:19	reaction
121:11	quarterly	246:12	33:19	97:19
122:2	40:8 60:4	252 : 10	54:19,23	reactor
189:19	60:6,9,11	276:12,16	54:24 55:1	13:18,19
204:14,23	60 : 12	question	55:15 , 15	15:24 17:7
209:5	147:17	255:10	55:18 , 20	18:11
220:5	183:5	questioned	57:15 , 16	21:16,24
227:17	263:13	96:2	ratepayers	150:22
228:6,10	question	questioning	7:20 24:2	169:19
232:9	9:23,24	107:5	24:8	218:3
238:8,14	10:8,11,12	278:14	118:20	reactors
239:11	10:15,17	questions	138:21	22:23
252:4	20:4 31:23	9:14 10:23	157 : 2	read 102:24
PWR 20:8	43:13 45:1	11:6,13	161:21	115:21,23
	61:7 , 8	36 : 18	162:7	117:10
Q	75:18,18	85:20	167:1	156:10
QC 268:24	81:10	117:11	197:7	181:6
269:3,12	85:17 , 22	160:2,6	249:11	201:12
qualific	85:23 87:6	176:7	256:19	235:5
29:11 52:8	87:8,15	212:2	rates 24:9	275:17
191:7	89:12,15	256:8	50 : 22	276:16,24
265:18	89:16	263:21	126:12	277:1
qualified	92:15	280:5	128:7	283:14
-		l	l	

				330
005 7 0	100 16	45 01 01	1.4.6.0	60 1 2
285:7,9	100:16	45:21,21	146:8	60:1,3
readily	112:24	47:7,10	159:9,11	63:9,10
28:16	113:2,3	49:9 60:6	171:21,24	70:22,25
reading	118:3	61:24	174:22	72:12,14
111:21	129:9	62:23	175:5,9,13	72:17,19
147:23	135:4	64:14,19	175:16	72 : 25
ready 198:15	140:2,3	70:8 78:20	198:22	73:12,13
real 29:8	142:1,3	78:21	211:12	73:14,18
142:13,16	172:3	80:10,19	223:4	74:5,13,24
247:12	181:8	80:21 81:4	235:16,19	74:25 75:2
273:8	188:17	82:18,20	235:20	75:24
275:15	195:15 , 15	82:25 83:2	236:8,9	76:11 , 15
reality 86:5	196:4	83:3 84:22	240:9,19	76:16 , 20
180:11	206:25	86:22 87:1	255:3,4	76:21 77:1
realization	221:5	87:13 88:4	264:21	77:14 78:4
228:24	234:11,12	88:7,22	265:2,6,9	78:22 96:1
realize	248:14,24	90:5,9,16	266:10,11	98:12
277:21	268:16	90:19 91:3	266:24	111:2
realized	reasonable	91:16 92:3	268:6,7	114:17
239:12	150:5	93:24 94:2	269:9	140:21
264:8	178:10	94:5,7,9	271:8	142:5,9
really 10:3	179:10	94:13,17	receipt	159:6
19:18 24:9	197:3	94:19,25	268:17,17	162:9
25:7 27:1	207:1	94:25 95:2	269:6,15	183:4
28:20 29:8	210:3	95:5,20	receive	194:8,11
29:13 33:3	Reasonably	96:25 97:1	42:20 46:5	219:1,9,13
65:11 82:1	199:5	97:3,4,6	46:10,16	233:23
105:23	reasons	97:24 98:1	47:23 48:1	253:16
109:25	37 : 19	98:21	48:5,11,12	259:18,24
113:3	147:13	99:17	48:15,18	262:18,19
124:2	164:15	100:4,21	49:3,6	272:4
152:23	180:2	100:25	61:4 65:15	275:14
166:23	211:15	101:11,23	70:20	receiving
170:15	Rebecca 1:23	102:16,18	73:15	44:8 45:21
209:1	4:8 7:12	104:20	75 : 21	49:9 60:7
215:23	284:4,23	106:3,5,5	76:11,24	175:13
224:9	285:5	113:13,15	77:12,13	recess 56:25
234:23	recall 13:21	113:17	183:10	107:1
236:3	16:9,10,12	128:19	184:13	163:1
258:21	18:8 20:4	129:9	197:20	212:25
259:14,16	26:24 27:1	131:24	268:18	253:12
260:23	27:8 33:8	132:3,5	272:3	278:9
267:11	33:10,13	136:5,7	received	recognition
271:6	35:22	141:12,15	38:10 44:9	239:15
reason 10:22	37:18	141:17,19	45:17	240:17
10:24	39:10,17	141:21	48:23 49:4	recognize
10.21			10.25 47.4	1000911126
L				

				331
	l	l	l	1
118:6	241:9,19	284:13	78:1 95:20	146:25
135:12	241:22,23	recorded	references	148:12
recognized	241:24	255:4	76:12	208:10
160:25	242:17	records 34:2	referred	209:18
211:17	245:3,13	34:19,20	23:19	212:14
recollec	247:8,12	35:12	52:11	262:9
11:8 19:5	252 : 5	recounted	68:18 72:3	reflecting
39:14 40:3	253:3,5	101:22	126:11	118:23
42:13	recommended	159:7	158:23	222:14
47:11	86:20	160:23	referring	reflects
83:10	92:24	recover	24:20 61:1	103:13,17
86:23	191:17	166:13	71:8,20	204:3
106:8	240:1	recoverable	72:5 73:9	refusal
159:14	278:19	203:5	75:9 77:2	182:8
170:10	recommen	recovered	164:12	refuse 162:2
268:16	197 : 2	169:11	170:2,4,6	regard 32:23
269:5	recommends	recovering	170:9	139:21
recommend	103:22	151:10	174:18	208:25
86:19	reconfig	recovery	178:13	231:25
183:23	265:22	165:15	182:13	regarded
244:9,12	record 7:15	167:15	199:1	183:13
recommen	9:4,20	228:19	237:2	regarding
87:16,17	10:3 36:12	267:25	273:1	41:15 70:6
108:23	56:24 57:2	red 89:3	refers	70:19
187:22	102:24	105:11	275:11	112:7
189:18	106:25	redo 37:15	refine 150:2	127:23
213:23	107:3,15	redoing	225:18	180:20
214:1,2	108:1,9	37 : 14	refined	182:10
240:19	115:23	reduce	54:12,14	229:23
241:4	123:2	265:20	refinement	230:9
244:13	127:21	reduced	217:6	231:22,23
245:9	156:10	284:11	refining	257:14
recommen	162:25	reduces	226:10	265:3
6:5,7	163:3	123:19	reflect	regardless
67:15	178:8	reduction	10:16	73:22
191:12,13	179:15	167:4,4	34:20	115:10
191:22,13	181:6	270:3,15	35:10	169:5
194:20	195:24	refer 11:14	46:13	227:18
195:1	201:12	24:13	133:9,13	252:22
237:18	212:24	147:22	154:2	regular
238:3	213:2	156:23	260:17,18	60:23 62:7
239:4,18	253:11,14	164:9	reflected	62:9 64:22
239:20,23	254:23	237:25	111:13	65:25 66:3
239:20,23	254:23	reference	114:13	67:1,4,19
240:3,14	277:2,3	117:16	143:1,11	67:1,4,19
240:3,14	278:8,11	referenced	143:1,11	100:3
240:23	2/0:0,11	rererenced	T44:TT	100:3
	=	•	•	-

				332
	100.20		100.00	214.12 12
regularly	188:20	relied	102:23	214:12,13
66:16,17	190:11	232:13	109:16	214:19,24
110:1	192:1	234:19	115:20	215:1,1,2
175:1,3,4	196:5	rely 164:2	156:8	215:5,7
223:17	202:7	relying	168:16	225:2
regulations	205:12	231:5,14	181:4	233:17
21:11 31:6	207:17	234:17,18	201:10	235:3,5,6
regulatory	212:2	remain 264:2	209:7	237:4,18
1:14 2:12	230:11	remainder	Repeatedly	237:20
7:24 8:2	231:6	151:18	258:5,6	239:1,3,22
18:21	232:21	remained	replaced	241:9
20:19	233:1,20	119:18	20:1	242:2
24:25	233:22,25	222:25	replacem	243:18
25:25	277:19	224:14	19:21	244:18
177:10	284:15	remaining	replicate	247:3,8
254:3	relates	222:23	15:24 17:6	250:20
reiterated	103:21	remains		251:8
			replication	
133:1	179:5	124:7	16:2	252:3,4,6
relate 96:13	relation	164:23	report 12:25	252:25
168:2	174:2	169:22	13:7 33:20	253:6
176:8	250:16	remember	33:24	262:25
related	relative	15:22	44:14	263:6
32:19 44:4	19:25 36:1	17:12	45:23 47:9	271:10,12
44:6 46:21	68:14	46:24	60:9,11,13	reported
47:22 48:4	133:24	71:13	61:23 , 25	1:23 67:19
49:10,25	161:15	87:16 97:7	62:1,2,4	94:20
61:14 78:2	165:11	105:5,7	62:12 , 17	112:18,20
79:21	183:19	125:24	63:2,8,16	113:4
81:20 83:1	267:22,23	132:6,8	66:16 68:5	114:8
84:3 89:20	relatively	133:25	71:3,7,10	195:18
98:19 99:3	106:22	155:3	71:14,19	233:15
102:9	148:13,23	170:13	72:4,10,12	reporter
110:3	relayed	175:8,11	73:5,8,18	1:24 4:9
111:8	35 : 23	193:11	74:4,7,15	6:21 7:12
112:12	relevant	220:17	77:23	8:22 9:18
120:10	69:21	223:2	82:16	42:16
132:23	214:14	267:19	100:8,15	88:18
134:16	reliability	269:11,14	106:11	REPORTER'S
142:9	217:18	269:11,14	126:8	284:3
156:3	220:10		144:5	
	reliable	remove		reporting
161:13		151:22	148:6	68:3 94:9
173:17	53:17	removed	183:11	125:17
174:16	217:8,11	138:23	184:3	133:2
175:10	217:16	214:22	188:19	reports
183:1,10	220:7	rental 33:21	205:13	39:24 40:8
184:7	221:6	repeat 45:1	213:14	42:20 44:9
	1	1	1	1

				333
	İ		l	İ
44:12	47:21	195:16	respect	256:3
45:17 , 17	62:10,11	required	112:10	rest 55:25
46:2,8,13	62:24	23:10 40:2	respond	185:23
46:16	63:16	44:17 45:2	10:17	251:5
47:12 , 24	65 : 14	52:19 53:8	responded	restart
48:15 49:5	69:14	53:8	81:12	20:15,17
49:7,9,12	77 : 18	165:18	95:19 98:9	20:18,22
49:13,17	92:13	187:3	response 6:2	20:22
49:18 60:1	104:2	190:6,12	34:16	21:13
60:3,4,6	113:8,13	190:17	61:18	23:10
62:20	113:22,23	193:22	62:23,25	restarted
71:18,20	114:5	195:6,13	64:12,15	21:12
72:5 74:1	153:23	224:20	88:4,6	restrained
77:16	200:18	requirem	95:16 96:8	160:5
120:8	212:14	229:5,18	97:21	restrict
125:20,22	215:8,9,12	requires	98:11,20	44:24 45:4
126:2	228:10	51:17	100:4	45:10
183:4	263:4	research	113:22	158:5
259:19	requested	223:21	114:11	restriction
	15:14	resident		65:1
262:18,20			responses	
262:21	47:15	25:19	10:1 63:20	restrict
263:2,5,13	102:24	28:16	96:2 97:18	61:3,9
263:18	115:23	266:16,25	127:23	65:2
represent	156:10	269:11	responsi	restrictive
256:18	162:9	resolution	27:22	48:21
represen	172:4,7	155:20	41:12	result 47:21
107:24	181:6	resolve	44:24 45:5	133:2
represen	182:8,9,15	246:21	119:17	149:2
43:16	201:12	resolved	143:13	151:16
55 : 15	208:10	21:8	196:6	220:10
159:15,17	219:6	271:23	225:23	resulted
represen	requesting	resource	231:18	177 : 22
69:17	109:23	50:19 53:1	256:24	179:25
159:14	113:15	53:10	257:3,4,6	267:16
171 : 25	197:4	257 : 20	257 : 14	resulting
represented	253 : 20	258:1,8,21	261:24	62:5
43:17	268:11	259:3	262:12	results
161:1	requests	260:18,21	266:18	40:22
represen	49:17	260:24	279:7,11	42:25 63:4
9:15 107:9	161:9	261:3	279 : 19	85:11,23
280:3	227:12	262:11	responsible	91:21 92:9
represents	250:13	resources	15 : 9	92:14
107:17	require 23:2	50:21 51:3	181:15,16	99:24
117:14,24	30:23	53:11,12	191:24	144:12
132:18	50:16	53:12 88:3	261:5,18	187:1,23
request 5:17	167:3	200:4	responsive	189:20
				=====================================

191:10	166:5	147.04	66.14	120.12 15
		147:24	66:14	128:12,15
213:25	191:2	153:23	68:24 69:1	129:13,17
243:19	195:25	214:25	70:6 73:25	130:20
resume 11:22	205:1	revisit	74:2 76:16	131:10,13
11:24	219:6,20	165:20	77:2 , 21	131:23
resurgence	223:6	Richard 1:5	78:15	132:1,4,20
176:15	241:25	7:4	79:23 80:2	133:21
retaining	260:2	Richardson	80:8 83:7	134:7,18
281:12	270:14	2:3,6,6	84:20 85:9	136:1,8,12
retention	reviewed	7:19,20	87:19	136:24,25
120:8	45:9,11	106:16,19	88:11 , 20	137:17
retract	110:21	107:13,16	89:1 , 21	138:4,6
208:5,8,24	142:8	170:16,16	91:1,2	139:11
retracts	166:24	170:20	92:10 93:7	140:5,15
209:3,4	178:8	Richmond 3:7	95:4,24	140:19
211:3	189:21	right 12:3,6	96:3,9,12	141:5
retrospect	213:25	13:12	97:22	142:10,21
165:7	230:24	14:20 16:4	99:10	143:3,20
206:17	235:3	17:2 19:7	102:22	143:23
207:2	241:10	19:10	103:7	144:4,8,13
reveal 194:1	244:22	21:19 22:1	104:8	144:25
revealed	247:5	22:9,16,23	105:4	147:12,18
98:1 192:5	252:16	23:12,15	107:8	148:5,9,19
192:7,10	reviewers	25:12,13	107.8	149:20
272:8	191:21	28:6 31:2	109:15	150:18
revelation	reviewing	31:18,23	110:7,25	151:10
97:16	40:12,16	31:25 32:7	111:17	153:10
review 25:24	56:15	35:16	112:3	154:3,7
40:7,19,20	254:24	38:12,21	113:20	155:12,25
40:22	reviews	39:1,6	114:2,22	156:6
42:22	20:13	40:9 41:7	115:10,13	158:7,12
44:17,22	110:4	41:12,18	116:6,19	159:2,3
45:3 46:10	revise 149:6	42:2 43:5	117:9	161:10,23
48:12	revised 98:8	44:1 45:15	118:16	162:19
60:12,18	108:20	45:18	119:9,15	163:22
60:19 64:5	109:14,20	49:22,25	119:21,25	164:13,16
76:2 85:21	111:3,8,16	54:5,13	121:19	166:18
86:20	129:24	56:13	122:21	172:20,24
103:15	134:11	57:17 , 18	123:7	173:10,13
105:15	139:23	57:17,18	124:23	173:10,13
110:1,6,7	155:23	58:10,14	125:5,12	174:7
110:11,13	revision	58:18,20	125:15	176:16,20
110:16	168:10,15	59:1,7,14	126:3,14	176:25
139:16,18	168:18	59:17,18	126:18	177:11,22
157:10,22	revisions	59:21 61:6	127:6,7,17	178:2,11
158:2,3	74:7,9	63:13	127:21,25	179:11
	1	1	1	1

				333
180:1,7,17	241:16	122:1	73:12,14	36:8,25
182:11,12	245:4,15	run 18:18	94:6	37:25 38:3
183:2	246:3	260:10	152:17	38:10 39:6
	248:9	Rush 3:10	179:17	39:22 60:8
184:17				
186:20	251:13	8:5	203:20,22	60:12,15
188:2,13	252:14	S	207:21	61:18 62:9
190:1,3	255:16	S-O-U-L-T	228:17	62:21 64:5
192:21	260:15	42:18	242:11	64:12 65:4
193:4	266:9		249:3	65:6 67:8
194:22,24	268:13,20	safety 12:24	263:12	72:24
195:9	272:6	13:7 14:4	281:2,4	73:13,15
196:1,21	275:3	20:13	says 39:18	73:23 75:5
197:21	279:22	saga 22:17	113:18	76:2,7,10
198:21	281:17	Santee 3:9	130:9	76:24 77:1
199:25	rights	8:5 25:18	199:4	77:24 78:7
200:12	280:20	75:4,13	203:9	78:11 79:6
202:16,20	rigorous	77:24	249:4	80:1 81:24
205:17	222:14,16	101:17,25	270:2	85:19 87:7
207:23	RILEY 3:10	102:1	275:13	87:19
208:11	risk 49:6	159:15	SC 2:4,7,10	88:10
209:3,10	143:22	180:3	2:15,23	90:10
210:18	160:16	184:6	3:2,11,17	97 : 25
211:6	161:17	272:13	3:22	98:19
212:11,15	200:16	273:5	SCANA 1:11	100:25
213:11,12	risk-red	275:6	1:11,20	101:20
214:4,16	177:2	Sargent	2:16,22	104:2
216:7,13	risks 160:21	14:17,20	8:14,15,18	105:16
217:9	ROBINSON	14:21 17:8	8:20 9:15	107:17,23
218:6,22	3:16	18:5,19	35:1 36:7	108:20
219:25	Rock 3:2	21:9 25:15	36:25	110:2
220:8	role 15:3	53:21 54:2	37:24 38:3	111:2
221:7,15	27:14 31:1	54:18 55:7	38:9 39:6	113:24
221:24	40:6,15	55:12	107:17,23	118:4,6
223:5	41:7	80:18 86:3	275:11	119:18
224:8	278:19	154:19,20	SCANA/SCE&G	120:9,22
226 : 2	roll-out	154:24	32:9	122:7
229:20	273 : 8	232:20	SCARBOROUGH	127:23
231:6,18	rolls 261:21	233:24	3:10	132:13,18
231:22,24	261:24	save 119:4	SCE 239:10	132:23
232:4,24	Roman 89:4	saved 118:25	254:3	133:19
233:2	room 7:22	saw 97:18,20	SCE&G 5:10	134:10,20
234:2,15	33:21 51:6	211:7	5:16 6:2,9	134:22
235:12	roughly 58:1	222:6	8:16,18,20	138:20
236:9	58:2 166:5	230:1	9:15 32:5	140:14
237:15,24	rules 9:13	264:3	32:11	143:1,14
240:21	rulings	saying 73:4	34:16 35:1	144:16
		l	I .	

				330
145:20,25	229:9	214:12	130:19	208:23
146:18	231:15	221:13	131:20	209:5,9,14
147:18	234:21	248:5	134:11,23	209:16,16
148:1	240:5,16	283:1	139:5,8,15	209:17,18
149:5,23	240:20	schedule	139:17,18	209:24
149:25	241:8	40:17 41:5	139:23,25	210:4,7,11
150:5			·	
	242:12,15	48:15,18 48:20	147:7,25 148:5,11	210:15,15
151:9,18	244:4		•	210:22
152:2,17	245:3,11	49:21	149:2,11	211:4,25
152:24	245:12,14	50:12,20	149:24	212:2
153:22	246:6	51:12,17	150:2,4	213:7
158:3,18	247:2,3,9	51:19,21	151:4	214:12,19
158:24	249:2	51:22,24	152:18,22	214:22,23
159:1,20	250:9	52:3,5,10	153:24	214:24,25
161:9	255:21	52:12,14	155:24	215:4,17
169:4	257:3,14	52:15,16	157:11,23	215:24
171:17	260:7	52:19,24	158:2,3	216:10,11
174:2,22	261:5,17	52:24 53:1	160:13,14	216:16,19
176:5,22	262:2	53:2,9,10	161:13,15	216:20,23
178:9	265:6	53:16,17	161:23	217:5,7,8
180:6	266:20,24	53:23,24	162:2,9	217:11,15
181:1,15	266:25	54:7,14	183:14,16	217:22
181:16	267:6	55:3 , 8	187:14,15	218:4,9,11
183:13	268:9,24	56:10	190:12	218:16,17
184:6,8,11	269:7	59:11,25	196:10,11	219:19,24
187:7	271:16	63:23,24	196:15,17	220:6,7,11
189:7	272:3,19	64:4 76:12	196:20,24	220:23
191:24	276:12,17	76:13,20	197:9,13	221:10,15
197:4,7,18	278:19,23	76:21,24	198:6,6,9	221:23,25
201:8	279:2,7,11	77:2,4,12	198:12,16	222:4,4,9
202:3,7	280:19,20	77:13,14	198:18	222:12
204:2,21	281:2,12	77:14,18	199:11,17	223:11
205:2	281:14	77:19	200:5,17	224:5,16
207:17	282:3,13	103:22	200:25	224:21,23
208:18	282:17	108:21	201:8,18	225:4,6,10
209:6	285:2	109:14,20	201:20	225:11,15
210:12,17	SCE&G's	111:4,7,16	202:9,19	225:17,19
212:7	83:14	111:17,23	203:11,24	225:23
214:18,22	86:20 96:1	113:1	204:4,11	226:1,7,12
215:4,8,10	180:25	114:6,22	204:21,25	226:13,14
216:1,6,12	182:7,11	115:7,8	205:16,20	226:22
220:14,23	194:14	117:5	205:22	227:2,7,12
221:10,16	196:6	118:3	206:2,7,11	227:18
226:5,10	206:6	120:19	206:24	228:3,4,18
226:25	211:11	128:8	207:6,18	229:9
227:11	212:14	130:7,11	208:1,7,10	231:10,13
	<u> </u>	l .		

				337
001 14 17	100 01	106.05	100.16	010 01 00
231:14,17	122:21	186:25	100:16	219:21,22
231:20	131:12	187:9,11	101:7	239:12
232:2,10	148:3	189:10	105:9,11	seldom
233:16	149:6,7	190:25	111:5,11	130:10
234:4,5,7	183:15	191:1,20	112:18	selected
234:14,21	184:7	214:10	113:11	25:11
235:1	197:1,15	248:19	120:6,11	selecting
244:25	197:19 , 23	SCORS 254:14	121:7,25	213:17
246:15	197:23	Scott 5:19	122:11	selective
247:23,24	198:2,7	5:22 27:10	123:11	78:18
247:25	217:24,25	27:12 , 12	124:10,19	selectively
248:3	220:24	66:16,20	128:10,23	110:11
249:2,3	262:22	67:17 68:1	129:2,7	send 26:25
251:19,24	275:14	68:17	131:3	sending
252:19,24	scheduling	69:14 94:3	133:4	129:6
253:6	48:16,25	94:9,18	137:5	senior15:6
257:18 , 21	49:24	95:8,13	141:2,10	55:14,18
258:1,9,12	53:12,22	96:5,7	143:5	55 : 22
258:17,22	55:23	97:5 120:6	151 : 25	57 : 16
259:15	57 : 10	125:11,18	152:21	58:17 67:5
260:8,11	71:19	125:20	163:14	67:8,9,24
260:14,21	128:2	129:1,4	170:3,15	189:16
260:25	153:5	133:1,14	181:8	282:17
261:1,12	209:23,25	136:6	216:18	sense 55:10
261:18	210:25	144:12	224:25	255:20,24
262:4,6,13	211:1	159 : 18	239:17	273:6
262:13	215:14,19	172:5	249:17	sensitivity
263:7,19	215:19	193:8	258:1	5:10 86:21
273:8	216:22	Scott143	260:22	87:7,18,22
scheduled	220:6	6:12	262:5	140:13,17
275:16	223:15,17	second 72:8	265:1	140:21
scheduler	230:6	98:6 111:1	seeing 47:7	141:9
55:16	234:7	122:6	47:10	162:18
153:5	259:19	136:16	78:13	170:8,12
schedulers	260:11	169:25	seek 228:19	Sensitiv
53:13 55:2	261:7,10	205:14	seeking	6:10
55:18,20	280:9	251:24	150:7	sent 98:8
55:22 56:1	scope 39:13	252:24	151:9	254:2
57:14	60:18	section 89:4	153:9,13	255:21
58:16,17	85:11	121:17	seeks 245:15	269:12
152:25	88:13	126:11	seen 40:4	sentence
schedules	89:14 93:8	237:17	74:8 83:20	117:20
50:5,7	97:12	see 11:17	94:5,6	124:7
75:25 76:1	99:25	13:21 22:4	179:15	128:6
76:10 78:2	100:17	31:9 38:14	214:21	130:17
117:12,23	185:21	78:10	219:8,16	136:16
111.12,23	100.21	70.10	217.0,10	100.10
L				

147:24					330
163:11 138:22, 17 269:16 192:11 34:3 273:1 146:18,20 Shirk 5:12 216:5 33:6 35:25 275:11 146:23 Shirk 5:12 216:5 36:6 36:6 separate 150:10,11 63:13 243:2 simply 90:2 243:2 196:3 156:22 99:3 100:2 significant 72:15 242:22 256:5 162:3,15 shop 265:22 51:18 72:15 72:15 256:6 173:3 shop 265:22 100:16 87:24 72:15 256:6 173:3 short-56:22 117:3 250:6,12 36:12 96:14 224:4 268:13 10:16 87:24 5inkler 4:5 5	147.24	6.8 135.16	267.18	192.1 5 6	simplified
270:2 138:22 269:16 195:19,22 simplify 275:11 146:18,20 Shirk5:12 216:5 33:6 35:25 separate 150:10,11 63:13 243:2 simply 90:2 196:3 156:22 99:3 100:2 43:1,2,3 simple 42:11 215:2 159:4 90:15 92:2 significant 72:15 242:22 256:5 162:3,15 267:3 100:16 87:24 50:16 87:24 50:16 87:24 50:16 87:24 50:16 87:24 50:16 87:24 50:16 87:24 50:16 88:13 104:19 109:5,7 72:15 72:15 36:12 50:6,12 117:3 250:6,12 267:16 87:24 50:24 268:10 106:22 123:17 5inkler 4:5 52:25 160:16 87:24 50:24 50:24 50:24 50:24 50:24 50:24 130:19 36:12 50:24 50:24 130:19 130:19 50:24 50:24 50:24 50:24					_
273:1 146:18,20 Shirk 5:12 216:5 33:6 35:25 275:11 146:23 Shirk 9:3:1 225:6 36:6 separate 150:10,11 63:13 243:2 simply 90:2 196:3 156:22 99:3 100:2 43:1,2,3 simple 42:11 256:5 162:3,15 shop 265:22 51:18 72:15 separated 172:23 268:1 100:16 87:24 separately 160:23,15 shop 265:22 117:3 250:6,12 separately 180:16 68:13 118:7 single 42:11 63:12 seven 218:22 106:22 123:17 sir 59:22 96:14 224:4 268:10 106:22 123:17 sir 59:22 27:17 september 11:9 179:1 269:24,25 short-term 132:11 sister 17:6 218:6 serious 27:10 35:19,19 36:12 264:1 191:4 27:16 21:11,1,14 shortened 19:14,9;11 227:10 278:14		•			
275:11 146:23 Shirley 63:1 225:6 36:6 simply 90:2 243:2 simply 90:2 242:22 242:11 30:10 30:10 30:10 30:10 30:10 30:10 30:10 30:10 30:10 30:11 30:10 30:11 30:11 30:11 30:11 30:11 30:11 30:11 30:10 30:10 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>					
separate 150:10,11 63:13 243:2 simply 90:2 242:22 242:22 242:21 242:21 243:1,2,3 single 42:11 72:15 243:1,2,3 35:18 72:15 243:1,2,3 72:15 243:1,2,3 35:18 72:15 243:1,2,3 72:15 243:1,2,3 35:18 72:15 243:2 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:2 243:2 243:2 243:2 243:2 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 243:1 <					
71:18 150:12 90:15 92:2 significant 242:22 single 42:11 196:3 156:22 99:3 100:2 43:1, 2, 3 2single 42:11 256:5 162:3,15 267:3 100:16 87:24 separated 172:23 268:1 100:16 87:24 256:6 173:3 short56:22 117:3 250:6,12 separately 180:16 68:13 118:7 sinkler 4:5 3:12 96:14 224:4 212:22 124:17,22 69:24 September 11:9 179:1 269:24,25 short-term 130:10 sister 17:6 273:17,21 several 130:10 135:7 sit34:15 273:17,21 several 130:10 135:7 sit34:15 2818:6 5annon shorten 145:14 141:25 218:6 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 38:11,1,14 41:7 share 44:15 145:14 147:14 229:22 28:18 44:16,19			_		
196:3 156:22 99:3 100:2 43:1,2,3 single 42:11 215:2 159:4 shop 265:22 51:18 72:15 256:5 162:3,15 267:3 100:16 87:24 separated 172:23 268:1 104:19 109:5,7 256:6 173:3 short 56:22 117:3 250:6,12 separately 180:16 68:13 118:7 250:6,12 separately 180:16 68:13 118:7 sinkler 4:5 separately 268:10 267:15 130:9 267:16 sitsplendber 268:10 267:15 130:9 267:16 273:17,21 several 30:10 35:7 5it 34:15 218:6 Shannon shorten 145:14 141:25 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 seriously 171:1 shorten 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:4,9,11 227:10 24:111,1,1	_				
215:2 159:4 shop 265:22 51:18 72:15 256:5 162:3,15 267:3 100:16 87:24 256:6 173:3 short 56:22 117:3 250:6,12 separately 180:16 68:13 118:7 Sinkler 4:5 63:12 seven 218:22 106:22 123:17 sir 59:22 96:14 224:4 212:22 124:17,22 69:24 September 268:10 267:15 130:9 267:16 273:17,21 several 35:10 sister17:6 273:17,21 several 130:10 sister17:6 218:6 Shannon shorten 135:7 sit34:15 28:13 35:19,19 shortened 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 229:22 seriously 171:1 shorten 197:12 230:8 21:11,14 22:18 44:16,19 shortly 202:7 240:18 22:18 45:7,12				_	
256:5 162:3,15 267:3 100:16 87:24 256:6 173:3 268:1 104:19 109:5,7 separately 180:16 68:13 118:7 250:6,12 separately 180:16 68:13 118:7 Sinkler 4:5 63:12 26:10 267:15 123:17 69:24 September 11:9 179:1 269:24,25 short-term 130:9 267:16 11:9 179:1 269:24,25 short-term 130:10 35:7 5it 34:15 series 112:6 270:17 shorted 37:9 137:2 70:18 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 132:23 35:19,19 278:14 190:23 168:8 seriously 171:1 shortened 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 221:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 221:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 221:1					_
separated 172:23 268:1 104:19 109:5,7 separately 180:16 short 56:22 117:3 250:6,12 separately seven 218:22 106:22 123:17 sinkler 4:5 96:14 224:4 212:22 124:17,22 69:24 September 269:24,25 short-term 130:9 267:16 273:17,21 several short-term 132:11 sister17:6 218:6 Shannon shorted 37:9 137:2 70:18 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 132:23 35:19,19 shortened 191:49,911 227:10 28si 36:12 shorter 197:12 230:8 211:11,14 44:16,19 shorter 197:12 230:8 221:11,11,14 44:23 45:3 shortly 202:7 240:18 served 30:5 share 44:3 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 36wm 249:10 274:1,8			_		
256:6 173:3 short 56:22 117:3 250:6,12 separately 63:12 seven 218:22 68:13 118:7 Sinkler 4:5 96:14 seven 218:22 106:22 123:17 sir 59:22 September 268:10 269:24,25 short-term 130:9 267:16 273:17,21 several 30:10 33:17 sista4:15 218:6 Shannon shorted 37:9 137:2 70:18 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 32:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 222:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 222:10 32:11 11:1 shortened 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 222:1 41:7 share 44:15 shorter 197:12 230:8 22:18 44:23,45:3 45:7,12 265:8 20:3 20:7 240:18 22:18 42:2:18 42:2:1 265:2		· ·			
separately 180:16 68:13 118:7 Sinkler 4:5 96:14 224:4 106:22 123:17 69:24 September 268:10 267:15 130:19 269:24 11:9 179:1 269:24,25 short-term 132:11 sister 17:6 273:17,21 several shorted 37:9 137:2 70:18 218:6 Shannon shorted 37:9 137:2 70:18 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 132:23 35:19,19 264:1 191:14 229:22 seriously 171:1 shortened 191:49,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 shortened 191:49,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 shortened 191:49,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 shortly 201:3,5 231:3 211:11,14 44:16,19 21:4 202:7 240:18 228:12,17 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 28xivicenit:	_				· ·
63:12 96:14 seven 218:22 224:4 106:22 212:22 123:17 24:17,22 69:24 267:16 September 11:9 179:1 273:17,21 269:24,25 several short-term 132:11 130:10 sitser 17:6 sit 34:15 Series 112:6 218:6 Shannon shorten 135:7 sit 34:15 Serious 228:13 27:10 36:12 shortened 191:14 125 168:8 168:8 228:13 seriously 228:13 36:12 shortened 191:14 229:22 222:10 41:7 share 44:15 21:11,14 42:18 44:16,19 44:16,19 44:23 45:3 44:16,19 20:13,5 23:13 201:3,5 23:13 240:18 site 5:23 228:12 8 228:12,17 56 58ared 44:3 51 21:14 22:14 214:14 22:15 202:7 10 23:13 225:18 228:12,17 56 58ared 44:3 51 21:14 22:14:14 51 21:14 22:14:14 51 24:15 23:13 32:13 225:18 228:12,17 56 265:2 8 12:14 52:1					· ·
96:14 224:4 268:10 267:15 130:9 267:16 11:9 179:1 269:24,25 short-term 132:11 sister17:6 273:17,21 several 130:10 135:7 sit 34:15 series 112:6 270:17 shorted 37:9 137:2 70:18 218:6 Shannon shorten 145:14 141:25 3228:13 36:12 278:14 190:23 168:8 3228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 229:22 seriously 171:1 shorter 197:12 230:8 41:7 share 44:15 218:19 201:3,5 231:3 221:11,1,14 44:16,19 218:19 201:3,5 231:3 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 64:7,35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 served 30:5 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 22:1,8,11 253:1 36ws169:25 267:24 42:2,3					
September 268:10 267:15 130:9 267:16 11:9 179:1 269:24,25 short-term 132:11 sister17:6 273:17,21 several 270:17 shorted 37:9 137:2 70:18 218:6 Shannon shorten 145:14 141:25 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 132:23 35:19,19 shortened 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 44:15 shorter 197:12 230:8 211:11,14 44:16,19 21:14 201:3,5 231:3 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 267:24 42:2,3					
11:9 179:1 269:24,25 short-term 132:11 sister 17:6 273:17,21 several 270:17 shorted 37:9 135:7 70:18 218:6 Shannon shorten 145:14 141:25 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 132:23 35:19,19 264:1 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 229:22 seriously 171:1 shorter 197:12 230:8 41:7 share 44:15 218:19 201:3,5 231:3 221:18 44:16,19 shortly 202:7 240:18 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 40:2 70:5 273:9 shown 249:10 274:1,8 44:15,16 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9					
273:17,21 series 112:6 270:17 shorted 37:9 137:2 570:18 218:6 Shannon shorted 37:9 145:14 141:25 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 229:22 seriously 171:1 shorter 197:12 230:8 41:7 share 44:15 shorter 197:12 230:8 211:11,14 44:16,19 shortly 202:7 240:18 225:18 44:23 45:3 shortly 202:7 240:18 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 served 30:5 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 22:1,8,11 253:1 shown 249:10 signific 44:15,16 22:1,8,11 265:12 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 <th>_</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	_				
series 112:6 270:17 shorted 37:9 137:2 70:18 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 132:23 35:19,19 shortened 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:4,9,11 227:10 seriously 41:7 share 44:15 shorter 197:12 230:8 41:7 share 44:15 shortly 202:7 240:18 221:11,14 44:16,19 shortly 202:7 240:18 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 served 30:5 shared 44:3 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 265:2 27:24 42:2,3 40:2 70:5 167:1 265:2 shown 249:10 signific 44:19,23 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 216;6 similar14:7 64:22 65:3					
218:6 Shannon shorten 145:14 141:25 serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 132:23 35:19,19 shortened 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 229:22 seriously 171:1 shorter 197:12 230:8 41:7 share 44:15 218:19 201:3,5 231:3 211:11,14 44:16,19 shortly 202:7 240:18 212:18 44:23,45:3 shortly 202:7 240:18 225:18 45:7,12 shortly 214:14 site5:23 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7,35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 20:4 39:22,23 service11:5 167:1 265:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 service11:5 273:9 shows 169:25 signific 44:15,16 40:2 70:5 Shaw 265:11 22:6,8 151:16 45:12 10:2 8	1				
serious 27:10 278:14 190:23 168:8 132:23 35:19,19 264:1 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 229:22 seriously 171:1 shorter 197:12 230:8 41:7 share 44:15 218:19 201:3,5 231:3 211:11,14 44:16,19 3hortly 202:7 240:18 212:18 44:23 45:3 39:14 site5:23 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:15,16 40:2 70:5 273:9 121:6,8 151:16 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 22:6,7 similar 14:7 64:22 65:3 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 services 38					
132:23 35:19,19 shortened 191:4,9,11 227:10 228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 229:22 seriously 171:1 shorter 197:12 230:8 41:7 share 44:15 218:19 201:3,5 231:3 211:11,14 44:16,19 shortly 202:7 240:18 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 served 30:5 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 267:24 42:2,3 14:2 21:25 238:10 shown 249:10 274:1,8 44:15,16 22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:19,23 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:3,7,9 108:24 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheet 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 services 38:2 263:11,15 signed 285:8 150:16,19					
228:13 36:12 264:1 191:14 229:22 seriously 41:7 share 44:15 218:19 201:3,5 231:3 211:11,14 44:16,19 shortly 202:7 240:18 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 served 30:5 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 267:24 42:2,3 14:2 21:25 238:10 shown 249:10 274:1,8 44:15,16 22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:19,23 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 257:10 shield 37:24 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding signific 176:7 104:12 38:7 176:2 233:21					
seriously171:1shorter197:12230:841:7share 44:15218:19201:3,5231:3211:11,1444:16,19shortly202:7240:18225:1844:23 45:391:14214:14site 5:23228:12,17265:8120:4220:439:22,23served 30:5shared 44:3144:2265:441:17 42:1service 11:5167:1265:2267:2442:2,314:2 21:25238:10shows 169:25274:1,844:15,1622:1,8,11253:1shows 169:25signific44:19,2340:2 70:5273:9shut 20:19126:1345:3,7,9108:24Shaw 265:1122:6,7similar 14:764:22 65:3171:17Sheet 6:22shutdown20:15 99:765:6 67:2248:6sheets 266:123:7127:2267:3,12257:10shield 37:24sign 225:12128:1468:14services38:2283:15133:1388:24 92:430:20263:11,15Signed 285:8150:16,19101:14session 66:1shieldingsigned-off176:7104:12set 118:738:7176:2233:21105:17145:8shipmentsignificsimilarly125:15145:8shipmentsignificsimilarly125:15125:15190:3,20154:19126:17		•			
41:7 share 44:15 218:19 201:3,5 231:3 211:11,14 44:16,19 shortly 202:7 240:18 212:18 44:23 45:3 91:14 214:14 site 5:23 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 served 30:5 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 267:24 42:2,3 14:2 21:25 238:10 shown 249:10 274:1,8 44:15,16 22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:19,23 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 15:16 45:12 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 session 66:1 shielding signed-off 176:7 104:12 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>					
211:11,14 44:16,19 shortly 202:7 240:18 212:18 44:23 45:3 91:14 214:14 site 5:23 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 served 30:5 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 267:24 42:2,3 14:2 21:25 238:10 shown 249:10 274:1,8 44:15,16 22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:19,23 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 session 66:1 shielding signed-off 176:7 104:12 set 118:7 38:7 176:2 233:21 105:17	_				
212:18 44:23 45:3 91:14 214:14 site 5:23 225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 served 30:5 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 267:24 42:2,3 14:2 21:25 238:10 shown 249:10 274:1,8 44:15,16 22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:19,23 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 140:23 265:12,14 22:6,7 similar 14:7 64:22 65:3 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 session 66:1 shielding signed-off 176:7 104:12 set 118:7 38:7 176:2 233:21 105				· ·	
225:18 45:7,12 show 88:16 216:5 6:4,7 35:1 228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 served 30:5 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 267:24 42:2,3 14:2 21:25 238:10 shown 249:10 274:1,8 44:15,16 22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:19,23 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 257:10 shield 37:24 sign 225:12 128:14 68:14 services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 session 66:1 shielding signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 set 118:7 38:7 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly <	•	•	_		
228:12,17 265:8 120:4 220:4 39:22,23 served 30:5 shared 44:3 144:2 265:4 41:17 42:1 service 11:5 167:1 265:2 267:24 42:2,3 14:2 21:25 238:10 shown 249:10 274:1,8 44:15,16 22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:19,23 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 140:23 265:12,14 22:6,7 similar 14:7 64:22 65:3 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 257:10 shield 37:24 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 145:8 shipment 190:3,20 154:19		44:23 45:3	91:14	214:14	site 5:23
served 30:5shared 44:3144:2265:441:17 42:1service 11:5167:1265:2267:2442:2,314:2 21:25238:10shown 249:10274:1,844:15,1622:1,8,11253:1shows 169:25signific44:19,2340:2 70:5273:9shut 20:19126:1345:3,7,9108:24Shaw 265:1121:6,8151:1645:12140:23265:12,1422:6,7similar 14:764:22 65:3171:17Sheet 6:22shutdown20:15 99:765:6 67:2248:6sheets 266:123:7127:2267:3,12257:10shield 37:24sign 225:12128:1468:14services38:2283:15133:1388:24 92:430:20263:11,15Signed 285:8150:16,19101:14set 118:738:7176:2233:21105:17145:8shipmentsignificsimilarly125:15284:1830:23190:3,20154:19126:17		*			*
service 11:5167:1265:2267:2442:2,314:2 21:25238:10shown 249:10274:1,844:15,1622:1,8,11253:1shows 169:25signific44:19,2340:2 70:5273:9shut 20:19126:1345:3,7,9108:24265:12,1421:6,8151:1645:12140:23265:12,1422:6,7similar 14:764:22 65:3171:17Sheet 6:22shutdown20:15 99:765:6 67:2248:6sheets 266:123:7127:2267:3,12257:10shield 37:24sign 225:12128:1468:14services38:2283:15133:1388:24 92:430:20263:11,15Signed 285:8150:16,19101:14set 118:738:7176:2233:21105:17145:8shipment176:2233:21105:17284:1830:23190:3,20154:19126:17	•	265:8			· ·
14:2 21:25 238:10 shown 249:10 274:1,8 44:15,16 22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:19,23 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 140:23 265:12,14 22:6,7 similar 14:7 64:22 65:3 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 shield 37:24 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 257:10 shield 37:24 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	served30:5	shared44:3	144:2	265:4	41:17 42:1
22:1,8,11 253:1 shows 169:25 signific 44:19,23 40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 140:23 265:12,14 22:6,7 similar 14:7 64:22 65:3 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 257:10 shield 37:24 sign 225:12 128:14 68:14 30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17		167:1	265:2	267:24	42:2,3
40:2 70:5 273:9 shut 20:19 126:13 45:3,7,9 108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 140:23 265:12,14 22:6,7 similar 14:7 64:22 65:3 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 257:10 shield 37:24 sign 225:12 128:14 68:14 services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 38:7 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	14:2 21:25	238:10	shown 249:10	274:1,8	44:15,16
108:24 Shaw 265:11 21:6,8 151:16 45:12 140:23 265:12,14 22:6,7 similar 14:7 64:22 65:3 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 257:10 shield 37:24 sign 225:12 128:14 68:14 services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	22:1,8,11	253:1	shows 169:25	signific	44:19,23
140:23 265:12,14 22:6,7 similar 14:7 64:22 65:3 171:17 Sheet 6:22 shutdown 20:15 99:7 65:6 67:2 248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 257:10 shield 37:24 sign 225:12 128:14 68:14 services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 30:20 263:11,15 signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	40:2 70:5	273:9	shut 20:19	126:13	45:3,7,9
171:17Sheet 6:22shutdown20:15 99:765:6 67:2248:6sheets 266:123:7127:2267:3,12257:10shield 37:24sign 225:12128:1468:14services38:2283:15133:1388:24 92:430:20263:11,15Signed 285:8150:16,19101:14session 66:1shieldingsigned-off176:7104:12set 118:738:7176:2233:21105:17145:8shipmentsignificsimilarly125:15284:1830:23190:3,20154:19126:17	108:24	Shaw 265:11	21:6,8	151:16	45:12
248:6 sheets 266:1 23:7 127:22 67:3,12 257:10 shield 37:24 sign 225:12 128:14 68:14 services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	140:23	265:12,14	22:6,7	similar 14:7	64:22 65:3
257:10 shield 37:24 sign 225:12 128:14 68:14 services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	171:17	Sheet 6:22	shutdown	20:15 99:7	65:6 67:2
services 38:2 283:15 133:13 88:24 92:4 30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding 176:7 104:12 set 118:7 38:7 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	248:6	sheets 266:1	23:7	127:22	67:3 , 12
30:20 263:11,15 Signed 285:8 150:16,19 101:14 session 66:1 shielding 176:7 104:12 set 118:7 38:7 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	257:10	shield 37:24	sign 225:12	128:14	68:14
session 66:1 shielding signed-off 176:7 104:12 set 118:7 38:7 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	services	38:2	283:15	133:13	88:24 92:4
session 66:1 shielding signed-off 176:7 104:12 set 118:7 38:7 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	30:20	263:11,15	Signed 285:8	150:16,19	101:14
set 118:7 38:7 176:2 233:21 105:17 145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	session 66:1	•			104:12
145:8 shipment signific similarly 125:15 284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	set 118:7	_		233:21	
284:18 30:23 190:3,20 154:19 126:17	145:8	shipment	signific	similarly	125:15
		_		_	
			The state of the s		
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				339
100 0 10	l	l		1
133:2,10	Smith 3:10	234:20	84:2,6,10	168:5
144:6,12	5:12 8:5,5	239:9	84:14,18	230:22
159:12,13	43:18	272:14	84:22 85:6	speaking
261:23	62:11 63:1	277:11	85:16	133:16
268:19,25	63:1,10	sorry 11:25	99:18	150:23
270:23	77:9 80:7	13:19	135:20,24	special
sited 272:23	81:1,1,19	14:24 17:4	136:8	30:23
sitting 48:3	81:24	18:8 33:5	193:6	specialt
112:22	82:10 83:6	42:16 49:2	Soult's	49:18
situated1:7	85:13	62:8 68:17	83:21	specific
situation	86:19	71:15	sound 40:9	32:18
21:17	90:15 , 24	75:17 87:6	48:25	33:13
126:23	92:2,13,25	87:8 90:8	sounds 95:25	49:15 66:8
six 21:22	99:3 100:2	96:22	sources	75:8,10,12
53:25 54:5	154:10	110:15	62 : 25	76:10 83:4
55:9 56:4	194:19	115:20	South 1:1,10	91:15
59:9 130:7	243:14	117:17	1:12,14,19	92:15
130:13,14	Smith's	130:12	2:12,16	95:20
131:19	62 : 23	147:22	3:14,19,21	113:19
132:9	software	150:11,14	4:6 7:5,8	117:15
209:12	48:16,19	157:25	7:10,24	129:3,9
six-year	48:24,25	172:2,18	8:10 25:16	133:23
13:10	49:4,21	202:14	25 : 19	148:16
skeptical	259:25	203:20	28:16	168:6,8
200:11,15	260:3,5,8	237:10,12	31:21 39:4	174 : 24
skilled	260:10,10	273:19	69:4 70:5	181:24
136:19	sole 151:7	274:19	75 : 14	207:25
Skip 62:11	solely 53:20	276:25	105:19	223:18
77:9 80:7	206:22	sort 29:22	124:1	224:12
83:6 90:15	269:11	51:24,25	155 : 2	240:19
92:12,25	solutions	54:2 59:16	156:24	264:15
99:3 100:2	178:1,20	59:20,21	162:7	270 : 22
154:10	solve 267:15	68:3 96:9	163:21	271 : 18
194:19	267:17	97:22	234:18	272:21
243:14,17	somebody	107:14	249:11	specific
skipped	65:17	155:10	252:2	9:21 24:3
237:12	82:13	sorts 151:2	284:1,5	27:9 29:2
skipping	89:12,15	166:11,17	285:23	33:8,10
128:5	244:12	sought 104:2	SPALDING	35:22,24
slide 164:9	someplace	158:6	2:19	39:11
164:10,16	264:11	197:20	span 13:10	61:15,24
169:9,21	somewhat	Soult 42:14	speak 102:3	64:19
slides 164:5	14:7 28:9	42:18 43:3	102:8,11	69:11
slightly	48:20	43:25	102:14	80:21 81:5
14:9	193:9	83:13,18	131:14,15	87:1 91:19
slips 21:19	216:22	83:23,24	166:23	92:18
311p3 21.17	2 + 0 • 2 2	00.20,24	100.25	72.10

				340
05.10	04-1-1-	244.2		221.6.22
95:19	Stable	244:2	statement	231:6,22
103:18	169:23	248:23	36:12	233:21
104:23	stack 11:2	258:25	39:12,15	240:24
107:19	266:2	259:2	118:10	262:9,18
113:17	stacked	start-up	131:15	262:20,21
120:25	208:24	263:24	137:19	263:22
129:7	stacks	264:9	140:8	272:19
133:16,22	168:25	started 12:9	198:11	statutorial
150:23	staff1:14	12:22 13:3	219:16	31:21
172:8	2:12 7:25	31:15	221:1	statutory
174:23	8:2 24:25	47:12	285:7,9	27 : 22
175:11,16	67:6,13,24	65:25 86:7	states	stay 21:7
182:21,22	67:24	92:11	113:25	stayed 263:9
190:22	84:11	125:25	176:16	steam 12:12
232:15	114:25	242:19	275:9	step 189:9
235:19	170:14,14	244:3	stating	Stephen 5:16
237:2	189:16	248:23	107:14	STEPP 3:16
238:1	200:7	255:9	141:14	steps 247:4
243:11,13	269:1	258:20	Station 12:7	249:21
243:15,20	staffing	259:15	status 12:20	Steve 2:13
257:16	46:5 51:1	277:16	12:22	8:1 110:14
261:9	268:5	starts 131:3	17:12,22	Steven
262:17,23	stage 241:6	237:6	18:25 19:2	107:10,11
263:12	stages 13:9	273:2	39:21	Stone 265:5
266:24	14:3 66:24	state 1:1,12	44:10,13	265:10,11
268:7	67:7 , 14	3:21 7:7	45:16,18	265:14
269:9	258:10,19	9:3 14:7	46:2 49:5	stood 84:9
271:9	stand 152:19	113:24	49:10,13	84:23
274:13	160:17,22	144:16	49:17,18	225:15
specificity	161:18	176:22	59:21 66:1	243:16
91:4 101:8	standard	177:24	69:16,21	stop 162:12
specifics	85 : 18	180:24	69:24 89:5	186:22
39:17 78:8	standards	181:8	99:1	188:15
78:20	16:2	182:6	103:10,11	197:2
speculating	standing	203:9	103:14	204:14,23
234:6	77:10	232:7	106:7	271:4
speed 265:20	start 7:22	255:10	117:25	stopped
spell 26:5	11:6 14:5	284:1,5	125:18	105:7
spend 32:12	14:14	stated 83:21	163:17	268:1
spent 33:19	47 : 12	131:12	168:11	stopping
210:10	52:17	132:19	173:6	106:14
spot 254:4	108:21	135:15	187:13,17	stored 266:6
squared	117:22	147:23	206:12	story 172:10
18:21 19:6	125:21	198:1	224:8	strategies
stability	192:2	255:23	229:24	41:3 64:6
144:17	238:18	268:9	230:9	116:22,23
			-3333	,

150.00				
178:20	155:1	138:8	149:12,15	Summarizing
	subcontr	140:11	155:17	136:14
2:19,22	86:12	147:17	157:4	summary 5:22
3:2,6,11	154:25	171:17	189:16	6:4,7,13
	subcontr	175:19,24	208:20	34:6,19
7:10	155:2	183:14	substant	35:15
	subcontr	185:15,17	38:10 53:4	67:15
59:9	148:3	202:22	224:7	68:13
		202:22	success	83:21
strictly 20:14	subject 38:20			
		210:12	124:8	125:14
41:19	145:2	231:2	164:24	129:13
52:17	163:10	254:2	165:5	164:15
strike	168:10,15	258:12	169:22	238:1
155:10	168:18	submitting	successf	240:23
	submit 26:13	105:7	125:1	255:13
structural	26:14 31:7	132:3,5	successor	Summer 5:20
264:20	32:11 34:2	252 : 17	50:13,15	14:7 24:15
265:3	37:9 68:5	283:2	50:17	81:8
266:11	111:23	subpoena	51:11	109:14
structure	146:14	30:5 34:17	52 : 22	160:25
165:6	198:15	253:16 , 19	successors	163:17
177:17	254:21	254 : 6	258:16	176:14
250:25	262:7	256 : 3	sufficient	super 83:11
struggle	283:3	subscribed	52:1,5,24	supervision
129:16 s	submittal	285:22	suggest	236:2
studies 5:11	13:8	subsequent	141:7	supervisors
123:25	113:11	90:18	suggested	235:22
162:18	146:12,19	98:22	85:13	supplement
170:8,12	146:21	subseque	139:22	27:24
study 6:11	212:4	155 : 7	140:18	supply 12:12
123 : 20 s	submittals	214:20	154:10	supplying
142:16	49:14	subset	240:4	151:5
143:5,8 s	submitted	117:10	245:13	support 6:9
169:25	11:9 30:8	Subsidiary	suggesting	12:14 13:5
247:12,15	33:1,16	1:11	41:1 129:7	15:13,13
stuff 171:5	40:5 62:21	substance	226:5,9	84:11
212:9	71:14	63:20 95:2	suggestion	128:8
230:1	87:19 91:7	133:12	88:5	162:2
239:4	105:4,5	164:6	215:13	173:16,21
245:18,18	108:18	233:21	suggests	174:1,6,10
254:25	109:3,24	241:21,22	88:9	174:11,15
sub-folders	109:25	substantial	Suite 3:2	212:14
254:16	110:2,12	103:24	summaries	supported
sub-modules	110:22	136:23	62:20	143:8
147:11	113:9	137:16	263:8	161:9
subcontract	131:22	138:10,25	282:11	196:11
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				342
supposed	table 266:2	265:5	185:6	13:16
supposed 109:22				
	take 9:18	266:11	194:10	15:22
111:19	10:7 12:15	278:9	210:19	18:10 20:7
158:2	21:24	285:4,5	224:11,12	20:8
169:15	26:17	takes 53:15	224:12	136:18
supposedly	50:23,24	209:9	229:2	176:19
249:8	51:2,9	222:21	234:9	tell 10:11
sure 9:20	53:19	223:23,23	237:5,8,20	10:14
10:10 11:7	56:21 58:3	talk 9:25	238:17	27 : 20
14:23	106:22	27:9 64:9	243:12,25	28:25
27:16	145:8	69:8	243:25	45:20
29:22	148:17	101:17,20	250:16	57:11 , 13
56:21	162:21	102:1	261:3,9,13	80:14
64:10	180:23	153:2	266:10	89:13
68:19 73:9	187:5,13	169:1	task 28:2	104:10
78 : 23	187:14	177:5 , 17	29:5 33:18	108:16
110:7	195:6,13	213:4	33:19	120:16,25
117:17	195:16	230:18,19	49:15 50:2	125:23
127:21	209:11	280:6,14	50:8,11,12	128:19
148:18	212:21	281:8,9	50:14,16	138:9
167:12	216:24	talked 90:14	50:20,22	154 : 16
170:19,24	225:17	92:12	51:4 54:2	159:11
171:4	226:6,8	108:14	tasked	173:8,12
179:2	239:13	156:3	170:20	173:15,20
207:13	244:12	169:24	tasks 29:16	173:13,20
238:18	247:4	205:12	32:18,20	174:4
240:2,18	249:15,21	257:18	50:7	188:15
252:11	253:8	264:16	tax 137:3	192:24
257:25	254:23	269:24	249:13	196:14
	taken 1:19		taxi 33:22	236:24
surprise		talking		
148:8	4:4 7:3,9	19:16	team 21:9	239:2
198:12	56:25	24:17	42:25 43:8	242:5,7
257:17	107:1	38:23 48:6	43:8,16,19	243:1,3,15
272:15	120:21	50:14,15	43:24 44:1	262:22
surprised	161:18	53:21	53:22	276:19
98:23	163:1	57:10,17	65:11	telling 21:7
swear 8:22	178:9,15	59:24,25	66:14	84:22
sworn 8:25	178:22	87:15	67:18 88:2	91:17 94:2
284:8	179:14	101:5	97:17	132:8
285:22	184:23	110:8,10	193:3	184:24
system 12:13	189:4,6	110:15	teams 86:9	186:8
20:25 26:1	212:25	123:12	technical	228:13
265:20	215:1	157 : 12	121:3	243:21
	227:8	168:22	technician	248:11
T	228:12	178:14 , 18	7:13	ten 11:9
T 3:20	253 : 12	181:25	technology	22:19 52:3
	l	l	I	l

				343
54:3,4	110:5,12	152 : 4	247:19	63:14,15
55:1,9	testimony	153:19,19	247:19	79:1 84:13
56:11	5:8,16	157:4,13	252 : 17	101:6
57:14,17	6:14 11:4	158:15,25		107:4
85:23 89:6		159:7,22	257:19,20 264:16	132:13
	11:12,14	·		
89:11,13	11:23	159:22,23	265:1,6	135:23
99:2 218:5	38:24	171:16	267:23	187:8
ten-year	39:25 40:1	175:25	268:4,9	189:11,23
19:12,13	40:5 70:4	176:7,8,10	269:23	192:9
22:17	70:10,13	176:13	272:23,24	210:22
tension	71:14	177:5	273:23	214:23
271:16	72:11,25	178:5	276:2	217:3
tenure 43:19	74:11	180:15,24	277:18,18	223:14,15
term 22:17	75:11	182:7	278:18	232:17
24:13,21	76:13,22	184:21	280:6,15	236:7,8
277:17	77:1 78:1	185:4,17	280:18,18	241:3
termed 111:3	79:22	185 : 24	281:9	246:24
terms 29:19	83:23 89:1	192:4	283:2,3,4	247:22
30:14,15	91:7,11,12	197:14	284:13	248:3,21
30:16	91:16 94:7	198:1,14	Testimon	250:6 , 12
31:19	102:22	198:23	6:16	251:18 , 23
118:3	103:7,10	199:2	testing 13:9	252:18 , 20
144:24	103:12,13	200:10	17:24	252 : 23
148:13	104:3	201:24	263:24,25	268:20
150:10	106:9	202:2,3,6	264:9,9	269:4
156:22	108:14,17	202:12,15	Texas 155:2	things 20:13
158:19	108:18	202:17,22	155:6	25:25 26:2
162:15	109:3	203:10,13	text 164:16	30:24 36:3
194:3	110:2,8,10	204:5,12	thank 59:23	36:4 41:6
217:14	110:14,20	204:20	88:6 108:7	48:22
251:1	111:13	205:21,23	130:20	50:10 , 25
Terry 2:6	116:12,13	206:9	133:8	54:15 64:9
7:19	116:14	211:10	256:8,9,22	70:21 , 23
106:14	117:1,8	212:10	278:13	71:1,22
testified	119:22	214:11	279:23,24	78 : 18
8:25 112:2	131:22	215:3,21	283:10,11	89:13,17
197:11	132:3,5	219:23	thanked	114:23
218:1	138:8	220:18	84:25	115:4
243:6	140:12	223 : 8	thanks 84:10	121:14,21
245:1	144:2	226 : 25	then-exi	129:12
279:6	146:11,14	231:3	137:16	138:3
testify 40:1	146:20,22	236:16 , 17	theory	139:12
40:1 231:1	146:23,25	240:3	119:18	147:10
244:21,22	148:7,13	242:11,13	thing 9:24	160:15
284:8	148:22	244:4,19	37:8 41:4	161:16
testimonies	151 : 12	247:1,9,16	61:13	189:13
			<u> </u>	1

_				344
190:24	101:15	225:8,14	160:6,10	35:14 36:2
204:7	104:16,18	225:16	160:12	36:7 38:22
204:7	104:16,16	226:20	160:12	43:18
220:9	103:10			44:20 47:8
		227:17	164:17	
223:19,21	116:12	228:8,25	177:4	47:10 51:4
223:24	118:11	230:2	184:2	51:7,18
224:14	123:24	231:8	200:3,4,8	56:12,14
225:3	127:4	235:21	200:17,21	59:13,15
226:17	128:14	236:1	206:4	59:19 61:1
229:2	130:8	252:21	211:10,17	62:6,22
234:8	135:20	254:6	240:15	63:19 64:3
235:18,20	136:16	257 : 19	249:15	64:16
238:9	137:7	258:24	252 : 20	65:10 , 18
239:2,16	138:5,9	259:7 , 10	272:4	66:5 67:10
240:17	141:16	259:11,20	277 : 22	69 : 22
251:23	155 : 7	260:20,23	279:6	70:17
252:1	159:20,21	260:25	281:15	71:19
255:19	159:21,23	261:2,21	three 18:13	72:20,21
263:25	164:4	263:22	22:4 53:25	74:11,14
264:16	165:6,7,17	267:23	54:4 55:9	74:18,25
269:13	166:6,7,19	271 : 10	56:4 58:4	79:8 80:5
think 14:10	166:24	277:9,21	72:5 75:16	82:11,20
18:24 19:4	169:24	279 : 11 , 18	80:16	82:24 83:2
21:5,6,19	170:3,6,9	282:8	81:12,13	83:25
22:2 23:5	171:19	third 83:15	85:12	85 : 13
27:9,10	172:1,8	111:2	122:6	90:19
39:9,12	182:16,18	117:19	131:3	91:15 92:1
40:2 41:2	183:12	122:18	193:13	92:7,8,21
48:9 53:18	184:12,18	145:10	209:12	93:5 94:15
57:15	191:5,18	212:3,9	216:21	94:24
61:11	191:22	279:3	three-month	95:23 96:1
64:18 66:9	193:22	third-party	59:5	96:7 97:20
67:25	194:5,13	145:18,21	throw 255:7	98:3 99:4
68:11 70:9	194:16	thought	tie 277:15	99:18
71:3,17,21	195:10,13	14:19	tied 175:17	100:5,12
75:22,25	196:11	28:14	ties 191:6,8	100:3,12
			1	
76:8 78:9	197:25	41:11	time 10:6,11	101:4
78:12 79:1	198:1	69:21	12:15 13:1	104:5
80:22,22	201:17	80:11,15	13:6 17:10	105:7
80:24	202:1,11	81:6 82:12	17:13 18:9	108:7,16
82:11	204:5,17	82:14 87:7	19:3,5	110:21,21
92:11,12	208:3	87:23 88:1	22:13,14	114:4,20
92:13,15	210:3	88:2	23:22,23	116:6,16
95:24	211:15	120:21	27:2 31:24	123:7
99:22	212:20	131:16,18	32:2,3,12	124:15
101:2,13	217:13,23	156:19	32:23 33:9	125:21
<u>'</u>		1	1	

				345
126:1,17	100.10 00	57:20 58:9	242:14	00.16.20
	199:18,22			90:16,20
129:19	200:18,20	58:9,14,19	243:6	90:24 91:5
130:23	203:24	58:22	247:1	91:10,17
131:11,16	204:24	63:23	253:17	92:6,22
133:18,18	205:24	64:14 65:9	277:18	93:21,25
133:25	207:1,19	65:14 66:4	279:6	94:2,21
135:4,8	209:6,19	66:8 70:8	today's 12:1	95:3 99:5
137:3	209:23	97:19	told 28:19	100:24
139:24	210:12,14	101:21	63:24	101:6
140:11	211:16	175:6	80:15	Torres's
143:7,17	212:10,16	243:6	90:20	94:7
147:2,5,14	214:7	263:20	91:20,22	Torrez
149:22	219:20	266:1	92:13,15	271:19
151:11	221:2	timing	94:17	Toshiba
152:10	222:2,7,10	117:12,23	96:17	138:20,20
153:10,14	222:11	187:6	100:14,15	144:18
153:24	224:4	267 : 20	100:18	156:24
154:17,21	225:22	TIMOTHY 3:5	104:6	180:15,22
157:3,8,9	226:8,19	title 15:1	173:4,5	Toshiba's
157:12 , 13	235:11	33:17	188:23	180:20
157:18	239:10	55 : 14	243:11,13	total 209:23
158:1	240:15	110:23	243:14,17	209:25
159:6	242:7,19	164:10	244:5,7	totally
162:19	249:6	169:21	250:17,21	55 : 17
165:18	250:24	titled	251:9,10	168:21
166:19	258:7 , 8	113:10	251:12 , 16	206:13
169:13	259:2 , 14	today 9:9	251:19	225:12
171:14,18	265:12,16	12:4 24:13	252 : 12	tour 39:23
173:9	267:22	24:22	281:14	64 : 23
175:23	268:11	31:24	top 80:16	101:14
176:14	269:5	34:15 48:4	81:17	tours 41:17
177:4	270:25	70:18	85:23 89:6	42:1,4
178:11	271:4,8	107:18	89:11,13	track 32:18
179:2,3,3	272:5	112:22	99:2	267:1
179:14	273:13	121:13,22	105:10	269:21
180:16	275 : 21	123:18	131:4	tracking
181:18	277 : 25	141:25	159:18	45:23
184:11	278:23	165:3	191:18	252:5
185:18	281:10	168:8	266:2,9	265:19
186:4,12	283:1	185:4	273:5	transfer
188:12	timeline	201:7	topic 63:13	32:9
189:6,7	259:12	227:10	98:17 99:4	transition
193:11	timely 79:5	229:22	99:11,16	134:12
195:13	times 33:19	230:8	99:17,21	transmitted
197:23	43:22	231:3	topics 35:11	255:15
198:20	44:20	240:19	Torres 77:10	transparent
-	1	l		

				340
279:7,12	trusted	30:17 33:9	150:23	147:19
	251:9	33:9 34:5	uh-huh 10:2	156:12
transposed		55:24	58:5 73:11	165:12,22
	trusts 250:15	56:11		
transpos			272:10	165:25
37:7	truth 284:8	57:16	275:12	167:25
travel 30:21	284:9	58:17,19	ultimate	168:2,7,7
32:2,2	truthful	62:25 64:9	119:17	168:17
tray 222:21	10:23	71:18 72:5	256:23	170:19
trays 19:23	205:3	72:9,9	257:2,4,14	171:5
tried 16:15	279:19	74:1,2,23	ultimately	172:15
28:13	try 10:3	121:5	51:12	185:10,19
66:21	12:15	130:15	104:1	185:21
250:12	18:20	134:9	118:15,19	186:6
265:18	150:2	137:8	146:14	203:14,18
trip 271:10	250:18	144:15	161:9	205:10
271:11,19	255:24 , 25	187:13	172:19	207:13
triple	256:20	188:19	190:5	209:21
156:23	trying 55:3	189:11	216:18	213:14
158:22	55:6,7,10	195:23	226:3	215:3,9,12
truck 101:16	56:9 68:19	207:12	228:10,18	215:16
true 32:11	69:19 , 25	214:24,25	233:14	217:8
38:17	141:21	221:9	247:4	218:14
51:17	205:10	228:10	261:20,23	224:15
73:25 94:6	206:18	232:2	unable	225:3
121:14	207:22	247:7	145:19	230:24
130:2	210:15	249:14	219:19	240:2,18
131:15	218:12,14	250:8	unaware	242:13
147:2	247:24	259:8	106:10	understa
150:24	262:6	267:8	unbilled	16:6 32:5
162:8,17	276:4	271 : 17	31:10	32:8 33:5
179:20	turned 65:9	two-part	undergoing	39:19 53:7
190:8	turnover	13:1	64:4	63:8 64:1
193:25	235:21	two-week	understand	64:3,25
200:23	236:2	48:21	10:11,15	70:6 79:18
211:25	turns 29:13	77:15	24:17,20	84:2,5,6
212:12	TVA 19:2,7	Tye 104:21	37:3 45:1	89:19
216:10	tweaks	105:18,21	46:20 50:5	93:11
224:9	166:21,22	type 82:13	64:11 72:4	105:24
230:4	181:18,20	273:11	73:3,7,9	125:3
243:5	181:21,22	typed 109:5	77:25	152:2,6
244:23	204:9	types 263:25	79:14	159:25
279:21	Twelve 275:1		93:16	166:3
		typewriting		167:2,13
280:9,22	Twice 70:9	284:12	97:10,13	
281:1	two 11:13	U	107:12	167:14
282:11	20:24	U.S28:21	118:13	169:1,2,7
284:13	28:21	0.320:21	129:5	169:12
			•	•

				347
172.1 (210.7	016.11 15	151.01	27.5
173:1,6 181:11	218:7 259:23	216:11,15 217:24	151:21 152:8	37:5
213:9	undertake			variations 241:3
	53:20	unrestri 64:24	258:21	varied 43:14
215:6,11			261:6	
218:23	uneconomic	unusual	280:16	43:19,22
222:3,16	249:7	150:20	Users 39:4	66:23 68:7
223:12	unescorted	176:1	usually	232:10
understands	65:15	up-to-date	20:19 31:8	variety
36:14	unexpected	262:4	35:7 43:20	107:17
understood	177:6	UPC 225:22	47:5 48:20	various 39:5
10:16 40:5	unfortunate	update 54:7	49:5 64:18	45:17
69:22	145:18	69:23	66:15 67:4	71:21
93:16	unfortun	77:11	67:14,20	108:15
102:21	14:6	149:6,11	101:14	113:9
108:10	unit17:7	175:24	110:4	116:5
109:11	18:15,16	187:17	230:18	207:4,17
119:6,22	137:2,13	210:15	258:19	211:22
127:10,12	149:16,17	262 : 7	utilities	230:25
127:14,15	220:15	updated	226:22	254:24
127:16	222:20	54:12,16	utility	262:21
133:18	223:19,22	76:13	15:16,18	263:20
142:23	223:24	106:7	16:21 21:2	varying
143:4,16	232:6,7,12	148:2	167:1	69:17
143:21	232:17,21	222:7	196:12	vast 274:16
144:22	233:23,23	223:24	utilize	VCS 6:13
145:1,2	United	260:17,18	50:22	105:17
147:15	176:15	261:2		vendors
148:22	units 5:20	262:6		151:4
149:1,5,10	14:2 23:2	updates	v 1:9 285:2	venues
149:15	24:14	76:24	v.c 5:20	262:21
153:22	136:21	77:12 , 13	14:7 24:14	verbal 68:9
155:14,23	137:21	77:15	81:8	vernacular
156:14	149:13	134:8	109:13	239:11
157 : 3	163:17	147:17	160:25	version
160:16,21	164:12	153 : 23	163:17	72:12 73:4
161:17	199:12	262:19	176:14	73:8 74:13
162:17	unknown	updating	VA 3:7	versions
166:9	84:10	210:4,14	vacation	71:9 72:10
168:12	unreason	upper 200:2	41:24,25	versus 7:5
171 : 16	189:4	upstream	vague 86:23	206:2
172:12,17	unreliab	264:11	validate	281:16
172:22	205:22	use 22:17	250:19	VI 89:4,4
195:17	unreliable	24:13,18	validation	viability
197:8	190:12,15	24:21	86:24	144:17
201:8	190:16,19	118:5	variances	180:20
203:12	215:20	139:22	36:1 37:4	vice 55:14
	l	l	l	l

				340
261:23	67:1 68:14	136:10	170:4	242:14
video 7:12	88:24	148:16	183:17	247:9
283:12	101:15	152:21	187:2,15	250:19,19
	125:15	152:21	191:25	260:19,19
Videogra		164:9		
3:25 7:1	133:2,10 144:6,13		192:6	264:8 277:9
8:21 56:23 57:1	•	171:4 179:2	212:5,5,6 213:15	ways 200:8
	270:23,25 visits 65:12			ways 200:0
106:24 107:2	67:3	207:13 224:4	225:23 231:12	12:15
162:24	visual		247:19	24:17 64:9
		236:13,23		
163:2 212:23	254:25 vocal 272:17	237:25	256:6	69:8 108:6 133:4
212:23		238:5,23 238:24	260:16,16 260:18	
253:10,13	Vogtle 102:18	258:24 254:1	260:18	we're 9:9,9 10:5,7,10
253:10,13	161:1	254:1 257:25	283:3	38:22 48:2
278:7,10	voiding	257:25	waste 242:3	57:17,23
283:12	179:25	264:15	waste 242:3	71:6 87:15
videotaped	voids 16:14	265:9	13:19	101:4
1:18 4:4	16:16	272:1	15:24 17:7	107:2
7:1,3	volume	276:24	18:11	182:23
view 40:23	217:19	wanted 28:11	21:16	196:1
52:1,14	volunteered	28:18 33:6	56:20	205:13
82:4,7,8	21:5	35:25	Watts 18:15	213:4
94:10	VP 159:10	36:11 57:4	18:16	224:11,11
138:22	12 103.10	65:10,12	22:16	224:12
150:16	W	106:15	way 2:14	264:8
153:11	wait 21:18	146:1	13:5 26:14	278:15
205:23	209:21	172:10	37 : 22	281:3,4,4
206:6	237:10,10	266:4	44:23 45:4	Webster
220:3	237:15,19	270:20	45:6,10,13	265:5,10
277 : 7	237:19	280:4	48:8 52:25	265:11,14
viewed	waive 107:22	Waring 6:4,6	61:17 75:5	WEC 158:18
155:11	Walker 78:9	128:23,24	82 : 23	158:19
views 151:8	281:21	129:7,12	115:3	159:1,6
196:9	want 7:22	wasn't29:6	116:5	265:5
Vigor 270:24	10:9 11:5	29:10,13	141:20	WEC's 158:24
violated	11:14	65:9 79:3	147:1	WEC/CB&I
250:15	21:22 36:8	79:4 83:9	154:18	111:2
virtually	51:4 57:9	83:12 96:3	158:5	117:13,24
108:1	57:12	99:6 124:2	160:5	118:2,5,7
vis-a-vis	64:10 73:8	135:7	168:3	week 11:9
280:21	78:23	140:6	206:14	56:7 57:21
vision	88:17	141:15	208:5	58:9
238:10	107:4,20	155:16	218:15	182:17,17
visit5:23	108:8	156:6	238:21	weekly 44:9
6:4,7,13	117:10	162:13	241:1,7	44:12,13
	ı	ı	1	1

				JT)
45:16	15:23 17:7	229:14	withhold	WOODS 3:6
62:19	20:8 21:15	232:8	173:16,21	word 14:19
183:4	64:16	234:15,17	174:1,6,10	109:5,7,9
225:2	65:24	234:19,22	174:15	161:19
262:19	67:11 , 12	235:2	248:5	196:12
weeks 57:23	111:15	250:23	withholding	229:4
58:9	119:7,20	262:3,7,20	98:4	238:20
	119:7,20		230:20	
218:22		266:12,13		246:20
224:4	129:16	271:3,21	witness 5:3	261:6
weld50:23	133:19,25	280:21,25	6:22 36:19	wording
welder	134:10,21	281:16	38:5 42:18	272:1
265:18	134:22	282:13	43:10	words 46:20
welding	138:19,19	Westingh	56:19	50:23 51:5
269:4	140:1	119:14	73:17	91:24
well-versed	143:2,14	132:23	83:20	109:2,9,10
25:22	143:18	144:18	102:25	132:10
went 13:6	144:20,23	156:4	115:24	238:9,15
14:15 15:5	145:2,8,12	158:10	123:23	work 9:19
18:20 19:4	145:19,23	177:14	127:9	10:3 14:12
20:2 37:12	153:1	179:25	156:11	14:18
68:11	155:16	202:8	167:7	15:11 18:5
145:17	156:24	208:8,24	181:7	26:20,21
221:16	159:10,16	218:17	186:6	33:17 , 18
222:18,24	160:16,24	221:14,23	188:4	38:11
255:4	161:17	225:23	192:23	39:13 51:6
275:13	201:1	261:7	193:19	51:14 64:7
280:17	208:6,9,14	266:17	201:15	86:12
weren't	208:22	281:3	208:13	88:10
22:13,14	209:2,4,19	whatsoever	215:23	105:15
42:6 73:3	209:24	108:3	219:15	112:13
87 : 21	210:1,6	WHEREOF	230:14	115:4
97:13	211:4,8,9	284:18	231:8	148:4
149:23	217:9,11	Wholly 1:10	250:11	154:25
172:9	217:15,23	wide 107:17	256:9	173:13
230:20	218:20	willing	257 : 2	198:19
235:21	220:5,7	37:14	261:9,20	210:7
236:3	221:11,12	160:17,21	262:16	219:1
238:6,19	221:11,12	161:17	274:4	261:7,10
240:13	222:2,5	window	278:21	268:1
241:1	223:7	197:24	279:24	271:21
242:6	226:2,7	wire 32:8	281:19	workable
253:3	227:1,7,12	Withdrawn	283:6,11	178:1
271 : 3	227:16,18	167:23	283:14	worked 12:10
WESTBROOK	227:10,18	withheld	284:10,13	25:16
2:3,6	228:20	76:4,7,9	284:10,13	57:12 86:1
Westingh	229:5,10	247:20,21	wonder 265:8	86:9,10
Mescriigii	229.J, 10	Z41.ZU,ZI	wonder 200:0	00.9,10

				330
154.01		1 40 0 60 0		1001
154:21	write 109:2	48:2 62:8	1.15 112:15	199:1
178:19	writing	71:16	112:24	211:11
271:22	254:25	76:16	113:25	213:11,17
working	written 10:3	88:11	114:7,19	228:9
13:10	62:2,4,20	148:1	115:17,18	259:11
14:14	62:21 63:2	157 : 21	116:19	274:23
15:17 55:9	63:8,16	220:25	129:24	12/16 105:16
61:5 150:1	67:14 68:5	255:8,11	139:8	12:10 106 : 14
185:16	91:21 92:1	259:10	199:11,14	12:11 106 : 25
217:20	92:7 100:8	year's	204:1	120 5:19
218:12	100:14	220:20	1.8 200:2	1201 4:6
224:1	106:11	years 16:3	1:21 107:3	7:10
works 106:18	125:22	22:19	10 5:8 6:3	127 6:1
181:12	243:18	25:16	128:17,19	128,000
worry 227:24	255 : 7	28:22 33:9	199:4	58:14,25
worse 204:1	271:10,11	33:10	10:46 56:24	12th 245:15
234:25	wrong 70:20	154:21	10:59 57:2	247:10
244:3,3	71:11	198:8	100 55:21	13 6:10
worth 51:25	wrongly	210:23	56:12	140:25
217:5	161:19	250:17	57:16	141:3
worthwhile	wrote 109:5	Yep 236:18	58:14	198:20
225:17	109:7	you-all 98:1	134:12,21	199:1,4
wouldn't	WYCHE 2:14	Young 101:4	135:2,6	238:3
10:22		101:9	1037 2 : 4	239:7
59:13 , 15	X		104 5:14	273:2,16
76:5 126:5		Z	11 6:1,6	1310 3:16
126:6	Y		133:5,7	132 95:24
137:15	yeah 7:23	0	110 5:16	1320 3:11
143:20	14:21	001544	113 5:17	14 6:12,17
145:23	21:14	105:13	115 3 : 2	143:25
161:14	31:21 45:2	07July2	11549 3:21	144:3
178:17	55:6 87:9	6:11	1180 2:19	187 : 12
182:25	106:23		12 6:8 135:9	202:13,15
189:14	117:17	1	135:11	272:23
190:6,9,12	118:11	1 5:8 10:25	148:18	273:6
190:16	125:11	11:3 14:2	179:6,10	1426 2:22
199:19	126:25	18:15	181:17	15 6:14
216:14	150:20	52:17 , 17	182:11	146:3,6
217:10,10	168:12	176:6	183:2,22	151 : 12
221:8	184:5	209:13	185:7,9,25	188:9
229:14	210:15	210:2,16	186:11	198:25
245:5	237:7,14	274:16,17	189:4	150 55:19
246:10	237:25	274 : 18	191:25	56:11
249:8	266:23	1,000 150:17	192 : 7	57 : 16
250:11	274:10	176:18	196:5	58 : 22
280:20	year 14:11	1,280 58:13	198:20	153 6:16
		l	l	l

				331
15th 83:3	149:16	6:15 62:8	194:9,23	102:22
			· ·	
188:6	163:17	62:13,18	195:3	103:7
284:19	164:9,12	63:17	196:5	104:2
16 6:16	200:2	71:16	197:8,21	119:6,12
151:12	224:20,23	78:15	197:22	119:21
153:16,18	274:17	79:25 83:9	198:14,24	124:21
198:21	2-2 237:17	83:12,14	200:10,17	125:12
160 58:10,19	2,000 223:10	83:18	200:24	126:1
17 6:18	2.0 129:21	89:23 93:4	201:9	128:12,15
163:4,8	2.00 199:20	98:25	202:17,22	129:20
1730 2 : 7	2.2 249:14	100:20,23	202:25	130:5
176,000 59:3	2:44 162:25	104:22	203:1,13	131:11,23
17th 3:11	2:58 163:3	104.22	203:1,13	131:25
18 199:5,13	20171:7	113:16,24	204:13	132:4,22
18-month	268:12	114:20	208:10	133:10
157:20	269:18	115:16	211:11	138:9
197:24	2000 259:8	116:14,25	212:15,18	140:12
198:4	2008 121:6,9	117:1	213:8,10	141:6
199:17	121:14,15	122:9	213:12,18	142:2,6,23
200:9	121:18	146:12,15	214:4	144:7,22
19 14:9	164:11,13	147:3,6,6	228:9	153:13,20
171:7,7	164:17,19	148:13	229:24	153:22
1972 12:18	176:24	149:5	245:15	157:3
1978 12:18	2009 257:10	150:16,16	247:10	161:10
12:19	2011 25:3	153:9	250:8	163:22
1982 14:11	2012 264:16	174:23	252:12	165:1
1983 14:10	268:4	175:10,14	254:5	171:22
14:13	2013 76:14	179:4,7,10	271:13	172:19,24
1984 17:21	76:19		273:22	196:20,22
		179:20,22		
17:23	259:11,13	181:17	274:2	196:23
1986 18:24	2014 78:14	182:11	277:7	197:21
19:1	80:22,23	183:2,22	281:1,10	198:23
1996 19:5	81:24	184:23	281:13	213:15
1st 273:10	82:24 83:6	185:1,5,9	282:4,14	222:6
	83:11	185:10,13	282:16,25	237:3
2	92:25	186:1,11	2015-661	2016-EFi
2 5:9,20 6:6	109:12,17	186:16,20	129:25	6:9
6:13,18	109:18	186:20	2016 5:9,15	2016/6/21
14:2 16:10	111:2,14	187:6,25	5:20,22,22	135:25
24:14	112:3	188:5,13	6:1,4,4,6	2017 95:6
52:11,14	154:10	188 : 22	6:7,13,13	185:17
52:15,19	209:24	189:4	6:17,18	2017-cp
52:24 53:1	210:13,18	191:25	71:15,17	1:2 7:6
53:9 87:2	221:24	192:8,15	86:19	2018 1 : 21
87:5,10	273:17	192:18,21	87:19 91:8	4:7 7:11
137:13	2015 5:13,18	193:14	91:11,12	70:18
107.10	20130:13,10	190.14	J1.11,14	/0.10

DEPOSITION OF GARY JONES October 5, 2018

	1	1	1	1
179:1	256 5 : 5	158:14	5th 4:7 7:11	9
202:12,15	26 5:22	30309-3521	71:13,15	9 5:4 6:1
227:11	26-28 6:7	2:20	71:17	127:19,22
242:11	27 5:22 6:4	31st 95:6	284:6	9:394:8 7:2
257:19	122:8	32 31:7 36:2		90-day 48:21
269:23	188:10	37:4,7	6	77:15
270:14	27-28 88:24	320 58:19	6 5:9,17,22	259:20
272:24	274 274:25	327-4192 3:3	87:13	262:19
276:2	275 31:15,25	36 110:24	113:5,8	929-1400
284:6,19	278 157:17	38 117:7,17	6/17/2016	3:17
285:4	27th 62:6	39 117:7	136:1	9th 71:12,16
2019 149:16	83:3 188:6		6:03 278 : 8	
249:4	222:10	4	6:12 278 : 11	
2020 137:13	225:13	4 5:14,15	6:19 283 : 13	
149:17	280 5:6	104:25	283:16	
2021 249:4	284 6:21	105:3	6th 125:11	
2110 2:10	285 6:22	4:06 212:24	125:12	
217-9000	28th 62:6	4:19 213:2		
2:23	29 6:13	40,000	7	
22 5:13,18	113:16,24	182:16	7 5:19 120:2	
219:22	276:7	400,000	120:5	
22nd 4:6	29201 2:23	260:14	141:6	
7:10 213:9	3:11	404 2:20	142:6	
215:25	29205 2:10	44 2:14	700 149:20	
225:11	29211 3:17	48,000 58:22	727-6500 2 : 5	
23 5:19 37:7	3:22	59:1	734-6151	
23219 3:7	29464 2 : 4		3:22	
235 3 : 2	29601 2:15	5	775-1000 3:7	
24 6:15	29730 3:2	5 1:21 5:16	799-2000	
179:1	29812 2 : 7	13:19	3:12	
199:13	2nd 257:10	110:17,20	8	
202:13,17	3	169:21		
24-month		237:3	8 5:21 125:7	
199:5	3 5:12,20	285:4	125:10	
242-8200	24:14	5:14 253:11	800 3:6 803 2:8,11	
2:15	88:14,17	5:22 253:14	•	
247-page	88:21	5:27 256 : 12	2:23 3:3 3:12,17,22	
274:24	149:17	5:28 256 : 15	804 3:7	
250 31:16	163:17	50 237:8	84 18:24	
54:25	164:12	500,000 209:12	843 2:5	
250,000	171:22	210:2	864 2:15	
260:14	216:20	528,000 59:7	87 5:9	
251 274 : 24	3/28/2027 284:24	541-7850 2:8	8th 273:17	
275:2,3	30 6:13	572-2780	273:21	
252-4800	28:22	2:20	2,0.21	
2:11	۷0.22	2.20		
	-	•	•	•