

Page 1	Page 3
<p>1 (9:05 a.m.)</p> <p>2 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>3 Q. So there are some undertakings I understand</p> <p>4 that have been entered into the record?</p> <p>5 MS. GLYNN:</p> <p>6 Q. Absolutely. Newfoundland Power has</p> <p>7 fulfilled the undertakings that were</p> <p>8 outstanding.</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>10 Q. And so –</p> <p>11 KELLY, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. That's the last currently outstanding</p> <p>13 undertakings, Mr. Chairman.</p> <p>14 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So Mr. Johnson, I guess we're back to</p> <p>16 you.</p> <p>17 MR. JAMES COYNE (PREVIOUSLY SWORN) CROSS-EXAMINATION</p> <p>18 BY THOMAS JOHNSON, Q.C. CONT'D</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Good morning, Commissions. Good morning,</p> <p>21 Mr. Coyne.</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. Good morning.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. Mr. Coyne, I had been confused about the—one</p>	<p>1 A. Yeah.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. That's confirmed just for the record at CA-</p> <p>4 NP-159, okay? Now –</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. And that's why I took them out of the proxy</p> <p>7 group.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Yes, okay.</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. Yeah.</p> <p>12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. Yes. Okay, so Mr. Coyne, just going back</p> <p>14 just briefly to your HQTd (sic.) evidence,</p> <p>15 and we had some discussion of your Chart 4</p> <p>16 and that's at CA-NP-154.</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. Once again, can I borrow the Board's version</p> <p>19 that has the attachment?</p> <p>20 MS. GLYNN:</p> <p>21 Q. 154.</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. Thank you. Yes.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. So we have it on the screen here now</p>
Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 of the—that you had decided to rule out</p> <p>2 Consolidated Edison. What—the company you</p> <p>3 decided to rule out of your proxy sample was</p> <p>4 Edison International, and do you recall the</p> <p>5 reason why you ruled out Edison</p> <p>6 International which otherwise met your</p> <p>7 criteria for screening?</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. Yes, they had a troubled unregulated</p> <p>10 business that caused their credit rating—</p> <p>11 well, it caused their financials to be</p> <p>12 challenged and I didn't feel they were</p> <p>13 worthy, comparable to Newfoundland Power.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. Yes, the—one of their units went bankrupt</p> <p>16 under Chapter 11.</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. And unregulated.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Yes.</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. So yes.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. That's just –</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 where you're showing the average earned</p> <p>2 versus authorized ROE, US proxy group,</p> <p>3 operating companies. So you're not talking</p> <p>4 about the companies that are actually in a</p> <p>5 proxy group. You're talking about their</p> <p>6 subsidiary operating companies?</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. That's correct.</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. And of course in this case we're comparing</p> <p>11 Newfoundland Power to proxy group companies,</p> <p>12 right? Not operating subs?</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. We're doing it both ways. The capital</p> <p>15 market information that I derive by</p> <p>16 necessity is for public traded companies.</p> <p>17 So that's at the proxy group level.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. Yes, that's right.</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. But when I do my risk analysis, I do that at</p> <p>22 that operating companies so I made an</p> <p>23 apples-to-apples comparison.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Now just to confirm on Chart 4 when</p>

Page 5	Page 7
<p>1 we're talking about the—how the operating</p> <p>2 companies did compared to their authorized</p> <p>3 ROE, would you confirm that four of the</p> <p>4 years shown on average they didn't meet</p> <p>5 their allowed returns? That would be 2000,</p> <p>6 2005, 2009, 2010. Is that right?</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. That appears so from the chart, yes.</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. Okay, and this chart similarly doesn't tell</p> <p>11 us anything about whether these individual</p> <p>12 operating utilities earned the allowed</p> <p>13 return each year, right? This is--it just</p> <p>14 expresses an average?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. That's correct.</p> <p>17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>18 Q. Yes.</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. Yeah.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. And nor does this tell us what the median</p> <p>23 return was over this period of time, this</p> <p>24 ten-year period from 2000 to 2011, correct?</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 Commission, but I don't track the AUS</p> <p>2 Reports. We rely on –</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. Do you –</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. - SNL and other providers that are more</p> <p>7 relied upon in the industry for this type of</p> <p>8 data.</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. Yes. As a matter of fact I tried to put SNL</p> <p>11 data last time to Newfoundland Power's cost</p> <p>12 of capital witness and they didn't know if</p> <p>13 they could count on SNL data. Are you</p> <p>14 familiar with that?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. That the witness did not know?</p> <p>17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>18 Q. Yes.</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. Well that's rather odd because it's owned by</p> <p>21 McGraw-Hill and they're subsidiary plants.</p> <p>22 They're the largest provider of the state in</p> <p>23 the industry.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. Okay, very good. So anyway, AUS Utility</p>
Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 A. No, it's expressed as an average.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Now Mr. Coyne, we passed over for</p> <p>4 cross-examination purposes the January copy</p> <p>5 of the AUS Utility Reports.</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Okay, could we turn to those? They are a</p> <p>10 cross aid. It's item number 5 in my letter</p> <p>11 to Ms. Blundon of April 1st, 2016.</p> <p>12 MS. GLYNN:</p> <p>13 Q. And that will be entered as Information</p> <p>14 Number 19.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. Yes, I see it.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. All right. Have you seen these reports</p> <p>21 before, AUS Utility Reports?</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. I have not. I believe that Dr. Booth</p> <p>24 submitted this. Perhaps it was in a similar</p> <p>25 fashion, or his counsel did in the BCUC</p>	<p>1 Reports, I understand that you write a paper</p> <p>2 or published a paper that went to</p> <p>3 Fortnightly Reports? That's under the</p> <p>4 auspice of AUS, isn't it?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. I'm not sure who owed Public Utilities</p> <p>7 Fortnightly.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Well we'll come to that in a moment,</p> <p>10 too. So –</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. My understanding is that they're owned by an</p> <p>13 engineering firm, but that's the last</p> <p>14 understanding that I had.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So essentially, Mr. Coyne, maybe if—I</p> <p>17 passed over—by the time I got out of there</p> <p>18 it was a little bit late yesterday, but I</p> <p>19 did pass over a brief document about the</p> <p>20 qualifications of Ms. Pauline M. Ahern, the</p> <p>21 managing principal of AUS Consultants.</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. And with –</p>

Page 9

1 MR. COYNE:  
 2 A. I saw it, you did.  
 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 4 Q. And with the Board's indulgence I think it  
 5 went over four o'clock. By the time we got  
 6 out of here it was a little late. I don't  
 7 know if Newfoundland Power raised its  
 8 objection to me asking about that document.  
 9 KELLY, Q.C.:  
 10 Q. I'm not sure where it's going, Mr. Chairman,  
 11 but I don't take any objection, at least at  
 12 this point.  
 13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 14 Q. Yes, okay. Thank you. Let's look—Ms.  
 15 Ahern, she apparently is the CRRA of AUS  
 16 Consultants, and I just want to return to  
 17 the second page of this document, Mr. Coyne.  
 18 MR. COYNE:  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 21 Q. All right. See the third paragraph down?  
 22 MR. COYNE:  
 23 A. I do.  
 24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 25 Q. She, by the way, is the managing principal

Page 10

1 of AUS, responsible for managing the  
 2 consulting practice, et cetera, and -  
 3 MR. COYNE:  
 4 A. Well if I might add, she's no longer with  
 5 the company.  
 6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 7 Q. Okay, very good. Now as you see, we're—we  
 8 see where she's describing as the publisher  
 9 of AUS Utility Reports formally CA Turner  
 10 Utility Reports? Have you ever heard of CA  
 11 Turner Utility Reports?  
 12 MR. COYNE:  
 13 A. I have not.  
 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 15 Q. Okay. Ms. Ahern is responsible for the  
 16 production, publishing and distribution of  
 17 the reports. "AUS Utility Reports provides  
 18 financial data and related ratios for about  
 19 80 public utilities, i.e. electric,  
 20 combination of gas and electric, natural gas  
 21 transmission, telephone, water utilities on  
 22 a monthly, quarterly and annual basis.  
 23 Among the subscribers of AUS are utilities,  
 24 many state regulatory commissions, federal  
 25 agencies, individuals, brokerage firms,

Page 11

1 attorneys, and they've been continuously  
 2 provided financial statistics on the utility  
 3 industry since 1930." You weren't aware of  
 4 that, were you?  
 5 MR. COYNE:  
 6 A. I was not.  
 7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 8 Q. Okay.  
 9 MR. COYNE:  
 10 A. No.  
 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 12 Q. So that's news to you?  
 13 MR. COYNE:  
 14 A. Yes, they're not—as I said, they're not  
 15 widely used for those that do the work that  
 16 we do because we subscribe to databases that  
 17 we can access electronically in full.  
 18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 19 Q. Yes, but now you've been only preparing cost  
 20 of capital for what, seven years?  
 21 MR. COYNE:  
 22 A. As we said, ten years, but it's -  
 23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 24 Q. 2007?  
 25 MR. COYNE:

Page 12

1 A. Yes, but I'm part of a team of people that  
 2 do this work in my firm and we rely on a lot  
 3 of data, but we don't rely on AUS and I'm  
 4 not aware of other consultants that I work  
 5 with that do, but -  
 6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 7 Q. Okay. Well let's just for a moment see -  
 8 MS. GLYNN:  
 9 Q. Mr. Johnson, before you move from that  
 10 document, my apologies, we don't have the  
 11 paper copies. So we will distribute that at  
 12 the break.  
 13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 14 Q. Yes. I'll have -  
 15 MS. GLYNN:  
 16 Q. And we will enter that as Information Number  
 17 20.  
 18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 19 Q. Pardon me. Sorry about that.  
 20 MS. GLYNN:  
 21 Q. Okay.  
 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 23 Q. Yes. Well, let's just look at what these  
 24 people say, and perhaps you could find in  
 25 your material that you find authoritative

Page 13	Page 15
<p>1                   whether you'd agree or can find something to</p> <p>2                   contradict it.</p> <p>3 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>4           A.    Yeah.</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6           Q.    So if we look at the AUS Monthly Report that</p> <p>7                   was—that we've been provided through Dr.</p> <p>8                   Booth, we see here that there—we're going</p> <p>9                   back to the other cross aid there, Samantha.</p> <p>10                  Okay. Can that be made a little bit bigger?</p> <p>11 MS. PIERCEY:</p> <p>12          Q.    Is there a certain section you have there?</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14          Q.    Yes, just come over a little bit further so</p> <p>15                  we can see the names of these companies.</p> <p>16                  Okay. So for the time being, Mr. Coyne,</p> <p>17                  you'll see that we're going to ignore Duke</p> <p>18                  and Eversource because AUS lists them as</p> <p>19                  combination gas and electric, but you were</p> <p>20                  mainly looking electric companies, right?</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22          A.    Yes, I was.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24          Q.    Okay.</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>2          Q.    Okay. And likewise it just—if you look at</p> <p>3                  Great Plains –</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5          A.    Yeah, yeah.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7          Q.    - which is the company number 7—Samantha, if</p> <p>8                  you just go—so Great Plains, company number</p> <p>9                  7, if you just come across the line to</p> <p>10                 those—just go back over across the screen</p> <p>11                 again. It's showing an allowed return of</p> <p>12                 9.57 but the return that's reported at</p> <p>13                 column 21 is 5.7 percent. And OGE if you</p> <p>14                 just—is item number 11, OGE Energy. Again</p> <p>15                 go across. This one is a little bit better,</p> <p>16                 9.98 is the allowed versus 9.1. If you</p> <p>17                 could go a couple of lines down to Pinnacle,</p> <p>18                 number 13, allowed 11, earned 8.8. And then</p> <p>19                 go down to the—number 18, Samantha, if you</p> <p>20                 could to Westar. Right. So Westar is 10.20</p> <p>21                 versus 8.5. And finally if you go down to</p> <p>22                 the table below which are the combination of</p> <p>23                 electric and gas, we pick up Duke as company</p> <p>24                 number 11. If you could, just go back</p> <p>25                 across the screen. Yes, so their allowed</p>
Page 14	Page 16
<p>1           A.    Yeah.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3          Q.    Now so if we look at number 1, ALLETE,</p> <p>4                  traded on the New York Stock Exchange. It's</p> <p>5                  number—company number 1.</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7          A.    Right.</p> <p>8 (9:15 a.m.)</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10         Q.    Do you see what their allowed—the allowed</p> <p>11                 return was from 2013, of 10.64? That's</p> <p>12                 right across. Right across the—that's</p> <p>13                 column number 24.</p> <p>14 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>15         A.    Right.</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17         Q.    Could you just come over a little bit</p> <p>18                 further, Samantha? Okay, so you see their</p> <p>19                 allowed was 10.64 and the return that's</p> <p>20                 being shown according to this document is on</p> <p>21                 common equity, is 9.3 percent, in column 21.</p> <p>22 KELLY, Q.C.:</p> <p>23         Q.    Is there –</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25         A.    I do see that.</p>	<p>1           ROE is 10.17 and the earned on common equity</p> <p>2           is 6 percent. And finally, number 14,</p> <p>3           Eversource. Number 14, come across, 9.32</p> <p>4           and earned was 9.1. Now can you confirm,</p> <p>5           Mr. Coyne, that as appears evident to us at</p> <p>6           least, that not one of the solely electric</p> <p>7           companies as defined by AUS and included in</p> <p>8           your sample actually earned their allowed</p> <p>9           ROE in 2015?</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11         A.    No.</p> <p>12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>13         Q.    Okay.</p> <p>14 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>15         A.    Let me tell you why if I might.</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17         Q.    Okay.</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19         A.    So you've given us one page from this</p> <p>20                 report, and there are footnotes associated</p> <p>21                 with it.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23         Q.    Okay.</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25         A.    So I want to take a look at what the data</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 was. So if one looks at—we don't subscribe</p> <p>2 to this report, but I asked one of my</p> <p>3 annalists last night if they'd go dig us out</p> <p>4 one and we have one that was provided in</p> <p>5 another proceeding. So I have the November</p> <p>6 version of it, November 2015, where I could</p> <p>7 find the footnotes. So a few important</p> <p>8 issues. You're looking at the percent</p> <p>9 return on book value common equity.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. Yes.</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. To make that determination, right, when</p> <p>14 you're looking at the earned ROE?</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Right.</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. Okay, so this is what they say, "Income</p> <p>19 available for common equity divided by the</p> <p>20 average common equity multiplied by 100.</p> <p>21 Average common equity based on the most</p> <p>22 recent beginning and ending, moving 12-month</p> <p>23 period available." This is at the holding</p> <p>24 company level, right?</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 periods." So A, they're looking at holding</p> <p>2 company returns, holding company balance</p> <p>3 sheets pertaining to an average across-</p> <p>4 jurisdictions of allowed ROEs. They may be</p> <p>5 for different time periods. So they're</p> <p>6 comparing apples to persimmons. I mean</p> <p>7 these—this is not a reliable way to look at</p> <p>8 whether or not a regulated utility has</p> <p>9 earned its allowed ROE. You can't take—you</p> <p>10 can't divide the book income at the holding</p> <p>11 company level by the book value of its</p> <p>12 equity at the holding company level and make</p> <p>13 a determination as to what that means for</p> <p>14 the regulated utility. Let me make—let me</p> <p>15 give you a case in point. If you look the</p> <p>16 sheet you have on the screen, it shows PP&amp;L</p> <p>17 with a common equity ratio of 34.1 percent.</p> <p>18 So that would be—do you see that?</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. What column?</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. That would be "Common Equity Ratio," number</p> <p>23 3. That's your column 20. And do you see</p> <p>24 the number 34.1 percent under the common</p> <p>25 equity ratio?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 Q. Right.</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. The holding company level.</p> <p>4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>5 Q. Right.</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. Let's go on. "On allowed ROE that is the</p> <p>8 most recent report, state level allowed ROE</p> <p>9 rate of return on common equity ROE for</p> <p>10 companies operating in multiple</p> <p>11 jurisdictions," which most of these do, "are</p> <p>12 averages. Various companies are received in</p> <p>13 centre (phonetic) based ROE authorization</p> <p>14 that are reported in this report. The date</p> <p>15 of the commission order authorizing reported</p> <p>16 ROEs for companies operating in multiple</p> <p>17 jurisdictions, no date is given because the</p> <p>18 reported ROE is an average derived from</p> <p>19 multiple commission orders issued at</p> <p>20 different times." Then they go to say, "In</p> <p>21 many instances available information</p> <p>22 required that per share and percent return</p> <p>23 and book value of common equity total</p> <p>24 capital derived from figures that represent</p> <p>25 financial activity from different 12-month</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>2 Q. Yes.</p> <p>3 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>4 A. Okay, PP&amp;L, the regulated utility, has a</p> <p>5 common equity ratio of 52 percent, not 34.1</p> <p>6 percent.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. So the holding company is at 34 percent?</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. It's a holding company number.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Right.</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. So the –</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. But just let me understand something now,</p> <p>17 Mr. Coyne. Aren't you in fact comparing</p> <p>18 Newfoundland—when you do your DCF analysis</p> <p>19 for instance and you're getting information</p> <p>20 from the stock exchanges and building up</p> <p>21 your DSF—DCF estimates to determine your</p> <p>22 risk premium analysis and building up your</p> <p>23 DCF analysis to Board what their—what</p> <p>24 Newfoundland Power's ROE should be, are you</p> <p>25 not precisely looking at holding companies?</p>

Page 21	Page 23
<p>1 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>2 A. Yes, you have to when you're using that</p> <p>3 capital market information, but you're doing</p> <p>4 so consistently. I'm not using it to try to</p> <p>5 make the determination you're making here -</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. Okay.</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. - of dividing one number by another that</p> <p>10 doesn't indicate whether or not the utility</p> <p>11 earned its earned return or not. What I'm</p> <p>12 doing with the DCF numbers is showing the</p> <p>13 growth rates for those companies projected</p> <p>14 by analysts or modified by GDP on a</p> <p>15 consistent basis that at the holding company</p> <p>16 level. I'm not mixing apples with oranges.</p> <p>17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. -</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. Or this case persimmons.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay now, Mr. Coyne, do you—would you regard</p> <p>23 it as material information for the Board to</p> <p>24 know whether the companies that are</p> <p>25 populating your US proxy groups actually</p>	<p>1 information, it can certainly express so,</p> <p>2 and I'd respond to it.</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. Well hold on now. That's not what I'm</p> <p>5 asking. I'm asking you whether you share</p> <p>6 her view.</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. And which view specifically is that?</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. That it would be -</p> <p>11 KELLY, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. In fairness to the witness, if you're going</p> <p>13 to put that—you need to put the transcript</p> <p>14 to her.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Well I'll find that in the</p> <p>17 transcript, but are you indicating that it's</p> <p>18 your view that this Board of Commissioners</p> <p>19 need not be concerned about whether the</p> <p>20 holding companies actually earned—have a</p> <p>21 track history of earning the allowed return?</p> <p>22 Is that your evidence?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. No, my evidence is not that--my evidence is</p> <p>25 based on the analysis that we've done that</p>
Page 22	Page 24
<p>1 earn the allowed returns?</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. If the Board wishes to have this</p> <p>4 information, it's something that can be</p> <p>5 researched and provided. The reason we</p> <p>6 provided it, as I mentioned in the case of</p> <p>7 Hydro Quebec, is that Regie in a prior order</p> <p>8 had requested that that evidence be brought</p> <p>9 before them, and we did the research and it</p> <p>10 shows just what I showed there.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Well Mr. -</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. That on average US utilities earn their</p> <p>15 allowed returns. It's our experience that</p> <p>16 they do so.</p> <p>17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>18 Q. Well Mr. Coyne, let us put it this way, Ms.</p> <p>19 Perry tended to agree or apparently agree</p> <p>20 with me that it's—it would be important to</p> <p>21 know what the track history is for earnings</p> <p>22 of the companies that Newfoundland Power is</p> <p>23 being compared to. Do you share her view?</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. If—well, if the Board wishes to have that</p>	<p>1 presents a forward looking cost of capital</p> <p>2 analysis.</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. Yes.</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. Not a retrospective look at whether or not</p> <p>7 they did or did not earn allowed returns,</p> <p>8 but the research that we've done shows that</p> <p>9 on average US utilities do, just as on</p> <p>10 average Canadian utilities do.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Well, Mr. Coyne, can you -</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. It's typically not an issue of controversy.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Mr. Coyne, are you able to file something as</p> <p>17 an undertaking that provides other data to</p> <p>18 indicate that these holding companies</p> <p>19 actually earned the returns?</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. It's not a holding company issue. It is an</p> <p>22 operating company issue, and to do so would</p> <p>23 require a significant research going over a</p> <p>24 long period of time at each of the operating</p> <p>25 company's level.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  2 Q. I see.  3 MR. COYNE:  4 A. Companies. So it's not, as I mentioned  5 yesterday, it's not an insignificant task  6 and you have to sort your way through the  7 accounting data in a reliable way to be able  8 to do so. It's not as simple as looking at  9 a page in this report of holding company  10 level data and say that I understand whether  11 or not this utility earned its allowed  12 return or not. Some of these utilities file  13 annual reports that have the earned return  14 in them, and you can rely on them in those  15 cases. And otherwise you need to look at  16 the book data, the book regulated data for  17 the utility, and then make sure that you  18 have one that they're actually using for  19 rating making purposes. So it's not an  20 insignificant task to do so.  21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  22 Q. Right, and it's your view, is it, that  23 American US utilities typically earned their  24 allowed return, is it?  25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 of the Marsh &amp; McLennan Companies?  2 MR. COYNE:  3 A. Yes, yes.  4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  5 Q. Have you ever heard Oliver Wyman?  6 MR. COYNE:  7 A. Yes, McLennan is a big pension fund company  8 and also does human resources related work.  9 I'm not as familiar with the work of Oliver  10 Wyman, but I have heard the name.  11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  12 Q. Well this is a recent document from Oliver  13 Wyman. I under—it's copyrighted 2015. So  14 it appears fairly recent, and it on the  15 front page indicates that. "This is a new  16 analysis from Oliver Wyman suggesting that  17 utilities have a solid foundation to  18 participate, grow and deliver strong  19 investor returns in the North American  20 market." Now are you aware of what they say  21 about whether US utilities typically make  22 their allowed returns?  23 MR. COYNE:  24 A. No.  25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 A. Absolutely.  2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  3 Q. Okay. We passed over a document from the  4 consulting firm Oliver Wyman. Did you see  5 that?  6 MR. COYNE:  7 A. It was in your cross-examination documents,  8 yes.  9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  10 Q. Yes.  11 MS. GLYNN:  12 Q. It's number 11 from the correspondence and  13 that would be entered as Information Number  14 21.  15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  16 Q. Pardon me?  17 MS. GLYNN:  18 Q. Information Number 21.  19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  20 Q. Yes.  21 MS. GLYNN:  22 Q. And I believe it's 11 from your  23 correspondence.  24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  25 Q. Thank you. Mr. Coyne, have you ever heard</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 Q. You're not?  2 MR. COYNE:  3 A. I flipped through the document, but I'm not  4 aware of any specific comments they made in  5 the regard.  6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  7 Q. Okay. Could you turn to page 10? And you  8 see the—page 10 under that bullet, "Focus on  9 cost management" -  10 MR. COYNE:  11 A. Um-hm?  12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  13 Q. - "to better earn allowed returns." And  14 they say, "Look within first. The average  15 utility does not earn its allowed return on  16 equity. 2014 the average return on equity  17 was 8.1 percent. To earn their allowed  18 returns utilities need to reduce non-fuel  19 operating and maintenance expenses around"—  20 "about ten percent annually." In general  21 most utilities could stand to improve their  22 management performance. A ten percent  23 expense reduction is difficult to achieve  24 and sustain, but will certainly go a long  25 way to improve future earnings." So what's</p>

Page 29

1 your reaction to that?

2 MR. COYNE:

3 A. Well it's not at all clear to me what work

4 they've done to reach that conclusion. I

5 don't know again if they're looking at

6 holding company data. For all I know it

7 could be the type of data that we just

8 looked at here. As I just described,

9 determining whether or not a utility has or

10 has not earned its allowed return is—takes

11 some work.

12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

13 Q. Yes.

14 MR. COYNE:

15 A. And I'm not—I don't see Oliver Wyman in the

16 utilities space, so I'm not sure what work

17 they've done to reach that conclusion.

18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

19 Q. So are you aware of anything like in terms

20 of a report or paper recently which would,

21 you know, from somebody like an Oliver Wyman

22 or an another big consulting group which

23 would rebut this assertion that the—they on

24 average don't make their returns?

25 MR. COYNE:

Page 30

1 A. Well, you've just looked at the analysis

2 that we did in Hydro Quebec.

3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

4 Q. Oh I see. So we'll compare that now to

5 Marsh and McLennan.

6 MR. COYNE:

7 A. Well –

8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

9 Q. Okay.

10 MR. COYNE:

11 A. We have a team of people—we have a team of

12 60 people that do this day in and day out,

13 and they're looking at the proper data to

14 make those types of determinations. Down

15 below they say, "Oliver Wyman believes the

16 utilities are a smart bet for the new grid.

17 Our new analysis suggests the utilities will

18 have a strong earnings platform especially

19 for the near term." So yeah, I don't know

20 where to take those two conclusions. If

21 they're not earning their returns, why are

22 they betting on them?

23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

24 Q. Oh well, we come back to the Oliver Wyman

25 report.

Page 31

1 MR. COYNE:

2 A. But it is—they do say one thing that I agree

3 with here, and that is that utilities need

4 to manage their costs in order to be able to

5 earn their returns.

6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

7 Q. Yes.

8 MR. COYNE:

9 A. And I fully agree with that.

10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

11 Q. Yes.

12 MR. COYNE:

13 A. It's not a given that a utility earns its

14 return. They have an opportunity to earn

15 their allowed return and that's what's

16 important, but it's not a given. It takes a

17 sound management team to be able to do so;

18 good management practices.

19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

20 Q. Okay.

21 MR. COYNE:

22 A. It's not a slam dunk.

23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

24 Q. So I guess to summarize you're saying,

25 "Look, take my word for it; not Oliver

Page 32

1 Wyman's on this point," right?

2 MR. COYNE:

3 A. I would say take the research that we have

4 done.

5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

6 Q. Okay.

7 MR. COYNE:

8 A. Not my word.

9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

10 Q. I just want to understand where you are on

11 that.

12 MR. COYNE:

13 A. I would like to know what research they've

14 done. I could better address this. You've

15 given me this just beforehand. I haven't

16 had a chance to look at what they've done.

17 If you did so, I might be able to make more

18 meaning out of it.

19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

20 Q. Well, I gave it to you, gave it--sent over

21 on March 31st.

22 MR. COYNE:

23 A. Well, with nothing behind it. I don't know

24 what's behind this report. I don't know

25 what their analysis is.



Page 33

1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 2 Q. That's fine.  
 3 MR. COYNE:  
 4 A. There's no way for me to really look at it,  
 5 given—based on what you've given me.  
 6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 7 Q. I see. Well, so I take it –  
 8 MR. COYNE:  
 9 A. And we work with these utilities on their  
 10 allowed returns; you know we do this work  
 11 every day.  
 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 13 Q. Okay.  
 14 MR. COYNE:  
 15 A. And utilities, as we discussed yesterday, if  
 16 they feel as though they're not able to earn  
 17 their allowed returns, they have the option  
 18 to come in for rate cases.  
 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 20 Q. Right. How many utility clients do you  
 21 have?  
 22 MR. COYNE:  
 23 A. My firm?  
 24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 25 Q. You.

Page 34

1 MR. COYNE:  
 2 A. Well, I don't know that I can specify the  
 3 number, but we work—I work for a broad  
 4 number of clients in both the US and Canada.  
 5 And my firm works in all 48 states and  
 6 across most jurisdictions in Canada. So we  
 7 have access to a lot of information in this  
 8 regard.  
 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 10 Q. Okay, but evidently not this report.  
 11 MR. COYNE:  
 12 A. It's not something that we rely on, no.  
 13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 14 Q. Okay. So in terms of the ability for  
 15 Newfoundland Power to recover costs and earn  
 16 their returns, I understand that the credit  
 17 rating agencies for instance, they grade  
 18 Newfoundland Power pretty darn highly, is  
 19 that your understanding as well?  
 20 MR. COYNE:  
 21 A. Yes, they give them a solid ranking as a  
 22 regular.  
 23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 24 Q. Yes, like A, big A, small A, I think Moody's  
 25 or—for their ability to recover their costs?

Page 35

1 MR. COYNE:  
 2 A. They rank them highly.  
 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 4 Q. Yes.  
 5 MR. COYNE:  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 8 Q. And just one thing I noticed about the—if  
 9 you go back to the AUS Monthly Report, you  
 10 see column number 19?  
 11 MR. COYNE:  
 12 A. I do.  
 13 (9:30 a.m.)  
 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 15 Q. And so their—or column number 18, the S&P  
 16 Bond rating?  
 17 MR. COYNE:  
 18 A. Um-hm.  
 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 20 Q. I see a lot of like, you know, Bs, triple  
 21 Bs, B minus, triple B plus. The bottom—some  
 22 of the bottom companies are A minus, A, A  
 23 minus, and going down to the combination gas  
 24 and electrics, you know quite a smattering  
 25 in the B range, although mind you some As.

Page 36

1 So in terms of the universe of US utilities,  
 2 would they—I take it that there's no a large  
 3 number of utilities that are up in that A  
 4 category as considered by S&P?  
 5 MR. COYNE:  
 6 A. There are, if you look at the universe  
 7 utilities including those that are public,  
 8 we have some that are triple A, some that  
 9 are double A in others.  
 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 11 Q. Yes.  
 12 MR. COYNE:  
 13 A. So this—they're not looking at the entire  
 14 universe of utilities.  
 15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 16 Q. Yes, but like your –  
 17 MR. COYNE:  
 18 A. So, but -  
 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 20 Q. But your average utility is not A though, is  
 21 it?  
 22 MR. COYNE:  
 23 A. Oh the—I think the average utility is  
 24 probably either A minus or in that range.  
 25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

Page 37	Page 39
<p>1 Q. Okay. So let's just turn to CA-NP-126.</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. And that's one of the reasons why we</p> <p>4 screened on credit rating. You want—a</p> <p>5 credit rating. You wanted those that were</p> <p>6 most like Newfoundland Power. Is this an</p> <p>7 attachment?</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Yes.</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. Okay.</p> <p>12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. It's only a small attachment.</p> <p>14 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>15 A. Okay, and what was the number?</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17 Q. CA-NP-126.</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19 A. 126. I have it.</p> <p>20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Okay, and so if we could, just flip up to</p> <p>22 the actual question for a moment. Yes, so</p> <p>23 this was a question posed that where we</p> <p>24 said, "In answer to an information request</p> <p>25 in a 2010 Line 9 hearing before the NEB,"</p>	<p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>2 Q. And only 23 percent being A minus according</p> <p>3 to S&amp;P?</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. Right.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. Yes.</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. Yeah.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. So like I think Fortis has an S&amp;P rating of</p> <p>12 A minus. Are you aware of that?</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Okay, and so you--Newfoundland Power for</p> <p>17 instance from DBRS has an A rating. Would</p> <p>18 you expect that they would have an A rating</p> <p>19 from S&amp;P?</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. An A rating from S&amp;P?</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Yes, Newfoundland –</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. I have no way to determine what the rating</p>
Page 38	Page 40
<p>1 I'll cut out a little detail there, "Ms.</p> <p>2 McShane provided the following histogram of</p> <p>3 the number of US utilities in each bond</p> <p>4 rating and their respective business risk</p> <p>5 scores. Can Mr. Coyne update this histogram</p> <p>6 and/or comment on whether it is no longer</p> <p>7 appropriate" - or "accurate for US</p> <p>8 utilities?" So we see what Ms. McShane's</p> <p>9 histogram was showing. Basically certainly</p> <p>10 not many in that A range relative to all the</p> <p>11 lowers, and you updated the histogram for</p> <p>12 us?</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. Yes, we did.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Which is on the attachment?</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. Right.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Yes, right there. So you have it graphed</p> <p>21 and presented numerically. So we only see</p> <p>22 like four percent that would be considered</p> <p>23 an A grade by S&amp;P, is that right?</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. That's right.</p>	<p>1 would be.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Would you expect their rating to be higher</p> <p>4 than Fortis Inc.?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. Probably not.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. It wouldn't be higher than Fortis Inc.?</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. Again, it's speculation on my part.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Are you aware that S&amp;P has rules regarding</p> <p>13 the rank—the ratings that they give to</p> <p>14 subsidiaries that are ring fenced?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. The subsidiary needs to be ring fenced in</p> <p>17 order for it to give it a higher credit</p> <p>18 rating.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Right. Otherwise, they—you're—they're below</p> <p>21 the—there's a limit to how the parent can be</p> <p>22 above the utility?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. Unless they're ring fenced.</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>

Page 41	Page 43
<p>1 Q. Right.</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. My understanding, this company is.</p> <p>4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>5 Q. Right.</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. Properly insulated from its parent in that</p> <p>8 regard.</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. Okay.</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. And this Board insisted that it be so.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. So seventy-odd percent of US investor-owned</p> <p>15 utilities are a triple B plus and lower?</p> <p>16 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>17 A. Investor-owned utilities, yes.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. Investor-owned utilities.</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. This does not include the publics.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. It doesn't include the publics, okay.</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. We have some publics that are triple A,</p>	<p>1 A. So we screen carefully for companies that</p> <p>2 have credit ratings comparable to this</p> <p>3 company.</p> <p>4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>5 Q. So when a US investor is looking at the</p> <p>6 universe of US investor-owned electric</p> <p>7 utilities, do you have any evidence to</p> <p>8 suggest that they can differentiate between,</p> <p>9 you know the—or the 42 percent that are in</p> <p>10 the triple B and below versus the numbers</p> <p>11 that are in the A minus for instance?</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. They certainly do. Yes.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. They do, do they?</p> <p>16 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>17 A. Those that are lower ranked pay higher costs</p> <p>18 for their capital.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. As it should be. They're riskier.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>
Page 42	Page 44
<p>1 double A and single A.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Yes, okay.</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. If you looked at the universe of utilities,</p> <p>6 it would all shift to the left.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. These are investor owned, so out of</p> <p>9 investor owned we see 38, 42 percent would</p> <p>10 be triple B and below?</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. That's correct.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. Yes.</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. Yeah, and that's why we screened on credit</p> <p>17 rating to do our proxy groups.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. Yes.</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. Our average or the average credit rating in</p> <p>22 our proxy group is E minus.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. Yes.</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 A. That's why one does not want –</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. And where is your –</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. One does not want to slip –</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. Where is your evidence of that though?</p> <p>8 That's an assertion you're making. Where is</p> <p>9 your evidence of that?</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. Would you like to turn to my Rebuttal</p> <p>12 Evidence? We have a graph showing the</p> <p>13 difference between a triple B cost of debt</p> <p>14 and an A cost of debt. We have it in</p> <p>15 multiple places.</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17 Q. Yes, but I'm talking about what—an equity</p> <p>18 investor, if they're looking at this</p> <p>19 universe.</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. If you –</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Would an equity investor not look at the US</p> <p>24 utilities broadly without making a</p> <p>25 differentiation about someone is up at A</p>

Page 45	Page 47
<p>1 minus or A?</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. It would not be necessary for me to do so,</p> <p>4 because I was focussed on companies with</p> <p>5 credit ratings like this one for purposes of</p> <p>6 my analysis. I wasn't trying to examine the</p> <p>7 entire universe of US utilities.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. I see.</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. That would not be a good use of my evidence</p> <p>12 and it wouldn't be informative to the Board.</p> <p>13 I was trying to examine those for a proxy</p> <p>14 group.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. I see.</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. That looked like the target company that we</p> <p>19 were estimating the cost of capital for.</p> <p>20 One would never do that. It just wouldn't</p> <p>21 be informative.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Let's talk about the concept of integration</p> <p>24 with the United States market.</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 Number –</p> <p>2 (9:40 a.m.)</p> <p>3 MS. GLYNN:</p> <p>4 Q. FortisBC?</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. That's right.</p> <p>7 MS. GLYNN:</p> <p>8 Q. So we'll enter that as Information Number</p> <p>9 22.</p> <p>10 KELLY, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. Yes, got it. Thanks.</p> <p>12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. Now this—just to put this piece of evidence</p> <p>14 into perspective, this was evidence filed by</p> <p>15 FortisBC Energy Inc. on December 18th, 2015</p> <p>16 in the GRA proceeding—or the BCUC proceeding</p> <p>17 that you have been involved in, Mr. Coyne,</p> <p>18 right?</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. That's correct.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay, so you recognize this question and</p> <p>23 this answer, right?</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. I do.</p>
Page 46	Page 48
<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Between Canada and the United States. Okay?</p> <p>4 And leaving for a moment how the market in</p> <p>5 the United States broadly views the ability</p> <p>6 of the US utilities to earn returns versus</p> <p>7 in Canada. Now Newfoundland Power is</p> <p>8 Fortis.</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. Um-hm.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Its shares are listed for trading. Are they</p> <p>13 listed for trading outside of Canada, are</p> <p>14 you aware?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. I'm not aware that they are, no.</p> <p>17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. In fact you're aware that they're not</p> <p>19 I take it?</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. That's my understanding</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Right. And could we turn to Cross Aid</p> <p>24 Number 2 that was sent over to you on April</p> <p>25 1st? Yes, it's the April 1st. It's the Item</p>	<p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So in this question the Association</p> <p>3 of Major Power Consumers of BC I understand</p> <p>4 asked, on the first page there, "Please list</p> <p>5 the percentage of Fortis non-Canadian</p> <p>6 shareholders for each year since 2000."</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. I see that.</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. Right.</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. Um-hm.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. And the response that we see at lines 23 to</p> <p>15 27 on that, "FEI does not have the ability</p> <p>16 to access the requested Information back to</p> <p>17 the year 2000, but the chart below shows the</p> <p>18 percentage of Canadian versus non-Canadian</p> <p>19 shareholders, including Institutional</p> <p>20 ownership, from 2010 to the most recent</p> <p>21 available date. This data was obtained</p> <p>22 through Bloomberg and is based on publicly</p> <p>23 reportable holdings. Bloomberg only has</p> <p>24 this data available from 2010 onwards."</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>

Page 49

1 A. Um-hm.

2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

3 Q. So if we turn over the page, we actually see

4 the shareholdings from 2010 to 2015 broken

5 down by Canadian versus non-Canadian

6 shareholders.

7 MR. COYNE:

8 A. I see that.

9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

10 Q. And this—the source of the information is

11 Bloomberg. Is that a source that you would

12 accept?

13 MR. COYNE:

14 A. Yes.

15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

16 Q. Okay. And so we see here that this data

17 seems to be pretty steady at about, you know

18 18 to 20, 25 percent over those—that five-

19 year period for non-Canadian ownership. Do

20 you see that?

21 MR. COYNE:

22 A. I do see that.

23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

24 Q. Okay.

25 MR. COYNE:

Page 50

1 A. Yeah.

2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

3 Q. Do you know if this would be unusual for a

4 Canadian utility?

5 MR. COYNE:

6 A. To have that percentage of foreign

7 ownership? I don't recall looking at it

8 more broadly, but it strikes me as not

9 unusual, no.

10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

11 Q. And why does it strike you as not unusual?

12 MR. COYNE:

13 A. Well, we have integrated financial markets

14 specifically between the US and Canada and

15 globally these days. So foreign investors

16 are looking for returns wherever they can

17 find them and they're looking for

18 diversification across geographic boundaries

19 as well.

20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

21 Q. Oh, so you're regarding the relatively low

22 numbers of non-Canadian shareholders as

23 evidence of an integration of the Canada/US

24 market, are you?

25 MR. COYNE:

Page 51

1 A. No, I said it's evidence of integrated

2 global markets. It's broader than that.

3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

4 Q. I see. Are you aware, Mr. Coyne, that

5 neither Canadian utilities nor America which

6 are part of your Canadian proxy group are

7 listed outside of Canada in—on the New York

8 Stock Exchange or NASDAQ?

9 MR. COYNE:

10 A. That's my understanding.

11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

12 Q. And you –

13 MR. COYNE:

14 A. But that's not necessary to raise capital in

15 the US to be listed on the New York Stock

16 Exchange.

17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

18 Q. I never asked you if it was.

19 MR. COYNE:

20 A. Well –

21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

22 Q. Now are you aware that most Canadian

23 companies are in fact, big Canadian

24 companies are listed on the NYSE and NASDAQ?

25 MR. COYNE:

Page 52

1 A. Some are; some aren't. Yes.

2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

3 Q. Okay. Now TransCanada Corporation and

4 Enbridge, I understand that they're both

5 listed in the United States?

6 MR. COYNE:

7 A. I believe that's correct.

8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

9 Q. Because they have huge pipeline assets in

10 the United States, is that right?

11 MR. COYNE:

12 A. They both have substantial assets in the

13 United States, yes.

14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

15 Q. Okay. Why would you think or do you think

16 that Canadian utilities are unattractive to

17 non-residents and that the Canadian

18 utilities such as Fortis managers don't see

19 any value in a US listing, do you know?

20 MR. COYNE:

21 A. Well, you've asked two questions. Let's go

22 to your first.

23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

24 Q. Okay.

25 MR. COYNE:

Page 53

1 A. You suggested that –

2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

3 Q. That these –

4 MR. COYNE:

5 A. - Canadian invest—that foreign investors do

6 not find Canadian investments as being

7 attractive or Canadian utility investments?

8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

9 Q. That's right. Do you agree with that?

10 MR. COYNE:

11 A. Well, this suggests to me that at least some

12 do, and before we go too far, if you go back

13 to the prior page of that answer it says

14 that this includes institutional ownership.

15 So it's not all ownership. It's just

16 institutional ownership. It doesn't reflect

17 the ownership of individual investors, and

18 that's because those aren't reported through

19 Bloomberg, and I think that that has to do

20 with privacy concerns. So we don't know

21 what the total –

22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

23 Q. Are you saying that the 20 percent –

24 MR. COYNE:

25 A. Could I finish my answer, please? Okay.

Page 54

1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

2 Q. I just want to understand. Are you saying

3 that the 20 percent is only including

4 institutional investors?

5 MR. COYNE:

6 A. Yes, that's what the—that's what it says in

7 the response.

8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

9 Q. I don't read the response like that.

10 MR. COYNE:

11 A. Yes. Okay, the second line, "The chart

12 below shows the percentage of Canadian

13 versus non-Canadian shareholders, including

14 Institutional ownership." So it's

15 institutional ownership only that Bloomberg

16 reports. They do not have the data on

17 individual investors.

18 (9:45 a.m.)

19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

20 Q. Well, but Mr. Coyne, if they're saying it

21 includes, including—it doesn't say

22 "including institutional ownership only,"

23 does it?

24 MR. COYNE:

25 A. Well that is the data.

Page 55

1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

2 Q. I see. Anyway, so are you aware as to

3 whether – are you aware that Canadian

4 residents get a dividend tax credit, which

5 is not extended to non-residents, so that

6 Canadian residents face a lower tax rate on

7 dividend income from Canadian utilities

8 versus non-Canadian utilities? Are you

9 aware of that?

10 MR. COYNE:

11 A. Generally aware of this, yes. I'm not a tax

12 expert.

13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

14 Q. Okay. So all else constant, there is no

15 incentive for a Canadian to hold foreign

16 utility stocks, do you agree with that?

17 MR. COYNE:

18 A. I do not – from a tax standpoint?

19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

20 Q. Right.

21 MR. COYNE:

22 A. Well, from a tax standpoint, perhaps no;

23 from an investment diversification

24 standpoint, I can't speak for that. My

25 assumption is that Canadians look for

Page 56

1 investment diversification and they're

2 probably broadly invested in other markets.

3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

4 Q. Are you –

5 MR. COYNE:

6 A. Just as U.S. investors are.

7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

8 Q. Are you aware that Canadian residents have

9 to pay withholding tax on foreign source

10 dividends?

11 MR. COYNE:

12 A. On foreign source dividends?

13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

14 Q. Right.

15 MR. COYNE:

16 A. I believe that's correct.

17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

18 Q. Okay, and are you aware that U.S. residents

19 face a withholding tax on Canadian source

20 dividends?

21 MR. COYNE:

22 A. Yes.

23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

24 Q. And are you aware that as a result of these

25 holding taxes, pension funds and other

Page 57	Page 59
<p>1 utilities that do not pay tax have an</p> <p>2 incentive to invest in dividend paying</p> <p>3 shares from their own country?</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. Yes, but that doesn't address then why we</p> <p>6 see such tremendous cross border investment</p> <p>7 that we do. There are tax considerations</p> <p>8 investing beyond your own borders, but yet</p> <p>9 we see substantial cross border investment</p> <p>10 certainly between the U.S. and Canada, and</p> <p>11 certainly between the utilities, they're</p> <p>12 aggressively pursue investments specifically</p> <p>13 from Canada in the U.S..</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. Mr. Coyne, do you think foreign exchange</p> <p>16 risk plays a part in determining where</p> <p>17 investors invest?</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Have you – we sent over a cross-aid, but</p> <p>22 there's perhaps no need to reference it</p> <p>23 unless you're unfamiliar with it. Have you</p> <p>24 ever heard of the following phrase on a</p> <p>25 Canadian prospectus, and I just lifted this</p>	<p>1 securities cannot be sold in the United</p> <p>2 States unless they're sold to an exempt</p> <p>3 purchaser or U.S. investors buy them on the</p> <p>4 TSX, is that right?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. U.S. investors buying them on the TSX, yes.</p> <p>7 The first part of your question?</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Unless they are sold to an exempt purchaser?</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. Yeah, I'm not sure what an exempt purchaser</p> <p>12 would mean in that case.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. Well, I'm talking about the –</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. Under the '33 Act?</p> <p>17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>18 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. Well –</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. You don't know?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. No, I don't know the answer to that</p> <p>25 question.</p>
Page 58	Page 60
<p>1 from a recent Fortis prospectus in relation</p> <p>2 to a preference share offering that they</p> <p>3 were making, and it says, "The securities</p> <p>4 being offered under the short form</p> <p>5 prospectus have not been and will not be</p> <p>6 registered under the United States</p> <p>7 Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or any</p> <p>8 state's securities laws, and may not be</p> <p>9 offered or sold within the United States</p> <p>10 unless the securities are registered under</p> <p>11 the 1933 Act, or an exemption from the</p> <p>12 registration requirements of the 1933 Act is</p> <p>13 available". Are you aware that that appears</p> <p>14 on all Fortis prospectuses?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. I'm aware of that quote, and it's consistent</p> <p>17 with U.S. Securities Regulation. You have</p> <p>18 to be registered to sell the securities</p> <p>19 there. Again that's not to say that you</p> <p>20 can't buy the securities through a Canadian</p> <p>21 broker dealer in Canada, but that you must</p> <p>22 be registered in order to sell them directly</p> <p>23 to a U.S. buyer under the '33 Act, yes.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. So this means, I take it, that these</p>	<p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>4 A. I would stipulate, though, that, yes, you do</p> <p>5 need to buy those securities in all</p> <p>6 probability on the TSX and not in the U.S.</p> <p>7 under those restrictions.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. So do you –</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. Which you're able to do so.</p> <p>12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. Do you think that this is – you know, this</p> <p>14 type of thing, this is on the very front</p> <p>15 page of these prospectuses, right, you're</p> <p>16 aware of that?</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. I don't know where it is in the prospectus.</p> <p>19 We could look to see where it is.</p> <p>20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Well, subject to check, would you take it</p> <p>22 that it's on the very first page at the top?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. If you say so, I accept that.</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>

Page 61	Page 63
<p>1 Q. Okay, I do say so, Cross-Aid 3, just for the</p> <p>2 record, and maybe we should refer to it so</p> <p>3 that it will be formally on the record.</p> <p>4 MS. GLYNN:</p> <p>5 Q. We'll enter that as Information 23.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. Okay.</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. All right, thanks.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. Do you see it right up at the top there of</p> <p>12 the screen, Mr. Coyne? It's very small.</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. And where are you looking, which paragraph?</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. At the very top line. It even appears</p> <p>17 before – there you go, it's up there, part</p> <p>18 way down, "The securities being offered</p> <p>19 under the short form prospectus have not</p> <p>20 been and will not be registered", and you</p> <p>21 can read it there. That's in relation to a</p> <p>22 600 million dollar short form prospectus in</p> <p>23 relation to redeemable fixed preference</p> <p>24 shares for Fortis. So do you think, Mr.</p> <p>25 Coyne, that this is consistent with a</p>	<p>1 the United States. We see significant cross</p> <p>2 border flows of Fortis capital into the</p> <p>3 U.S..</p> <p>4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>5 Q. Mr. Coyne, just let me talk for a bit about</p> <p>6 the concept of integrated market for a</p> <p>7 moment. Would an example of a fully</p> <p>8 integrated market be, say, for instance, the</p> <p>9 gold market? We know worldwide what the</p> <p>10 cost of an ounce of gold is, right?</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. There's a global market in gold, yes.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. That's a fully integrated market, right?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. When you say fully integrated, perhaps you</p> <p>17 could define that more precisely. I don't</p> <p>18 think I've used the term "fully integrated",</p> <p>19 so I'm not sure where you're going with</p> <p>20 fully integrated for gold.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay.</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. It's a highly specialized market,</p> <p>25 sophisticated traders and large institutions</p>
Page 62	Page 64
<p>1 completely integrated capital market between</p> <p>2 the United States and Canada, where Canadian</p> <p>3 and U.S. investors, you know, look at each</p> <p>4 other's stocks as being equivalent?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. You do?</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. Each have their own securities laws that</p> <p>11 have to be adhered to. Each company makes</p> <p>12 its own decision in terms of where it most</p> <p>13 efficiently raises capital, both debt and</p> <p>14 equity capital, and if you can have a fully</p> <p>15 subscribed issuance within your home market,</p> <p>16 then that's fine; if you need to go more</p> <p>17 broadly, you do, but again you can raise</p> <p>18 capital on your own stock exchange that come</p> <p>19 from either domestic sources or foreign</p> <p>20 sources. So the amount of – if the issue</p> <p>21 here is the amount of capital flowing in and</p> <p>22 out of the utilities industry across our</p> <p>23 borders, I would think that that would</p> <p>24 certainly not be an issue, especially with</p> <p>25 this company which is actively investing in</p>	<p>1 and countries, so I don't know if I would</p> <p>2 call it fully integrated. It's certainly a</p> <p>3 global market.</p> <p>4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>5 Q. Would you regard it as highly integrated?</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. When you refer to "integrated" in the</p> <p>8 context that I've used it, I'm talking about</p> <p>9 between countries, and certainly gold is a</p> <p>10 globally traded commodity. In that sense, I</p> <p>11 guess you could say so, but I want to see</p> <p>12 where you're going before I – I use the term</p> <p>13 "highly integrated". It's a global market</p> <p>14 for gold.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Okay, but, I mean, utility stocks are priced</p> <p>17 differently in each country, there's</p> <p>18 different risk free rates, there's different</p> <p>19 currencies, all that sort of thing figures</p> <p>20 into it?</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. Now can we just turn to Dr. Booth's Report</p> <p>25 for a moment at page 25. Just on the</p>



Page 65	Page 67
<p>1 previous page, just to put that chart in 2 perspective, at page 24 the question is, 3 “What is your forecast for the long Canada 4 bond yield for 2016/2017”, and Dr. Booth 5 answers, “The current January 8, 2015 RBC 6 forecast is below”, and, of course, RBC 7 provides the forecast for both Canada and 8 the United States, are you aware of that? 9 MR. COYNE: 10 A. Yes. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. Okay, and do you see the fourth quarter of 13 2015 for the 30 year in Canada? 14 MR. COYNE: 15 A. I do. 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. At 2.16 percent? 18 MR. COYNE: 19 A. Right. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 Q. And the United States 30 year at 3.02 22 percent, so significantly higher? 23 MR. COYNE: 24 A. I do see that. 25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>	<p>1 important for this analysis, is what 2 utilities are paying for capital, and my 3 analysis showed that U.S. and Canadian “A” 4 rated utilities are paying within 11 basis 5 points of each other for their debt capital. 6 So that’s what’s really important. The 7 credit spreads are higher in Canada than 8 they are in the U.S., which offsets this 9 differential to bring it within 11 basis 10 points. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. Yes, I – I didn’t have a chance to read the 13 transcript last night because it went into 14 my junk box, but I thought I recollected you 15 to say that the cost of debt was – there was 16 a higher spread now than in 2012, right? 17 MR. COYNE: 18 A. Yes. 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 20 Q. Yeah, but the cost of debt now, how would that 21 compare to 2012? 22 MR. COYNE: 23 A. Higher. 24 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 25 Q. The cost of debt is higher now, is it?</p>
Page 66	Page 68
<p>1 Q. And if we go right along the forecast period 2 from the first quarter of 2016 to the fourth 3 quarter of 2017, I think that you’ll confirm 4 that there is a persistent spread between 5 the risk free rate in Canada and the risk 6 free rate in the United States? 7 MR. COYNE: 8 A. I see that. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. And if these markets are integrated to the 11 extent that you’re suggesting to the Board, 12 why is the risk free rate significantly 13 higher in the United States than in Canada? 14 MR. COYNE: 15 A. In the short term there’s a stronger 16 economic outlook in the U.S. than there is 17 in Canada, and as a result of that there are 18 greater inflationary pressures in the short 19 run. We talked about this yesterday, and 20 there’s also a dislocation in government 21 bond markets where central banks are acting 22 to move bond markets in such a way that 23 they’re not in equilibrium, and you can see 24 this kind of disparity as a result. What we 25 looked at yesterday, which I think is</p>	<p>1 MR. COYNE: 2 A. Yes, that’s what we discussed yesterday. Can 3 I bring that up? 4 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 Q. I see. 6 MR. COYNE: 7 A. Can I bring up the exhibit? 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. No, I – 10 MR. COYNE: 11 A. Because I think it directly corresponds to 12 this issue. 13 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 14 Q. Fair enough, if you want to bring it up. 15 MR. COYNE: 16 A. If we could go to my rebuttal evidence, I 17 think that’s where I updated the chart. It 18 would be Figure 5 from page 19, if we can do 19 that, because I think this is where it all 20 comes together. At least, I hope it does. 21 This is what utilities are actually paying 22 for debt and it shows in this case a 23 Canadian corporate “A” versus a Canadian 24 utility “A”, and you can see that they 25 bottomed out in and around the period of the</p>

Page 69	Page 71
<p>1 last GRA, they went up again, they dipped</p> <p>2 again in the beginning – end of 2014 and</p> <p>3 beginning of 2015, and have now come up to</p> <p>4 the point where they're higher than they</p> <p>5 were the last time the company filed its</p> <p>6 GRA. So cost of debt for a Canadian utility</p> <p>7 is higher today than it was then.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Where –</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. If you look on the far end of the chart,</p> <p>12 that number is higher than it was back in</p> <p>13 September of 2012.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. How many columns or entries over from the</p> <p>16 right hand side? What does that right hand</p> <p>17 side represent?</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19 A. What is the right hand – it's percent bond</p> <p>20 yield.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. In terms of the date that you have on the</p> <p>23 2016?</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. I updated the data when I submitted my</p>	<p>1 A. Right, about a year ago.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. I see.</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. We've seen a lot of – that's about the time</p> <p>6 when we saw a dislocation in equity markets</p> <p>7 and debt markets in general. Investors have</p> <p>8 grown more weary of investments in all</p> <p>9 sources of capital since that period of time</p> <p>10 both debt and equity. We've seen more</p> <p>11 volatility in equity markets, and we've seen</p> <p>12 the reverberations in debt markets as a</p> <p>13 result of that, and also, I think, investors</p> <p>14 are taking a longer view even as bumpy of a</p> <p>15 road as it's been, they view both Canada -</p> <p>16 the forecasts are for both Canada and the</p> <p>17 U.S., to continue to grow out of the</p> <p>18 recessionary environment that we have been</p> <p>19 in in the past, and resume economic growth</p> <p>20 over the near term future.</p> <p>21 (10:00 a.m.)</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Yes.</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. So as a result of that, expectations are</p>
Page 70	Page 72
<p>1 rebuttal evidence, so it would have been</p> <p>2 March 18th.</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. Right.</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. So it's as far as we had the Bloomberg for</p> <p>7 value curves as of that date.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. So when I see the little valley there in</p> <p>10 bond yields just to the right of the screen,</p> <p>11 what date was that?</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. Well, it's looking to me as though it was</p> <p>14 January. Which value are you talking about?</p> <p>15 Oh, the one back in May?</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17 Q. I see the dip towards the right hand of the</p> <p>18 screen, if you could bring the cursor over a</p> <p>19 little bit.</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. Right, I think that looks to be May,</p> <p>22 April/May.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. 2015?</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 that demand for money is increasing and</p> <p>2 there's more risk aversion in the market, so</p> <p>3 debt costs are up.</p> <p>4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>5 Q. Mr. Coyne, we also see, though, that utility</p> <p>6 recently, like your client, Maritime</p> <p>7 Electric, they agreed on a lower ROE by 40</p> <p>8 basis points.</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. 35.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Was it 35?</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. And then in Alberta, they had been at 8.75</p> <p>17 on an interim basis back in around 2012, and</p> <p>18 then that got adjusted down to 8.3 percent,</p> <p>19 so sort of recognition that the cost of</p> <p>20 equity nevertheless is coming down, would</p> <p>21 that be right?</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. No. Two issues; one is that reflected, as we</p> <p>24 mentioned yesterday, a settlement in</p> <p>25 Maritime Electric on a bunch of issues, so</p>

Page 73

1 in their case that settlement did reduce  
 2 their ROE from, I think, 9.7 to 9.35.  
 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 4 Q. Yes.  
 5 MR. COYNE:  
 6 A. Over a three year period, so my presumption  
 7 is that they settled on a variety of issues  
 8 and the ROE was part of that package. In  
 9 the case of – we’re look at cost of capital  
 10 today, not what the AUC decided for the  
 11 prior three years, and there are a host of  
 12 witnesses before the AUC today to update  
 13 that generic cost of capital, and their  
 14 recommendations are in the 10s or 10s  
 15 pluses.  
 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 17 Q. Mr. Coyne, are you familiar with the Fortis  
 18 utilities south of the border called Central  
 19 Hudson?  
 20 MR. COYNE:  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 23 Q. And are you familiar with what’s recently  
 24 happened with their return on equity?  
 25 MR. COYNE:

Page 74

1 A. I am not, no.  
 2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 3 Q. It’s a matter of evidence in this proceeding  
 4 that they return on equity in July of 2015  
 5 was decreased by one full percentage point  
 6 from where it had been set two or three  
 7 years previously. Are you aware of that?  
 8 MR. COYNE:  
 9 A. What number is it now?  
 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 11 Q. 9. It had been 10. You didn’t know that,  
 12 did you?  
 13 MR. COYNE:  
 14 A. I did not. I could undertake to research if  
 15 that’s correct.  
 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 17 Q. Well, I’m just telling you it’s factual, but  
 18 you can take it subject to check, how is  
 19 that?  
 20 MR. COYNE:  
 21 A. Yes, and –  
 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 23 Q. So would that indicate that there’s some  
 24 recognition south of the border that return  
 25 on equity is coming down?

Page 75

1 MR. COYNE:  
 2 A. Not based on that piece of evidence, no.  
 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 4 Q. Now Mr. Coyne, let’s just talk about Dr.  
 5 Booth’s testimony further to put a few  
 6 things into perspective in terms of returns  
 7 that markets can expect, etc, okay. Could  
 8 we turn to -  
 9 MR. COYNE:  
 10 A. Pardon me, I just want to make a note to  
 11 look at that for you.  
 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 13 Q. Okay.  
 14 MR. COYNE:  
 15 A. Yes, Dr. Booth’s evidence?  
 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 17 Q. Yes, please, page 58. By the way, does your  
 18 firm do the cost of capital work for Central  
 19 Hudson?  
 20 MR. COYNE:  
 21 A. We do do work in New York. I don’t recall  
 22 if we have done it for Central Hudson or  
 23 not.  
 24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 25 Q. Can you undertake to determine whether your

Page 76

1 firm did the cost of capital work for  
 2 Central Hudson in the work leading to the  
 3 order of June or July, 2015?  
 4 MS. GLYNN:  
 5 Q. Is the undertaking accepted?  
 6 KELLY, Q.C.:  
 7 Q. Yes.  
 8 MS. GLYNN:  
 9 Q. Noted on the record.  
 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 11 Q. Thank you. Now at page 58 of Dr. Booth’s  
 12 Report, and again just for context, if we go  
 13 back to page 57, Samantha, for a moment, and  
 14 Dr. Booth now is turning to considering any  
 15 other evidence on the validity of these  
 16 types of expected return estimates that some  
 17 of these models are producing, and then he  
 18 refers to in his answer at the bottom of  
 19 that page, “What’s important is that there’s  
 20 another side to estimating the fair ROE and  
 21 cost of equity capital. That is the  
 22 required rate of return on the part of the  
 23 investor. The cost of equity capital is  
 24 also the expected rate of return”, and he  
 25 refers to defined benefit pension funds need

Page 77	Page 79
<p>1 this expected rate of return to determine</p> <p>2 whether a fund is in deficit or surplus, and</p> <p>3 he refers on the next page to the October</p> <p>4 19, 2012 TD Economics, which produced its</p> <p>5 own analysis of long run returns of the type</p> <p>6 needed in defined benefit pension plans. So</p> <p>7 Mr. Coyne, I want to ask you a few questions</p> <p>8 about this. First of all, I take it you</p> <p>9 will confirm that your understanding is</p> <p>10 similar to ours and Mr. Booth's, that these</p> <p>11 are financial projections made by TD over</p> <p>12 the next decade and they made those back in</p> <p>13 2012, right?</p> <p>14 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>15 A. According to Dr. Booth, yes.</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17 Q. TD Economics is a good source to rely on?</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19 A. I'm aware of who they are. I think they're</p> <p>20 reasonable, yes, as a source.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay, and in terms of the numbers that</p> <p>23 they're showing for the average annual</p> <p>24 returns for cash, bonds, equities in Canada</p> <p>25 and the United States, and internationally,</p>	<p>1 of 9 percent by going through a mathematical</p> <p>2 calculation process. Do you understand how</p> <p>3 he arrives at 9 percent?</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. I can't say that I do.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Well, as I –</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. He's converting from geometric to</p> <p>10 arithmetic. Okay, I see that, yeah.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. So would you accept that 7 percent converted</p> <p>13 to arithmetic is around 9 percent?</p> <p>14 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>15 A. It sounds about right as a conversion.</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. So if we converted that 7 percent</p> <p>18 going forward estimate of TD to 9 percent,</p> <p>19 would you agree with this calculation going</p> <p>20 from long run compound returns as simple</p> <p>21 average returns? We're clear on that,</p> <p>22 there's no dispute about that?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. I haven't done the math, but it sounds about</p> <p>25 right.</p>
Page 78	Page 80
<p>1 I take it you would agree that these are</p> <p>2 geometric returns and they would need to be</p> <p>3 converted to arithmetic returns, is that</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. If they are geometric, yes, they would need</p> <p>7 to be converted.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. And I'm told that these are, in fact,</p> <p>10 geometric returns, and you'll see that the</p> <p>11 simple long run return of the risk premium</p> <p>12 of equities over bonds according to TD in</p> <p>13 2012 was 4 percent. So you see the TD</p> <p>14 equities, Canada, they're at 7 percent on</p> <p>15 the geometric basis, and the bonds in the</p> <p>16 universe bond index are at 3 percent, so</p> <p>17 that's where that 4 percent difference comes</p> <p>18 in terms of the premium of equities over</p> <p>19 bonds. See that?</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. Yeah, I see the math.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. And Dr. Booth then proceeds to convert these</p> <p>24 long run estimates of the equity returns</p> <p>25 from 7 percent to an average market return</p>	<p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>2 Q. He does then another adjustment in his</p> <p>3 report to the bond returns, and to calculate</p> <p>4 what that spread between the bonds and the</p> <p>5 equity is and put it in an arithmetic</p> <p>6 fashion, that converts to a 5.6 equity risk</p> <p>7 premium over bonds using the same type of</p> <p>8 calculation, do you accept that?</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. This is Dr. Booth's work, it's not my work,</p> <p>11 so I see what he has done here, I'll go that</p> <p>12 far. I have not checked his math in that</p> <p>13 regard.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. Okay, but you took no exception to his math</p> <p>16 when you did your rebuttal, for instance?</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. No, I did not feel the need to do so.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Okay, and so – now can we turn to</p> <p>21 Newfoundland Power's answer to CA-NP-014.</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. I have all your books. What was the number?</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. 014.</p>

Page 81	Page 83
<p>1 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>2 A. Okay. Maybe I don't have that book. Let's</p> <p>3 see if I have it here. This pertains to</p> <p>4 Mercer?</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. Yes.</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. Right, okay.</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. So in this answer, Newfoundland Power is</p> <p>11 indicating that – I'm reading from line 10,</p> <p>12 "The long term asset mix used by the company</p> <p>13 is 40 percent equities, and 60 percent</p> <p>14 bonds. Target mix of equities and bonds,</p> <p>15 together with the expected long term rates</p> <p>16 of return, assume in calculating the</p> <p>17 expected return on assets of 5.75 percent is</p> <p>18 shown in Table 1". So you see for equities,</p> <p>19 they have an expected return of 8.1 percent</p> <p>20 and for bonds 3.5 percent. I understand</p> <p>21 that if you convert the 8.1 expected return,</p> <p>22 because that's a compound return as I</p> <p>23 understand it, right -</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. It would probably be so if it's geometric,</p>	<p>1 2006. So this would be pretty up to date.</p> <p>2 Have you had a chance to view this document,</p> <p>3 Mr. Coyne?</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. Let me catch up to it.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. Certainly.</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. 269, did you say?</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. Yes, sir.</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. Attachment "B", yeah, I see that.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Could we go to page 3 of this,</p> <p>16 Samantha, 3 of 28, and I just want to read</p> <p>17 for the record that this document, they say,</p> <p>18 "Summarizes AON Hewitt Canada's 10 year</p> <p>19 forward looking capital market assumptions,</p> <p>20 CMAs, that are to be used in the</p> <p>21 determination of strategic portfolio</p> <p>22 allocations and related modelling or</p> <p>23 projection studies. The methodology</p> <p>24 described herein is also the basis of longer</p> <p>25 term 30 year capital market assumptions that</p>
Page 82	Page 84
<p>1 yes.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. And if you convert it, that 8.1 becomes a</p> <p>4 9.6 percent return, okay, after adjustment,</p> <p>5 would you accept that?</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. It sounds reasonable.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. And I think actually if we turn to CA-NP-</p> <p>10 269, Attachment "B" – before doing so, if</p> <p>11 you could come down that answer a little bit</p> <p>12 further.</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. I think I have it here, thank you.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Yes, I'm sorry, I missed this. In fact,</p> <p>17 Mercer did indicate that that would convert</p> <p>18 to a 9.6 percent at line 28.</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. I see that, yes.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. So now if we could turn to CA-NP-269,</p> <p>23 Attachment "B", and this is a very recent</p> <p>24 AON Hewitt Capital Market Assumptions and</p> <p>25 Methodology, Canadian version of January 7th,</p>	<p>1 can be used to determine an expected long</p> <p>2 term portfolio return for the purposes of</p> <p>3 performing an actuarial valuation", and then</p> <p>4 go on to say, "The CMAs, capital market</p> <p>5 assumptions, presented in this document</p> <p>6 represent AON Hewitt Canada's best estimate</p> <p>7 view of future economic conditions and are</p> <p>8 established by a national committee</p> <p>9 comprised of investment and risk management</p> <p>10 practitioners. The determination of the CMA</p> <p>11 involves a thorough analysis of all</p> <p>12 available quantitative and qualitative</p> <p>13 resources, including but not limited to in-</p> <p>14 house analyses of historical returns,</p> <p>15 external analyses of long term historical</p> <p>16 returns, presented and published research</p> <p>17 articles, the actual state of the market,</p> <p>18 and the good judgment of the National</p> <p>19 Assumptions Committee. Additionally, the</p> <p>20 CMAs reflect the analyses and research done</p> <p>21 by AON Hewitt investment and risk management</p> <p>22 colleagues around the globe and are checked</p> <p>23 for global consistency". So would you view</p> <p>24 this as a very authoritative document?</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>

Page 85	Page 87
<p>1 A. I think I would just accept it for what AON</p> <p>2 Hewitt characterizes it as, for purpose of</p> <p>3 performing an actuarial evaluation for its</p> <p>4 clients.</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. Well, it –</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. I accept it on face value for how they</p> <p>9 describe it.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. So let us just turn to page 8 of AON Hewitt</p> <p>12 for a moment. So there AON Hewitt has shown</p> <p>13 the current and the long term target yield</p> <p>14 curves. This would be on the long Canada</p> <p>15 bond, I understand. Oh, short to long, all</p> <p>16 of the bonds, short term, medium term, and</p> <p>17 long term bonds.</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19 A. Right, that's a yield curve.</p> <p>20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Okay, I'm sorry about that. Now we see that</p> <p>22 they have the long Government of Canada</p> <p>23 yield curve significantly above what we have</p> <p>24 been experiencing recently. Is this – would</p> <p>25 that be a fair assumption that they're</p>	<p>1 what they have said, around 2 percent.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. It wouldn't be your understanding that this</p> <p>4 AON Hewitt forecast for the long Canada bond</p> <p>5 yield, that's not for the forecast test</p> <p>6 year, is it, it's not for 2016, for</p> <p>7 instance?</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. I'm not sure if I understand your question.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. They are not saying that their long term</p> <p>12 target is for the test year 2016?</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. They have a yield curve that much, or if it</p> <p>15 even has – it doesn't have a timeframe to</p> <p>16 it. It just shows maturity and describes</p> <p>17 long term target. If you go elsewhere in</p> <p>18 the report, they do have numbers associated</p> <p>19 with their projections. That's not a</p> <p>20 projection for a specific period in time.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay.</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. It's just a yield curve as of – well, as of</p> <p>25 their analysis.</p>
Page 86	Page 88
<p>1 looking for the long Canada bond yield to</p> <p>2 increase about up to 4.8, about 1/8th</p> <p>3 percent, I think they say on the next page,</p> <p>4 which is just under 2 percent higher than at</p> <p>5 the time of their forecast. Would that be</p> <p>6 your understanding of this?</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. That's what it shows.</p> <p>9 (10:15 a.m.)</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. So AON Hewitt, Mr. Coyne, they</p> <p>12 wouldn't view the current long Canada bond</p> <p>13 yields as being sustainable, and, I guess,</p> <p>14 would that be something that you and Dr.</p> <p>15 Booth would agree on?</p> <p>16 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>17 A. I think we agree on that.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. Okay, and what do you understand by the long</p> <p>20 term target, Mr. Coyne?</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. Well, in this case I'm not sure if they're</p> <p>23 characterizing the Bank of Canada's long</p> <p>24 term target. It may be, because that would</p> <p>25 be an inflationary target consistent with</p>	<p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>2 Q. In January.</p> <p>3 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>4 A. Apparently so.</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. Just if we turn to page 19 for a moment. If</p> <p>7 you look at they have a summary of their</p> <p>8 expected long run returns by asset classes,</p> <p>9 and this is, I think you're probably aware,</p> <p>10 Mr. Coyne, this is what Dr. Booth has in</p> <p>11 Schedule 4 to his evidence as well. Are you</p> <p>12 familiar with this material?</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. I'm familiar with what I'm looking at here.</p> <p>15 I'd have to go back to see what's in</p> <p>16 Schedule 4 of his evidence. We accept that,</p> <p>17 subject to check.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. No sweat. Do you see that they have an</p> <p>20 annual average return in the first column,</p> <p>21 and then the second is the compound return,</p> <p>22 right?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. Yes, I do see that.</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>

Page 89	Page 91
<p>1 Q. And so as I understand it, this is the</p> <p>2 arithmetic versus the compound return. Is</p> <p>3 that your understanding as well?</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. That's right.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So if we look at the long run equity</p> <p>8 returns, AON Hewitt for Canadian equities</p> <p>9 has it at 7.1 percent. Do you see that?</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. Are you on page 19? Yes, and they have 8.3</p> <p>12 for average annual.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. Yes, which they convert then to a simple</p> <p>15 average or arithmetic return of 8.3 percent?</p> <p>16 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>17 A. I see that.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. Okay, and they also show average annual</p> <p>20 standard deviation?</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. Right.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. And that's the stock market volatility of</p> <p>25 standard deviation of 17 percent, and I</p>	<p>1 A. I see that.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Okay, and do you understand why they hedge,</p> <p>4 or I should say, make an exchange rate</p> <p>5 adjustment to the U.S. returns?</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. Due to foreign currency fluctuations and the</p> <p>8 fact that if you're going to – you pay when</p> <p>9 you want to lock down a return where there's</p> <p>10 an exchange associated with it, and you can</p> <p>11 hedge to do so and pay to lock down that</p> <p>12 return, so you're not exposed to whatever</p> <p>13 those deviations might be.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. And would you agree with me that the</p> <p>16 exchange rate adjustment reflects different</p> <p>17 inflation rate and interest rates in Canada</p> <p>18 than the United States has?</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. I don't know what's included in their hedge</p> <p>21 adjustment. I can't speak to that.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Is that what a hedge adjustment would</p> <p>24 normally adjust for, inflation rate and</p> <p>25 interest rate differences between the two</p>
Page 90	Page 92
<p>1 understand Dr. Booth uses a standard annual</p> <p>2 deviation of 20 percent. So there's not</p> <p>3 much difference between what Dr. Booth says</p> <p>4 in that regard and what's here. Is that</p> <p>5 your understanding as well?</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. I would leave that to Dr. Booth.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Okay, and for the United States, U.S.</p> <p>10 equities, we see U.S. equities and then we</p> <p>11 see U.S. equities hedged, right, Mr. Coyne?</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. And so that's where they're trying to make a</p> <p>16 conversion taking into account the currency</p> <p>17 difference between Canada and the United</p> <p>18 States, would that be right?</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. I assume so.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. And they would have the 10 year compound</p> <p>23 return at 6.6 and the average arithmetic</p> <p>24 hedged at 8 percent?</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 countries?</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. There's a market for hedges that include a</p> <p>4 host of factors, including the overall</p> <p>5 liquidity in that product. So those would</p> <p>6 be two of the issues that might be</p> <p>7 considered, but there's a market for hedges,</p> <p>8 it's quite liquid in terms of cross border</p> <p>9 currency exchange.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. So let's put it this way. Without doing a</p> <p>12 hedge adjustment, you can't compare a U.S.</p> <p>13 dollar return with a Canadian dollar return,</p> <p>14 would that be your understanding?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. Well, they're giving it to us both ways a</p> <p>17 reason. You can choose to hedge it or not.</p> <p>18 Some companies will elect not to hedge;</p> <p>19 others will.</p> <p>20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Mr. Coyne, can we just turn to page 21 where</p> <p>22 there is a table that AON Hewitt used, and</p> <p>23 if we just go up to see the title of this</p> <p>24 table for a moment called, "Select Monthly</p> <p>25 Correlations", and my understanding, Mr.</p>

Page 93	Page 95
<p>1 Coyne, is that this is a table that tries to</p> <p>2 get at the level of correlation between</p> <p>3 selected instruments, debt instruments,</p> <p>4 equity instruments, in a variety of places;</p> <p>5 Canada, the United States, global equities,</p> <p>6 etc, and Mr. Coyne, I understand and I don't</p> <p>7 know if you'd agree with this, that what</p> <p>8 we're talking about here in terms of</p> <p>9 correlation is the extent to which two</p> <p>10 securities move together. Would you accept</p> <p>11 that?</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. Yes, that's the definition of correlation.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. Okay, and if you look at Canadian equities,</p> <p>16 okay, and U.S. – if you look at Canadian</p> <p>17 equities and you come all the way over,</p> <p>18 you'll see a .6, right?</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. I see that, yes.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay, and if you come down to – do you see</p> <p>23 this table, Mr. Coyne, is indicating that</p> <p>24 there's a .6 correlation between Canada and</p> <p>25 U.S. equities?</p>	<p>1 Q. What's that?</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. I can't tell. I can't tell. You tell me</p> <p>4 what you think it is, and I'll accept it.</p> <p>5 That's an impossible chart to read.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. So U.S. equities or Canadian equities would</p> <p>8 be equally correlative with the merging – is</p> <p>9 it global equities or merging markets as the</p> <p>10 U.S. market, is that what AON Hewitt is</p> <p>11 telling us?</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. I see those two correlations as being the</p> <p>14 same. I don't know what period of time this</p> <p>15 is done over – well, I think they tell us in</p> <p>16 the front of the report what time it's done</p> <p>17 over. The analysis that I did that I showed</p> <p>18 in JMC-1 shows that over the past 25 years,</p> <p>19 the TSX and S &amp; P 500 have been correlated</p> <p>20 by .71, so I accept that based on the</p> <p>21 analysis I know I did. That's not that far</p> <p>22 off. It tells me they're highly correlated,</p> <p>23 but not perfectly correlated.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. In this correlation coefficient, I</p>
Page 94	Page 96
<p>1 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>2 A. I see that number, yes.</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. Okay, that's probably the simple way to do</p> <p>5 it, and do you see what the correlation</p> <p>6 between Canadian equities is and a merging</p> <p>7 market equities?</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. I think that's also .6. These numbers are</p> <p>10 quite small.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. .6?</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. I can't make it out. Maybe on the screen</p> <p>15 it's better.</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17 Q. .6 or .7. Do you need to have Samantha</p> <p>18 adjust the screen?</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. It looks like .8.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. .8?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. Now it looks like .6.</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>	<p>1 understand that that's part of the beta</p> <p>2 coefficient, is that right?</p> <p>3 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. My understanding is that the beta</p> <p>7 coefficient is simply the correlation</p> <p>8 coefficient multiplied by the relative</p> <p>9 standard deviations of the security in the</p> <p>10 market. Is that correct?</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. Yes, that's what beta is trying to measure</p> <p>13 is the correlation between a specific</p> <p>14 security in the broader market, yeah.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. And securities with higher correlation</p> <p>17 coefficients tend to have higher betas, is</p> <p>18 that right?</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. And I'm told that correlation coefficient of</p> <p>23 1 means the security moves identically with</p> <p>24 the market and offers no diversification</p> <p>25 benefits, is that also correct?</p>



Page 97	Page 99
<p>1 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. And it is this correlation structure, as AON</p> <p>5 Hewitt shows in this chart, that that would</p> <p>6 be crucial for modern portfolio theory,</p> <p>7 would you agree with that?</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. Crucial in what sense?</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. It would be crucial for modern portfolio</p> <p>12 theory and institutional investors to know</p> <p>13 the degree of correlation when they're</p> <p>14 building their portfolios?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. Investors would like to know the</p> <p>17 correlations across various equity classes</p> <p>18 for making investments, yes.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. So they can have diversification?</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. That's right.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. Right.</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 bottom of the chart you see real return</p> <p>2 bonds, which are very low, slightly above</p> <p>3 that, 91 day treasury bills, etc, and if you</p> <p>4 go all the way up, if you see the – let me</p> <p>5 just see here. The top of the range, as I</p> <p>6 understand it, for compound rate of return</p> <p>7 would be about 6 percent, a 10 year average</p> <p>8 annual model, 6 percent, which I think would</p> <p>9 convert arithmetically into 7.5 percent.</p> <p>10 Would you accept that conversion?</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. That sounds about right.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. Okay, and this would be what AON Hewitt</p> <p>15 saying would apply to global equities, U.S.</p> <p>16 equities, would be approaching that number,</p> <p>17 listed infrastructure, you see listed</p> <p>18 infrastructure?</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. I see that U.S equities is low volume at the</p> <p>21 top of that chart, yes.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Now, Mr. Coyne, do I understand you to be</p> <p>24 saying in your analysis for Newfoundland</p> <p>25 Power's fair ROE that your expectation is</p>
Page 98	Page 100
<p>1 A. And they can manage return and risk in the</p> <p>2 process of doing so.</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. So that they can know that they've got to be</p> <p>5 careful that if they invested one basket of</p> <p>6 investments and it moves in a highly</p> <p>7 correlated fashion with another basket, that</p> <p>8 that's not going to provide diversification.</p> <p>9 That would be my understanding.</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. I share that.</p> <p>12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. Okay, and that's very layman, I'll grant</p> <p>14 you. So would you agree that a table such</p> <p>15 as this with correlation coefficients are</p> <p>16 what institutional investors would need to</p> <p>17 build their portfolios?</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19 A. It's one of the tools they would use.</p> <p>20 (10:30 a.m.)</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Can we turn to page 25 of AON Hewitt, so</p> <p>23 what they have set out here is the risk</p> <p>24 return relationship by asset class, and so</p> <p>25 you see a whole variety - like, on the very</p>	<p>1 that the TSX market is expected to return</p> <p>2 13.46 percent on an infinite basis, on an</p> <p>3 infinite time period for your DCF analysis?</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. We conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis</p> <p>6 that yielded that result, yes, based on</p> <p>7 analysts' forecasts.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Okay, and just turn up JMC-5 and I think you</p> <p>10 want JMC-5 of the first part of the report,</p> <p>11 Smith, page 1 of 4. So this would be the</p> <p>12 Canadian companies that you're referring to</p> <p>13 in your DCF analysis, in terms of the broad</p> <p>14 Canadian market, right?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. This is the forward-looking test we did for</p> <p>17 the market equity risk premium using analyst</p> <p>18 forecast to explain, if I can –</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Sure.</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. This is the forward-looking market equity</p> <p>23 risk premium we derive by using the DCF</p> <p>24 analysis in analyst growth forecast and we</p> <p>25 did this for both the TSX Stock Exchange</p>

Page 101	Page 103
<p>1 utilities, using their current stock prices, 2 dividend yields and analyst forecasts, and 3 we did the same for the U.S., S &amp; P 500, so 4 basically what we did is we ran a DCF model 5 for each company in each market and then 6 aggregated them in order to determine what 7 the implied forward-looking market return 8 was based on current market prices, dividend 9 yields and analyst forecasts. And these are 10 five-year analyst forecasts. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. They are five-year analyst forecasts? 13 MR. COYNE: 14 A. Right. 15 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 16 Q. And so you end up with, in column 4, 17 secondary market investor required return of 18 13.46 percent and that would be the return 19 that, the expectation is that the TSX is to 20 provide? 21 MR. COYNE: 22 A. That's right. 23 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 24 Q. For what period of time is the TSX expected 25 to provide that return?</p>	<p>1 utilities, that's the entirety of the TSX, 2 is that your question? 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. I'm sorry, yes, okay. 5 MR. COYNE: 6 A. That should just say "TSX". 7 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 8 Q. And, I mean, that is a very high expected 9 return, nearly 13.5 percent. I mean, at 10 that rate, an investor is what, doubling 11 their money every what, five years or four 12 years? 13 MR. COYNE: 14 A. No, I don't think it's that fast, but it is 15 an aggressive growth rate. 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 Q. 13 into 72. 18 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Yeah, that's right, that's where you double 20 it, isn't that right? 21 MR. COYNE: 22 A. It would be about that period of time. 23 CHAIRMAN: 24 Q. So five and a half years. 25 MR. COYNE:</p>
Page 102	Page 104
<p>1 MR. COYNE: 2 A. Well these are five-year forecasts, so in 3 essence this is a five-year outlook. 4 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 Q. But as I understand the constant growth 6 model of DCF that that depends upon an 7 assumption of growth at that level on an 8 infinite basis, is that my understanding? 9 MR. COYNE: 10 A. That's the cost in growth assumption, yes. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. Right, okay. And just incidentally, we have 13 a whole slew of companies listed in this 14 exhibit, Sun Life to, you know, and 15 everybody can read them, Brookfield Asset 16 Management, Saputo, et cetera, et cetera, 17 and up top you have it called S &amp; P TSX 18 Utilities Index, why are you referring to 19 the TSX Utilities Index there? 20 MR. COYNE: 21 A. Because I'm trying to track—the broadest 22 indicator I have of the Canadian Stock 23 Market and I do the same for the S &amp; P 500 24 for the U.S. market. You're wondering why 25 it says "utilities", it's TSX, it's not</p>	<p>1 A. And that's what is implied by the stock 2 prices, dividend yields and expectations 3 billed into those forecasts. What we do 4 with that is we use it as, we use it as a 5 test of whether or not the historically 6 earned market equity risk premium is what 7 investors are expecting today. This tells 8 us this is what investors are expecting 9 today based on those assumptions. 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 Q. But I don't know if we could find, if you 12 went out in the Avalon Mall and said, what 13 do you think the prospects are of getting 13 14 percent, I think people wouldn't know what 15 you're talking about, would they? 16 MR. COYNE: 17 A. Well I haven't done the research at the 18 Avalon Mall, but I have researched the stock 19 prices, dividend yields and analyst 20 forecasts. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 Q. You wouldn't have to go to the mall, b'y, on 23 that one. 24 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 25 Q. Like, can you, I mean in all honesty, Mr.</p>

Page 105

1 Coyne, can you refer to any independent  
2 third party source, like an AON Hewitt or  
3 RBC or TD or a bank of Canada, I mean, I'll  
4 let you pick them, who can corroborate this  
5 view of the world?  
6 MR. COYNE:  
7 A. This is what this information is telling us,  
8 this is what these growth rates are  
9 providing and the market is providing. What  
10 we do with this is we use this and blend it  
11 with historic returns to try and come up  
12 with an indicator of what market  
13 participants are thinking about forward  
14 returns, that's the extent of it.  
15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
16 Q. So to answer my question, you cannot point  
17 to any independent third party source that  
18 would support this view of the world?  
19 MR. COYNE:  
20 A. No. What I have done is –  
21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
22 Q. Is that right, that you can't?  
23 MR. COYNE:  
24 A. I cannot, no. What I have done is we  
25 conducted a regression analysis to look at

Page 106

1 the relationship—our premise here is that  
2 just looking backwards at historic equity  
3 market returns will not tell you what market  
4 equity returns are in a current very low  
5 interest rate environment. So we conducted  
6 -  
7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
8 Q. Just to –  
9 MR. COYNE:  
10 A. Can I finish?  
11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
12 Q. Go ahead.  
13 MR. COYNE:  
14 A. I want to put this in context. So what we  
15 did is conducted a regression analysis to  
16 test this relationship between historic  
17 market equity risk premium that existed  
18 across a wide range of interest rates and  
19 the current very low interest rates, and  
20 what that shows us is that there's an  
21 inverse relationship that's well understood  
22 and you would expect in a current low  
23 interest rate environment that the market  
24 equity risk premium would be higher, so this  
25 is one test of that. The other test of that

Page 107

1 we did, was with our regression analysis.  
2 Both of us, both of those would get, as my  
3 point is, to a higher market equity risk  
4 premium than we've experienced historically  
5 by looking at records going back to the  
6 early 1900s, so that's the point of this.  
7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
8 Q. Mr. Coyne, AON Hewitt and TD and the other  
9 courses that Dr. Booth uses, they're  
10 forward-looking sources, right?  
11 MR. COYNE:  
12 A. They're forward-looking sources for  
13 actuarial analysis, they're not forward-  
14 looking sources for, what, let me just leave  
15 it there, they're forward-looking for  
16 actuarial analysis for those doing pension  
17 fund returns.  
18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
19 Q. But isn't AON Hewitt available to  
20 institutional investors as well?  
21 MR. COYNE:  
22 A. I suppose so, but you just read to me the  
23 purpose of their analysis was for actuarial  
24 analysis and that actuarial analysis is for  
25 pension fund returns.

Page 108

1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
2 Q. I see, so anyway, I guess your evidence is  
3 that this sky high projection which is  
4 implied by these forecasts of 13.46, this is  
5 what Newfoundland Power is relying upon in  
6 part for its 9.5 percent request from this  
7 Board?  
8 MR. COYNE:  
9 A. Let me go to the—I'll tell you how I have  
10 relied upon it. I would not—certainly not  
11 put it the way you have. If you go to page  
12 29 of my report in Figure 13 that shows you  
13 my reliance, so what I've done there is  
14 shown that we have estimated—or not  
15 estimated, relied on the estimates of  
16 historic market equity risk premiums going  
17 back to, as long as the records have them  
18 for both the S & P 500 and the TSX and those  
19 are the 5.6 percent in Canada and the 7  
20 percent in the U.S. And if we take that  
21 forward-looking view that we just  
22 characterized using the DCF analysis and we  
23 deduct from that the forward-looking view,  
24 on the equilibrium bond yield that I have  
25 utilized, deduct one from the other, that

Page 109	Page 111
<p>1 gets you the forward-looking market numbers,  2 the 9.8 percent return and 8.1. I averaged  3 those together to get a 7.6 percent average  4 return. If I were to—if I run this  5 regression analysis to ask the question  6 what's been the historic relationship  7 between the market equity risk premium and  8 interest rates, which is described on the  9 next page, with current interest—with the  10 current forecast interest rate or you can do  11 it either with the current or the forecast  12 interest rate, that gets you a 10.09 percent  13 current forward-looking market equity risk  14 premium. So you don't have to buy the  15 number projected in that forecast to  16 understand the principal that when interest  17 rates are very low, equity investors have  18 higher equity risk premium, expectations and  19 the same is true when rates are higher. You  20 have to try and estimate that some way and  21 otherwise, you're just relying on a period  22 of history that's not relevant to where we  23 are today and not relevant to the next two  24 or three years for this company. You have  25 to adjust for it in some way, so what I've</p>	<p>1 Q. Just one further thing, Mr. Coyne, if we  2 could just go back to AON Hewitt at page 20  3 to see that asset class risk reward  4 relationship and you'll see that they show  5 Listed Infrastructure or is that the right  6 one?  7 MR. COYNE:  8 A. I see Listed Infrastructure, yes.  9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  10 Q. And listed, as I understand it, just means  11 listed on a stock exchange?  12 MR. COYNE:  13 A. I think they have the definitions in the  14 front of the report.  15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  16 Q. And would you accept that that's what it  17 means, listed –  18 MR. COYNE:  19 A. Well let's look at the definition.  20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  21 Q. Okay, sure.  22 MR. COYNE:  23 A. No, they don't give us a definition. I  24 guess I can accept that.  25 (10:45 a.m.)</p>
Page 110	Page 112
<p>1 done is I've taken the market information  2 and I've done it one way and then I'll test  3 it historically using a regression analysis  4 which would point to even a higher number.  5 So I'm not here to say that the TSX is going  6 to return 13 percent in perpetuity; I don't  7 think that's the case. But the important  8 principal is that looking backwards for a  9 hundred years of bond income and income  10 returns on equities doesn't give you the  11 right answer. You have to find some way to  12 look forward and this is one way to do it.  13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  14 Q. So that 13.45 number that we've been  15 discussing, which of these numbers on your  16 Figure 13 are influenced by that assumption?  17 MR. COYNE:  18 A. That is the 9.8 and that, again, I have  19 weighted that equally with history in order  20 to come up with the 7.6 which represents the  21 average of them all. And again, that's the  22 number that I tested against that regression  23 analysis that I just described to you. So  24 that's the entirety of the context.  25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>	<p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  2 Q. Okay. Maybe just go to page 19 for a  3 moment, there you go. Can we just go up,  4 move the material up the screen for a  5 moment? Keep moving, here we go. Listed  6 unhedged infrastructure, 6.8 percent average  7 annual return and would you agree, Mr.  8 Coyne, that infrastructure would be quite  9 akin to and similar to describing  10 transmission and distribution assets?  11 MR. COYNE:  12 A. I have no idea what's in that, it could  13 include, it probably does include a host of  14 different type of infrastructure  15 investments.  16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  17 Q. Okay, Mr. Coyne, can we turn to page 26 of  18 your report? Now this part of your report,  19 you're starting a discussion around the  20 capital asset pricing model which is one of  21 the models that you used to arrive, I take  22 it, at a risk premium estimate.  23 MR. COYNE:  24 A. Yes.  25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 Q. Right. And just to clarify on this,</p> <p>2 yesterday I recall asking you when I was</p> <p>3 suggesting to you that your analysis was</p> <p>4 two-thirds DCF, that you use DCF as part of</p> <p>5 your risk premium analysis and you said that</p> <p>6 you did not, as I understand it. Do you</p> <p>7 recall telling me that?</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. But in point of fact, don't you actually use</p> <p>12 a DCF analysis to arrive at your risk</p> <p>13 premium?</p> <p>14 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>15 A. I used a DCF to test the forward-looking</p> <p>16 market equity risk premium that factors into</p> <p>17 it, yes.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. Okay, thank you. Now, and then you just</p> <p>20 used straight on DCF again, apart from the</p> <p>21 risk –</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. I used straight on DCF for utility proxy</p> <p>24 group, yes.</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 yield are 2.1 for Canada and 2.8 for the</p> <p>2 U.S.</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. For the ten year. Now, as I understand it,</p> <p>5 if you take a ten year, a forecast for the</p> <p>6 ten-year bond in Canada, you then have to</p> <p>7 make an adjustment to it to reflect what the</p> <p>8 yield will be on the long Canada for that</p> <p>9 year, is that right?</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. That's right, that's what we do in Figure 11</p> <p>12 on page 27.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. So you add 71 basis points?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. That's right. That was the then current 30-</p> <p>17 year estimate as of August 2015, the</p> <p>18 difference between the 10 and the 30 year.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. But just to understand, you're not using a</p> <p>21 risk free rate for Newfoundland Power of</p> <p>22 2.82 percent, which would be your 2.1 10</p> <p>23 year Canada, plus your 71 basis point</p> <p>24 adjustment, you're using a different risk</p> <p>25 free rate for Newfoundland Power, right?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 Q. Okay, thank you. Now critical to these risk</p> <p>2 premium estimates, I understand, is the risk</p> <p>3 free rate?</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. Okay, and Newfoundland Power, as you're</p> <p>8 aware, is on a forward-average test year, is</p> <p>9 that your information?</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. Okay, so the test year for which you're</p> <p>14 estimating the fair ROE for Newfoundland</p> <p>15 Power at 2016?</p> <p>16 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. And what is your estimate of the risk free</p> <p>20 rate to apply to the average 2016 test year?</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. Well first of all, my understanding is that</p> <p>23 rates in Newfoundland are typically in place</p> <p>24 for about three years, but for the test year</p> <p>25 2016, the forecast for the ten-year bond</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>2 A. I'm using a three-year average forecast from</p> <p>3 Consensus Economics for '16, '17 and '18 and</p> <p>4 to that, I'm adding the 71 basis points for</p> <p>5 Canada or the U.S. to get to the 3.68 or the</p> <p>6 4.29.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. Are you aware of –</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. If we could put page 27 up, it might be</p> <p>11 helpful for everybody to see that. So just</p> <p>12 to explain then where the figure is in front</p> <p>13 of us, can you just scroll up one more line.</p> <p>14 Thank you. So a three-year outlook from</p> <p>15 Consensus Economics gives an average of 2.97</p> <p>16 and 3.60 and to those, I'm adding the then</p> <p>17 current spread between the 30 and the 10</p> <p>18 year to get to the 3.68 and the 4.29.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. I see. So, Mr. Coyne, are you aware of</p> <p>21 whether in this jurisdiction we present a</p> <p>22 risk free rate for rate setting purposes and</p> <p>23 arrive at it in this fashion using a three-</p> <p>24 year projection of the rate?</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>

Page 117	Page 119
<p>1 A. I'm aware that there's a lot of discussion</p> <p>2 here, as in elsewhere, in terms of what an</p> <p>3 equilibrium or forward-looking appropriate</p> <p>4 risk free rate is, so the information that</p> <p>5 I'm presenting describes something that gets</p> <p>6 you towards more of an equilibrium risk free</p> <p>7 rate and I thought it was an appropriate way</p> <p>8 to present this data information for these</p> <p>9 purposes.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. So if we were to ignore the 2017 and 2018</p> <p>12 forecast that you've built into your risk</p> <p>13 free rate, we would be at 2.82 percent for</p> <p>14 2016. You can confirm that, right?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. If you were to ignore it, but I don't know</p> <p>17 why you would ignore it. You can see that</p> <p>18 those aren't the expectations for forward-</p> <p>19 looking rates which would be the ones that</p> <p>20 an equity investor would consider when</p> <p>21 making this type of investment. I would</p> <p>22 note that all of these were lower than Dr.</p> <p>23 Booth's estimate or a risk free rate.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. Just for clarification on the point, though,</p>	<p>1 between Canadian and U.S. utilities almost</p> <p>2 completely offset that differential, so no,</p> <p>3 I don't see that as being a—they were down</p> <p>4 11 basis points, so if you factor the credit</p> <p>5 spread differential on top of this, they</p> <p>6 would be nearly identical. And I apply the</p> <p>7 U.S.—when I'm using the U.S. proxy group, I</p> <p>8 use the U.S. sample, when I'm applying it to</p> <p>9 the Canadian companies, I'm using the</p> <p>10 Canadian, and by doing so, I can compare the</p> <p>11 results to see if they're giving me the same</p> <p>12 range, how they compare to each other.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. Mr. Coyne, if we could just turn back to</p> <p>15 your Figure 13 Market Risk Premia for Canada</p> <p>16 and the United States.</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. Which figure?</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Figure 13.</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. SO this is looking, as you say, part of it</p> <p>25 is the historical is looking at backwards</p>
Page 118	Page 120
<p>1 if we were to ignore, and you can disagree</p> <p>2 with whether we should and that's fair, it</p> <p>3 would lower your risk premium estimates by</p> <p>4 about .86 percent across the board, wouldn't</p> <p>5 it?</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I wouldn't ignore it, but it would do</p> <p>8 so.</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And I guess you would confirm that</p> <p>11 your United State's interest rate forecast</p> <p>12 are all higher to the—all higher than the</p> <p>13 Canadian forecast by about .6 percent or .63</p> <p>14 percent on average from 2016 to 2018?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. That's right, consistent with the forecast,</p> <p>17 that's right, at the Government bond yield</p> <p>18 risk free rate level, that's right.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Is there any reason to think or believe that</p> <p>21 the higher U.S. borrowing costs do not</p> <p>22 translate into a higher common equity cost</p> <p>23 for a U.S. utility?</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. As we discussed earlier, the credit spreads</p>	<p>1 looking data which shows that the Canadian</p> <p>2 market risk premium, according to your</p> <p>3 report, is about 5.6 percent, again over the</p> <p>4 risk free rate, would that be right? And</p> <p>5 the U.S. is higher at 7 percent on a</p> <p>6 historic basis, that's your evidence, that's</p> <p>7 what your report indicates.</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. On a historic basis, yes.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. Okay.</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. The AON Hewitt report that you just went</p> <p>14 through and it shows that the opposite true</p> <p>15 is true on a going-forward basis for</p> <p>16 Canadian equities versus U.S. equities by</p> <p>17 about the same difference. There is a 70</p> <p>18 basis point difference in their projected</p> <p>19 ten-year average return, with the Canadian</p> <p>20 return being projected higher.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. So let's just start at first principals for</p> <p>23 a moment then. The market risk premium is</p> <p>24 basically the extra return that investors</p> <p>25 require for investing in equities, rather</p>

Page 121	Page 123
<p>1 than bonds, is that right?</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. That's right.</p> <p>4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>5 Q. And then that becomes a benchmark that we</p> <p>6 use for judging the required return for low</p> <p>7 and risk securities, would that be fair?</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. Well in the context of the CAPM-1, yes.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. So when you estimate the return on the</p> <p>12 equity market, how would you go about</p> <p>13 calculating it? Let me just put to you a</p> <p>14 scenario: if the stock starts at \$100.00</p> <p>15 and it pays a \$5.00 dividend and ends the</p> <p>16 year at \$105.00. I understand we would</p> <p>17 calculate the total return as 10 percent, so</p> <p>18 that would be 5 percent for the dividend</p> <p>19 return and another 5 percent for the capital</p> <p>20 gain in the stock, would that be your</p> <p>21 understanding?</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. That's right.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. And so how did you calculate, at page 29,</p>	<p>1 A. I think I have that in here. I'm going to</p> <p>2 say it's 1914 for the U.S. and I think it's</p> <p>3 a little later than that for Canada. It</p> <p>4 goes back over a very long period of time.</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. Can you find out where that is?</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. Mr. Chairman, it's five to the hour. Maybe</p> <p>9 he could look for it –</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>11 Q. Sure.</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I can identify that.</p> <p>14 (RECESS – 10:57 A.M.)</p> <p>15 (RETURN – 11:41 A.M.)</p> <p>16 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>17 Q. So, Mr. Johnson, we're back to you and I</p> <p>18 understand we're going to around 1:15 or so</p> <p>19 and then we'll hear from Mr. Burry.</p> <p>20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. If I might complete –</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. Yes, sir.</p>
Page 122	Page 124
<p>1 how did you calculate the rate of return on</p> <p>2 Government bonds?</p> <p>3 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>4 A. Well I didn't calculate it, I relied on the</p> <p>5 two sources that are used for this purpose,</p> <p>6 Duff and Phelps or Ibbotson that provides</p> <p>7 this data.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. And you refer to them up at page, on the</p> <p>10 same page up at lines 8 to 10.</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. That's right. Morningstar and Duff and</p> <p>13 Phelps.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. Where you say historical MRP is based on the</p> <p>16 arithmetic mean of the equity market</p> <p>17 returns. Okay, so this was not something</p> <p>18 that you calculated, this was something that</p> <p>19 you took from these sources?</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. Right, this is the commonly used source for</p> <p>22 these purposes.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. And what time period was used?</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>2 A. A check I was doing for you pertaining to</p> <p>3 Central Hudson, I can confirm that they were</p> <p>4 awarded a 9 percent return on equity. In a</p> <p>5 decision of June 27, 2015 it was a</p> <p>6 settlement for three years. They went in</p> <p>7 with a settlement at 9 percent and they have</p> <p>8 an earning sharing mechanism that kicks in</p> <p>9 at 9.5 where they share earnings above that</p> <p>10 number with customers, and it was on 48</p> <p>11 percent equity. We did not provide evidence</p> <p>12 in that proceeding.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. They had been under a rate freeze, I think,</p> <p>15 prior to that year, as part of the deal when</p> <p>16 they bought the company?</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. I don't know, if there were rate freeze</p> <p>19 provisions, I'm not aware of them.</p> <p>20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Did you find out about the time</p> <p>22 period you used when you did your market</p> <p>23 risk premia historical, the historical</p> <p>24 figures you present for 5.6 and 7 percent,</p> <p>25 Canada and United States, as shown in Figure</p>

Page 125

1 13?

2 MR. COYNE:

3 A. Yes, the sources for those are Ibbotson,

4 Morningstar for the U.S. and the dates are

5 1926 to 2014, which were the most recent I

6 had available at that time; and they are

7 Duff and Phelps for Canada available from

8 1919 through 2014.

9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

10 Q. 1919 to 2014?

11 MR. COYNE:

12 A. Yes.

13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

14 Q. For Canada?

15 MR. COYNE:

16 A. Right.

17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

18 Q. These are obviously the historic figures,

19 okay.

20 MR. COYNE:

21 A. Right, and their calculation is a difference

22 between equity returns and bond income

23 returns.

24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

25 Q. Bond income returns, yes, okay. And that's

Page 126

1 how you're presenting them to the Board in

2 Figure 13 as well, right, you are taking,

3 you are presenting the risk premium over the

4 bond income returns?

5 MR. COYNE:

6 A. That's correct.

7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

8 Q. And I sent over to you a cross-examination

9 aid, being Ms. McShane's evidence from the

10 GRA from 2012. It's cross-aid 6.

11 MS. GLYNN:

12 Q. And we'll enter that as Information No. 24.

13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

14 Q. If you could go to page 64 of Ms. McShane's

15 evidence? Do you have that in front of you,

16 Mr. Coyne?

17 MR. COYNE:

18 A. Yes, I see it.

19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

20 Q. Okay, now you'll see that she, when she was

21 providing her evidence, she, in addition to

22 providing the premium, the risk premium over

23 the bond income return, which is in the far

24 right column, she also provided the risk

25 premium over the bond total return.

Page 127

1 MR. COYNE:

2 A. I see that.

3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

4 Q. And I guess you did not present that

5 information when you—you didn't present that

6 methodology in your evidence to the Board

7 this time, obviously.

8 MR. COYNE:

9 A. No, the way the data is typically calculated

10 is over the income return because that is

11 the true risk free rate and the number—what

12 you're doing with that is you're using that

13 to add to your risk free rate to get your

14 forward-looking return, so we're not

15 assuming anything other than the bond return

16 and that forward-looking risk free rate

17 that's consistent with looking at

18 historically that way. The bond total

19 return would include any appreciation in the

20 bond yield. The true risk free rate is just

21 the income portion of the bond yield.

22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

23 Q. So just ignore everything else but the

24 income that the bond generates?

25 MR. COYNE:

Page 128

1 A. To get to the risk free rate, yes.

2 (11:45 p.m.)

3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

4 Q. I see. So in terms of—so if we look at her

5 table for the period 1924 to 20—and I think

6 the way this is expressed, she expresses

7 Canada and the United States separately,

8 right? And so her 5.4 percent for the

9 period 1924 to 2011 and her period of 1947

10 to 2011, they yield a 5.4 percent risk

11 premium and 5 percent respectively, right?

12 MR. COYNE:

13 A. Yes, I see that.

14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

15 Q. And what you're saying is that the

16 historical risk premium in Canada is 5.6

17 percent?

18 MR. COYNE:

19 A. That's correct.

20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

21 Q. Okay, and then she indicates that over that

22 long period of time, the same periods in

23 each case that the risk premium in the

24 United States, historically, was 6.6 percent

25 and 6.4 percent respectively. And you're



Page 129

1 saying that it was 7 percent for the time  
2 period that you used?

3 MR. COYNE:

4 A. Well I'm not saying, it's source material,  
5 yes.

6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

7 Q. Right, okay, well that's the material that  
8 you're –

9 MR. COYNE:

10 A. This is Ibbotson and this is Morningstar,  
11 respectively.

12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

13 Q. And you are using slightly different periods  
14 of time, so in the United States, you're  
15 using 1926 to 2014, as opposed to Canada,  
16 1990 to 2014?

17 MR. COYNE:

18 Q. 1919 to 2014.

19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

20 Q. I'm sorry, 1919 to 2014.

21 MR. COYNE:

22 A. Right.

23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

24 Q. So should we take from this, because this is  
25 basically a bit of an update to the period

Page 130

1 that Ms. McShane was referencing in her  
2 last, when she testified at the last GRA, so  
3 are we to gather that the historic risk  
4 premium now has gone up just over the last  
5 few years since she gave evidence? Like,  
6 she, you know, she provides 5.4 and 5  
7 percent for Canada for those periods and  
8 you're at 5.6, so has it gone up in that  
9 short period of time?

10 MR. COYNE:

11 A. Yes, it changes.

12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

13 Q. And similarly in the United States, it's  
14 gone up to 7 from where it had been and this  
15 is ignoring completely the risk premium over  
16 bond total returns that Ms. McShane also  
17 presents and just looking at her risk  
18 premium over bond income returns.

19 MR. COYNE:

20 A. Yes, they change year to year, that's why we  
21 update it as the year book comes out. Those  
22 are three pretty strong stock market return  
23 years, that's not surprising.

24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

25 Q. Mr. Coyne, could you just turn to Exhibit

Page 131

1 JMC-8, page 1 of 1? This is in your capital  
2 asset pricing model and I'm looking at  
3 column 5, your average market risk premium  
4 for—and you will see at the bottom of the  
5 page where you're setting out the average  
6 market risk premium, you see at the bottom  
7 of the page, if you could scroll up a little  
8 tiny bit there, Samantha, source for the  
9 average market risk premium. Source average  
10 of the Duff and Phelps Canada historical  
11 risk premium, 1936 to 2013, and the Duff and  
12 Phelps U.S. historical risk premium, 1926 to  
13 2013, so that would appear to be a bit  
14 different.

15 MR. COYNE:

16 A. Yeah, I don't know if those are footnotes  
17 that need to be updated, but I just called  
18 to confirm, so let me see if I can reconcile  
19 those. I assume—let me just double check,  
20 I'd be surprised normally through 2013, I  
21 think that might be a footnote that just  
22 wasn't updated.

23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

24 Q. Perhaps what you can do is undertake to  
25 provide the data to which you referred.

Page 132

1 MR. COYNE:

2 A. Well I have, I think I have already done so  
3 in responses to, just take a moment, I can  
4 probably do that right here on the stand.  
5 In response to Consumer Advocate 103 and  
6 279, I've actually provided the data with  
7 those numbers and the years.

8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

9 Q. The numbers for the years that you gave us  
10 just on the stand that time?

11 MR. COYNE:

12 A. Yes.

13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

14 Q. I'll check that.

15 MR. COYNE:

16 A. But I'll just confirm that that was a simple  
17 matter of a footnote that wasn't updated.  
18 I'll still do that but the data that I've  
19 used certainly in response to both of those  
20 data requests and that is the 5.6 and the 7  
21 respectively for those years.

22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

23 Q. And did you receive—I take it your firm is a  
24 subscriber to the Duff & Phelps folks?

25 MR. COYNE:

Page 133	Page 135
<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Okay, and did you receive an advisory in</p> <p>4 March that they had made an adjustment to</p> <p>5 the estimate of the United States market</p> <p>6 risk premium?</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. I don't know.</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. Okay, and perhaps what we can do is turn you</p> <p>11 to Dr. Booth's rebuttal evidence at page 11.</p> <p>12 I don't know if we can make that a bit</p> <p>13 larger and scroll down a little bit there,</p> <p>14 Samantha. I'm sorry, the other way. This</p> <p>15 was an excerpt or a little blurb, if you</p> <p>16 will, that Dr. Booth received from Duff and</p> <p>17 Phelps in March month, I believe, where they</p> <p>18 indicate Duff and Phelps increases the</p> <p>19 recommended United States equity risk</p> <p>20 premium from 5 to 5.5 percent and they say</p> <p>21 "Duff and Phelps regularly review the</p> <p>22 fluctuations in global, economic and</p> <p>23 financial market conditions that warrant</p> <p>24 periodic reassessments of the recommended</p> <p>25 equity risk premium, ERP. Based upon the</p>	<p>1 all over the map, certainly more than 4</p> <p>2 percent. If you go to my attachment A, page</p> <p>3 279, if we could look at these in parallel,</p> <p>4 I think this might be informative. This is</p> <p>5 where I actually provide the data.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. Attachment A?</p> <p>8 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>9 A. Yes, and this is response to Consumer</p> <p>10 Advocate 279.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Okay.</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. I think this would resolve any confusion</p> <p>15 surrounding that. Is it possible to view</p> <p>16 that on the screen? I'm amazed at how fast</p> <p>17 you can get there, thank you. So this is</p> <p>18 the data. In this case this is from the</p> <p>19 Ibbotson year book and this is the data that</p> <p>20 I'm referring to from 1926 through 2014, and</p> <p>21 you can see that the market risk premium</p> <p>22 down at the bottom of this entire period of</p> <p>23 time, this is the U.S. market in this case,</p> <p>24 is 7.01 percent, so that's the number that</p> <p>25 I've used in my table. And you can see the</p>
Page 134	Page 136
<p>1 current market conditions Duff and Phelps</p> <p>2 recommends an increase in the U.S. ERP to</p> <p>3 5.5 percent when developing discount rates</p> <p>4 as of January 31st, 2016 and thereafter until</p> <p>5 further guidance is issued. The prior Duff</p> <p>6 and Phelps recommended the United States ERP</p> <p>7 was 5 percent established as of February</p> <p>8 28th, 2013. Both of these ERP estimates were</p> <p>9 measured relative to a normalized yield of 4</p> <p>10 percent on 20 year U.S. treasury bonds."</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. Right.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. Okay, now just to put that into, so we can</p> <p>15 understand that, if we go back to—because</p> <p>16 they're saying it's moved from 5 to 5.5,</p> <p>17 right?</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19 A. On top of the 4 percent bond yield, not the</p> <p>20 historic bond yields.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Oh, I see.</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. So the historic bond yields have ranged from</p> <p>25 1 percent to 13, 14 percent and they've been</p>	<p>1 bond yields are, they range from 3 percent</p> <p>2 to 13 percent over this period of time and</p> <p>3 that's the important point, is that these</p> <p>4 risk premia vary considerably over time in</p> <p>5 relationship to those bond yields and</p> <p>6 because of these documents you've presented</p> <p>7 me, I asked to take a look at this to see</p> <p>8 what they were saying and in that same</p> <p>9 report they go on to say that "during</p> <p>10 periods in which risk free rates appear to</p> <p>11 be abnormally low due to flight to quality</p> <p>12 or massive central bank monetary</p> <p>13 interventions, valuation analysts may want</p> <p>14 to consider normalizing the risk free rate.</p> <p>15 By normalizing, we mean estimating a risk</p> <p>16 free rate that more likely reflects the</p> <p>17 sustainable average return of long-term</p> <p>18 treasuries." So this is consistent with the</p> <p>19 numbers that I've used and consistent with</p> <p>20 the approach that I've used.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. You've just pointed out that this Duff and</p> <p>23 Phelps advisory is measured relative to a</p> <p>24 normalized yield of 4 percent on 20-year</p> <p>25 U.S. treasury bonds?</p>

Page 137

1 MR. COYNE:  
2 A. Right, that's what they say.  
3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
4 Q. What's the rate that you use for the risk  
5 free rate for the American companies?  
6 MR. COYNE:  
7 A. It is lower than that in the Canadian and  
8 the U.S. it is—here it is, 3.68 for Canada  
9 and 4.29 for the U.S., I'm sorry.  
10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
11 Q. Okay, 4.29.  
12 MR. COYNE:  
13 A. 3.68 and 4.29 respectively, yes.  
14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
15 Q. So, you know, that's, I guess, not a far  
16 distance off the 4 percent normalized yield  
17 that they are referring to, right?  
18 MR. COYNE:  
19 A. It's close, yeah.  
20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
21 Q. Yeah, so that would be a good independent  
22 indicator of what the U.S. equity risk  
23 premium would be by this, you know,  
24 reputable outfit?  
25 MR. COYNE:

Page 138

1 A. Well it's, that's lower than—well, okay,  
2 that's lower than what the history is there  
3 and –  
4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
5 Q. But the history –  
6 MR. COYNE:  
7 A. And they say, they go on to say that you  
8 need to normalize for the current risk free  
9 environment, so – restate your question, if  
10 you would.  
11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
12 Q. Well, can we just see the top of that screen  
13 that's there now? Okay.  
14 MR. COYNE:  
15 A. It would be ironic for the same firm to be  
16 saying that you have to normalize for risk  
17 free rates and in the interest rate  
18 environment that we are now, to have a lower  
19 risk premium than we've had historically.  
20 That just wouldn't add up for me. If the  
21 history is 7, I would expect something lower  
22 than that on a going-forward basis and for  
23 the same report, they say that you need to  
24 normalize the market equity risk premium for  
25 the risk free environment that you're in or

Page 139

1 for the bond yield environment you're in.  
2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
3 Q. Do they report the total return on bonds as  
4 well?  
5 MR. COYNE:  
6 A. I believe you can get both, yes. But again  
7 we're looking for the risk free rate. If I  
8 want to use a total return for the bond  
9 yield, then I should do so on a going  
10 forward bond yield, but I can't do that  
11 because I'm not sure what the appreciation  
12 of the bond, the actual bond instrument is  
13 going to be. I only know the coupon on  
14 those bonds and the expected yield. And  
15 that's the way that you typically approach a  
16 CAPM model is to use only the risk free  
17 rate.  
18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
19 Q. Would you undertake to provide a table in  
20 the fashion that Ms. McShane has used in  
21 Table 9 of this cross-aid so that we can see  
22 what the risk premium over bond total  
23 returns would be, and as well as the risk  
24 premium over bond income returns would be,  
25 so we can make the comparison?

Page 140

1 (12:00 p.m.)  
2 KELLY, Q.C.:  
3 Q. Perhaps the witness first could indicate how  
4 much effort is involved in that so we can  
5 get some sense as to cost benefit of doing  
6 it?  
7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
8 Q. Mr. Coyne just indicated that Duff and  
9 Phelps provides the data and this is  
10 alternate version of the data.  
11 MR. COYNE:  
12 A. Yeah, I'm not sure if it's contained in the  
13 same reports, I can check, but I would  
14 caution that it's not the risk free rate if  
15 you're using the total return, you're only  
16 looking for the income return, but I could  
17 certainly see if it's available.  
18 KELLY, Q.C.:  
19 Q. I'll take it as a conditional undertaking,  
20 Mr. Chairman because I think we need to  
21 understand how much effort is involved in  
22 that, versus the utility it might be, if  
23 any, to the Board.  
24 MS. GLYNN:  
25 Q. Noted on the record as such.

Page 141	Page 143
<p>1 KELLY, Q.C.:  2 Q. Thank you.  3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  4 Q. So just to conclude, though, the point that  5 based on the normalized 4 percent yield that  6 Duff and Phelps talks about, you're  7 indicating that the U.S., instead of 5 to  8 5.5 percent, you're indicating the U.S. MRP  9 is 8.1 percent on a forward-looking basis,  10 on a 3.96 percent—or on a 4.—what did we say  11 the risk –  12 MR. COYNE:  13 A. 4.29 percent.  14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  15 Q. 4.29 percent, that's what you're indicating?  16 MR. COYNE:  17 A. Yeah, I'm taking the average of those, I'm  18 using the 7.6 actually is what I'm using.  19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  20 Q. Yes, but in terms of the box –  21 MR. COYNE:  22 A. And I'm using that on a lower—yes.  23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  24 Q. - on Figure 13, let's just go there for a  25 moment, you're saying that the forward-</p>	<p>1 prefer to use the spot yield on U.S.  2 Government bonds available in the market as  3 a proxy for the U.S. risk free rating.  4 However, during times of flight to quality  5 and high levels of central bank  6 intervention, i.e. mail, those lower  7 observed yields would apply a lower cost of  8 capital, all other factors held the same,  9 just the opposite of what one would expect  10 in times of relevant economic distress. So  11 a normalization adjustment may be considered  12 appropriate. By normalization, we mean  13 estimating a rate that more than likely  14 reflects the sustainable average return of  15 long-term risk free rates. If spot yield to  16 maturity were used at these times, without  17 any other adjustments, one would arrive at  18 an overall discount rate that is likely  19 inappropriately low, vis-à-vis the risks  20 currently facing investors" from that same  21 report. So, this goes to the relationship  22 between both the market equity risk premium,  23 as well as the risk free rate.  24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  25 Q. Just so I can understand now, Mr. Coyne,</p>
Page 142	Page 144
<p>1 looking U.S. market risk premium is 8.1  2 percent and that compares to the 5 to 5.5  3 percent that Phelps is reporting on the  4 normalized 4 percent yield?  5 MR. COYNE:  6 A. Well I don't know that they're truly  7 comparable, I only have that one excerpt  8 you've given me, but yes, the 7.6 percent is  9 what I'm using.  10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  11 Q. Okay, but again –  12 MR. COYNE:  13 A. Duff and Phelps, this is a long report –  14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  15 Q. But again now, Mr. Coyne, you refer to the  16 7.6 that you're using, but your forward  17 looking is 8.1, is it not?  18 MR. COYNE:  19 A. That's correct.  20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  21 Q. Right.  22 MR. COYNE:  23 A. If I might, Duff and Phelps in this report  24 also says, if I might quote, "As stated  25 earlier in those circumstances we would</p>	<p>1 this is Duff and Phelps sent this out to  2 many, many people, I think Dr. Booth  3 included and I just want to understand the  4 reason why you're suggesting that this would  5 not be more persuasive as to what the U.S.  6 equity risk premium is going forward, than  7 what you've presented at 8.1 percent. I  8 just don't understand that.  9 MR. COYNE:  10 A. Well we do our analysis based on a forward  11 look and historic look and I'm not—they're  12 adding that to what they deemed to be some  13 forward-looking sustainable bond yield and  14 that gets them, I guess, to some—I'm not  15 sure where it gets them, but the sources of  16 data they would have used from these  17 companies reliably tell us what history is,  18 I think there are a lot of views on what the  19 forward-looking view is of the marketplace  20 and again, I would need to understand what  21 the basis is for their analysis, what's  22 behind it, before we would accept that as a  23 forward-looking view that's credible.  24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  25 Q. Let's put it this way, again I asked this</p>

Page 145	Page 147
<p>1 earlier in connection with another thing, 2 but do you have any independent, like, third 3 party corroboration from Duff and Phelps or 4 any other big institution that would say 5 yes, that 8.1 percent forward-looking U.S. 6 risk premium is on the mark? 7 MR. COYNE: 8 A. So we went through the AON reports earlier, 9 I had a chance to look at these over the 10 break and if you take a look, if we can 11 bring this up, page 19 if we can suffer the 12 indulgence of the Board to go back to that 13 document one more time. 14 KELLY, Q.C.: 15 Q. Do you have the - 16 MR. COYNE: 17 A. Yes, I'm sorry, it's in response to Consumer 18 Advocate 269 and that was page 19 that we 19 were referring to earlier, actually page 17 20 and page 19. Can you go back one to 17? So 21 to use this source, they're citing at page 22 17 a long-term Federal bond yield of 0.9 23 percent on that page on a 10-year average 24 annual return basis. If you flip forward to 25 page 19, they're citing at 8.3 percent</p>	<p>1 interest rates would be going up? 2 MR. COYNE: 3 A. I'm sorry? 4 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 Q. Is that on account of an expectation that 6 interest rates would be going up? 7 MR. COYNE: 8 A. I don't know; I didn't do their work. This 9 is just their numbers. This report we spent 10 so much time with, this is for pension 11 return expectations, they're suggesting that 12 the market equity risk premium there is 7.4 13 percent. I mean, the point is there's a lot 14 of—I think maybe the point is that there's a 15 lot of uncertainty in terms of what the 16 forward-looking market equity risk premium 17 is, but I think all reasonable parties would 18 agree that it's higher on a going-forward 19 basis when bond yields are at abnormal lows. 20 We see that in Duff and Phelps, we see that 21 implied here, we see that in a forward- 22 looking market analysis that we've done. 23 It's only a matter of how much higher it is. 24 We've estimated the market, we've estimated 25 using a regression analysis over a long</p>
Page 146	Page 148
<p>1 Canadian equity return. The difference 2 between those two is an implied market 3 equity risk premium of 7.4 percent over that 4 bond yield, so that's very close to the 7.6 5 percent that I have used in my analysis, but 6 I trust the work that was done here, I think 7 the regression analysis, again, tells us 8 that market equity risk premium should be 9 higher during a period when bond yields are 10 very low, so the combination of that work 11 tells me that that is a reasonable 12 projection of the forward-looking market 13 equity risk premium. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. Are you subtracting nominal from nominal or 16 real from real here, I just want to 17 understand here now. 18 MR. COYNE: 19 A. These are the average returns, so these are 20 arithmetic returns, 8.3 in one hand and 0.9 21 on the other hand. The difference between 22 the two would be their implied market equity 23 risk premium. 24 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 25 Q. Is that on account of their expectation that</p>	<p>1 period of time, so we cannot—none of us can 2 say precisely what that forward-looking 3 market equity risk premium is, but I think 4 this is a reasonable way to get your hands 5 around it. 6 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 7 Q. Okay, so earlier when we were talking about 8 the estimated overall market return for the 9 dividend paying firms in one of your 10 exhibits, 13.46 percent, remember that? 11 MR. COYNE: 12 A. Yes. 13 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 14 Q. Now I understand that, I think we've 15 established that that's—the assumption of 16 the DCF model is that's going to be the 17 growth rate that goes on to infinity? 18 MR. COYNE: 19 A. In the constant growth version of the model, 20 yes. 21 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 22 Q. In the constant growth version, okay. And 23 Dr. Booth would say that that is in fact one 24 of the assumptions of the model and he would 25 also say that that's why this model would</p>

Page 149	Page 151
<p>1 only be used for the overall market or very</p> <p>2 low risk firms. Would that be your</p> <p>3 understanding as well?</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. That's how I'd prefer to use it, for very</p> <p>6 low risk firms, such as utilities. That's</p> <p>7 why I prefer to apply the DCF directly to</p> <p>8 utility proxy groups, I think that's when it</p> <p>9 has its greatest value. Dr. Booth, I</p> <p>10 believe is in agreement, along with Dr.</p> <p>11 Cleary because that language is in effect in</p> <p>12 their textbook that they authored together</p> <p>13 and it has its most value for low risk</p> <p>14 firms, such as utilities.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Would you feel it is an appropriate tool,</p> <p>17 the constant growth model for valuing all</p> <p>18 common equities? I take it you wouldn't?</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. Well, it is used for those purposes. I have</p> <p>21 greater comfort with it when it comes to</p> <p>22 applying it directly to the utility. I use</p> <p>23 it for perspective of the forward-looking</p> <p>24 market risk premium. I have much more</p> <p>25 confidence when I apply it directly to the</p>	<p>1 go to JMC-4, page 3 of 3, you see the long-</p> <p>2 run GDP growth for Canadian utilities and</p> <p>3 Emera Incorporated, under the column 9?</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. So that's basically, that would be assuming</p> <p>8 forecast GDP growth into perpetuity?</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. That is correct, yes.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. And I understand that your analysis of the</p> <p>13 Canadian TSX would have dividends and</p> <p>14 earnings growing at basically 10 percent</p> <p>15 forever under the constant growth</p> <p>16 assumption, would that be right?</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. Dividends and earnings?</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Yes. Would that be right?</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. That's right.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. So what would happen over time if these</p> <p>25 firms do in fact grow at an average rate of</p>
Page 150	Page 152
<p>1 utility proxy group and those growth rate</p> <p>2 estimates.</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. I noticed in JMC-5, your exhibit, that there</p> <p>5 were firms there that had, like astronomical</p> <p>6 growth levels reported for them. You</p> <p>7 probably noticed them, like Cameco at 40.9</p> <p>8 percent; Osisko at 50 percent; Pason Systems</p> <p>9 at 52.31 percent; Hudson Bay Minerals at 43</p> <p>10 percent.</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. That's what we see in the broad market, yes.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. And on JMC-6, which talked about your U.S.</p> <p>15 firms, Caterpillar at 21 percent; Under</p> <p>16 Armour at 22.75 percent; Royal Cribbing, I</p> <p>17 think, at 20.54 percent; Cabot Oil at 42.75</p> <p>18 percent, just again subject to check, so</p> <p>19 what's the length of time of these</p> <p>20 estimates? I mean, how long are they –</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. As I indicated, those are five-year growth</p> <p>23 rate estimates.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. Now I think that you would agree that if we</p>	<p>1 10 over time and GDP grows at only 3.94</p> <p>2 percent, what would be the result of that?]</p> <p>3 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>4 A. And GDP grows at what rate?</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. 3.94 percent.</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. Well they're growing faster than the economy</p> <p>9 in that case.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. Right.</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. This is not the entirety of the economy,</p> <p>14 these are the largest corporations in the</p> <p>15 economy, the TSX or the S &amp; P 500. This is</p> <p>16 not the entirety of our economy. These are</p> <p>17 the large publicly traded companies. GDP is</p> <p>18 much larger than that.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. But as I understand it, if we make the</p> <p>21 assumption that these firms are going to</p> <p>22 grow at multiples of GDP growth rate</p> <p>23 expectations, that profits and the dividends</p> <p>24 will increase as a share of GDP and ranges</p> <p>25 get smaller and smaller and everything ends</p>

Page 153

1 up in corporate profits, that's where that  
 2 model would take you if you make an  
 3 assumption of outsize growth over GDP, would  
 4 that be fair?  
 5 MR. COYNE:  
 6 A. Well there's a lot in your question there.  
 7 I would stipulate that these companies are  
 8 projected to grow faster than the overall  
 9 economy by these analysts over that period  
 10 of time.  
 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 12 Q. But like DCF relies upon, the DCF  
 13 methodology for constant growth, does it not  
 14 rely on long-term growth assumptions?  
 15 MR. COYNE:  
 16 A. It does, yes.  
 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 18 Q. Did you adjust any of these estimates for  
 19 what's known broadly as analyst optimism or  
 20 bias?  
 21 MR. COYNE:  
 22 A. No, I did not.  
 23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 24 Q. And I understand as well that you didn't use  
 25 multi-stage DCF in presenting the DCF

Page 154

1 analysis to the Board?  
 2 MR. COYNE:  
 3 A. No, I applied my multi-stage model when I  
 4 estimated the return on equity for the  
 5 utilities directly.  
 6 (12:15 p.m.)  
 7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 8 Q. Okay, but not for the purposes of estimating  
 9 the risk premium?  
 10 MR. COYNE:  
 11 A. No, no.  
 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 13 Q. Right, and now we asked you to in CA-NP-100,  
 14 if we could turn to that – we asked, “In  
 15 terms of your forward looking DCF estimates  
 16 for the market, please confirm these  
 17 estimates are based on analysts' forecast,  
 18 provide the source of the analysts'  
 19 forecast, and explain why you have not used  
 20 the multi-stage DCF model”, and as I  
 21 understood your answer at line 15 to 16, you  
 22 said, “A multi-stage analysis would require  
 23 introducing assumptions concerning second  
 24 and third stage growth rates and was beyond  
 25 the scope of this analysis”.

Page 155

1 MR. COYNE:  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 4 Q. And I understand that out in British  
 5 Columbia where you testified very recently,  
 6 within the last several weeks, that you  
 7 were, in fact, asked to provide a multi-  
 8 stage DCF analysis for these purposes, is  
 9 that correct?  
 10 MR. COYNE:  
 11 A. I was.  
 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 13 Q. And you did provide that to the BC Board  
 14 after that undertaking?  
 15 MR. COYNE:  
 16 A. I did.  
 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 18 Q. And could you indicate to us what happens to  
 19 the risk premium when you apply the multi-  
 20 stage model?  
 21 MR. COYNE:  
 22 A. Well, you would get – obviously, get a lower  
 23 result. You're now introducing a lower GDP  
 24 growth rate into the equation as opposed to  
 25 just strictly relying on the analysts'

Page 156

1 growth rate, so they're much lower. They're  
 2 lower than the historic market equity risk  
 3 premiums, in fact.  
 4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 5 Q. So you actually put this in your rebuttal  
 6 evidence, right?  
 7 MR. COYNE:  
 8 A. Yes, we did.  
 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 10 Q. And that's at page 29 of your rebuttal?  
 11 Have I got the right section of where you're  
 12 saying this?  
 13 MR. COYNE:  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 16 Q. So you're indicating – just to go down to  
 17 the bottom of the previous page for a  
 18 second, you start at line 23, “My analysis  
 19 suggests that the current market risk  
 20 premium is above my estimate of 7.6 percent,  
 21 as indicated by my forward looking MRP of  
 22 9.8 percent for Canada, and 8.1 percent for  
 23 the United States. In a further test of  
 24 these results in British Columbia using a  
 25 more conservative multi-stage DCF approach

Page 157	Page 159
<p>1 to derive the forward market equity risk</p> <p>2 premium, forward looking market risk premium</p> <p>3 is lowered to 5.39 percent, and 3.96 percent</p> <p>4 for Canada and the United States</p> <p>5 respectively". So a drastic decrease in the</p> <p>6 market risk premium by putting in what</p> <p>7 you're terming "a more conservative multi-</p> <p>8 stage DCF model"?</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. Yes. I don't think that's a reliable</p> <p>11 indicator of the forward looking view of the</p> <p>12 market equity risk premium. Those would be</p> <p>13 lower than the historic ones with a range of</p> <p>14 bond yield that look very different from the</p> <p>15 ones that we have today. So I ran it on</p> <p>16 undertaking as a request, knowing full well</p> <p>17 it would come up here again, given Dr.</p> <p>18 Booth's interest in this matter, but it is</p> <p>19 lower and just does not give you reliable</p> <p>20 forward looking view of the market equity</p> <p>21 risk premium.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. And why?</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. Well, because – well, first of all, it</p>	<p>1 of capital for the utility. If you apply</p> <p>2 the multi-stage model as I did for the</p> <p>3 utility, you can do that directly, you don't</p> <p>4 have to go through that multi-stage logic to</p> <p>5 get around to a number you can estimate</p> <p>6 directly using the multi-stage model, using</p> <p>7 growth rates for the utilities that are</p> <p>8 comparable to Newfoundland Power, and using</p> <p>9 the multi-stage model using the GDP growth</p> <p>10 rate for the back end. So you can do it</p> <p>11 directly. There's no reason to do so so</p> <p>12 indirectly.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. You then go on to talk about how – you go</p> <p>15 on, as you've confirmed here, "That this</p> <p>16 yields an anomalous result when indications</p> <p>17 are the market risk premium is higher than</p> <p>18 historical average and not lower", and then</p> <p>19 you refer to your regression test of the</p> <p>20 market risk premium, suggesting that the</p> <p>21 market risk premium is much higher, is that</p> <p>22 right?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. That's right, yeah.</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>
Page 158	Page 160
<p>1 doesn't pass the logic test. It's giving us</p> <p>2 market equity risk premium that are lower</p> <p>3 than history, even though we have much lower</p> <p>4 bond yields. Everything we just discussed</p> <p>5 suggest that that's just not the case. We</p> <p>6 don't see any evidence of that in the</p> <p>7 marketplace. Secondly, if you want to use</p> <p>8 the tool of the multi-stage – what you're</p> <p>9 trying to do here is to take a model that's</p> <p>10 on crutches in the CAPM, that's disabled by</p> <p>11 the fact that you have a risk free rate that</p> <p>12 we have to try to find an equilibrium on</p> <p>13 because of abnormal bond yields, and we</p> <p>14 argue about beta, we argue about market</p> <p>15 equity risk premium in this current market</p> <p>16 environment. If you want to go to the</p> <p>17 trouble of using the DCF to estimate the</p> <p>18 market equity using the forward looking</p> <p>19 market equity risk premium, using a multi-</p> <p>20 stage model, why don't you apply it directly</p> <p>21 to the utility group which is the purpose of</p> <p>22 this exercise to begin with, as opposed to</p> <p>23 going through that tortured exercise, I</p> <p>24 would argue. That's just going above and</p> <p>25 beyond what's necessary to estimate the cost</p>	<p>1 Q. And where is your regression test? Is that</p> <p>2 Exhibit JMC-7?</p> <p>3 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>4 A. I believe it is, yes.</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. All right, let's go there for a moment then.</p> <p>7 If we could try to get that – so this is</p> <p>8 your regression analysis of market risk</p> <p>9 premium, the Government of Canada long term</p> <p>10 bond yields from '76 to 2014?</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. That's right.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. And you can see looking at the bond yields</p> <p>17 on the left hand side, they cover a broad</p> <p>18 range over that period of time. For the</p> <p>19 recession period of 2008, I use a dummy</p> <p>20 variable in the regression analysis, knowing</p> <p>21 that that caused great dislocation in</p> <p>22 financial markets, to estimate what the</p> <p>23 market risk premium would be in relationship</p> <p>24 to the long Canada bond yield if you</p> <p>25 measured it over time in that manner.</p>



Page 161	Page 163
<p>1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>2 Q. And so this is to provide some support for</p> <p>3 the appropriateness of the forward expected</p> <p>4 return on the overall market of 13.46</p> <p>5 percent, is it?</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. It's to do two things. It's to look at –</p> <p>8 it's to test it in terms of whether or not</p> <p>9 there's a relationship between the market</p> <p>10 equity risk premium and the long term bond</p> <p>11 yield.</p> <p>12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. Right, okay.</p> <p>14 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>15 A. There's a lot of literature out there that</p> <p>16 suggests that there is, and this is to</p> <p>17 measure it, and then to measure the</p> <p>18 magnitude of what that change would be</p> <p>19 between historic equity risk premium and</p> <p>20 bond yields we're looking at today.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay, so –</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. So what I did is I estimated that</p> <p>25 regression, and I plugged in the forward</p>	<p>1 Q. Just let's – I think we're going to need to</p> <p>2 see the right part of the screen for a</p> <p>3 second, and can you point us out your</p> <p>4 coefficient estimate on long Canada yields?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. That's –1.11.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. Right, so it's to the left hand side right</p> <p>9 where we see the words, "Canada long bond",</p> <p>10 and it's –1.11, okay. It's highlighted</p> <p>11 right there now. So would this mean in a</p> <p>12 nutshell, Mr. Coyne, that if Government bond</p> <p>13 yields went up 1 percent, say, from 4</p> <p>14 percent to 5 percent, okay, that the market</p> <p>15 risk premium would go down 1.11 percent, at</p> <p>16 least according to this model?</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. I believe it would.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Okay, and I thought you were claiming that</p> <p>21 long Canada yields were having a strong</p> <p>22 negative influence on market risk premiums,</p> <p>23 so would you not consider a –1.11 percent to</p> <p>24 be a fairly small number?</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>
Page 162	Page 164
<p>1 looking risk free rate that we used in our</p> <p>2 analysis to see what market equity risk</p> <p>3 premium would be predicted by that.</p> <p>4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>5 Q. So this market risk – this regression</p> <p>6 analysis, you're presenting this as opposed</p> <p>7 to presenting other available estimates from</p> <p>8 capital market participants, such as AON</p> <p>9 Hewitt, Mercer, TD, etc, that this is what</p> <p>10 really should justify your position?</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. This is our analysis, yes.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. Okay, okay.</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. And I use this to test whether or not the</p> <p>17 forward looking market equity risk premium</p> <p>18 that I'm looking at are reasonable in light</p> <p>19 of these bond yields.</p> <p>20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Okay.</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. So I'm using this as a test of those</p> <p>24 numbers.</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>	<p>1 A. Well, that's not expressed logarithmically,</p> <p>2 it would go down by 1.11 for every – well, I</p> <p>3 guess, because they're both expressed in</p> <p>4 percent terms, perhaps.</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. Right.</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. It's measuring an inverse relationship</p> <p>9 between the two, so as the bond yield goes</p> <p>10 up, the market equity risk premium goes down</p> <p>11 and vice versa.</p> <p>12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. Okay, and would you agree that that would</p> <p>14 appear to hold very little predictive power?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. Well, the regression statistics in total</p> <p>17 tell me that not everything that's going on</p> <p>18 with the market equity risk premium is</p> <p>19 captured by this regression analysis, nor</p> <p>20 was it my intent to do so.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. What do you mean by that?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. Well, if you look at the "R" square of 44,</p> <p>25 it tells us that 44 percent of the variation</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 165</p> <p>1 is -</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Just point that out on the screen for us,</p> <p>4 whereabouts is it?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. Yeah, the multiple--the R-squared of .19,</p> <p>7 sorry.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. So it tells us that we can account for 20</p> <p>12 percent of the variation in market equity</p> <p>13 risk premium this way by looking at the</p> <p>14 relationship between the Canada bond yields,</p> <p>15 but it tells us that there's 80 percent</p> <p>16 going on out there that we can't account for</p> <p>17 in this simple regression. So we're trying</p> <p>18 to estimate a relationship that's a very</p> <p>19 complex one using a very simple regression</p> <p>20 analysis.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. I understand, Mr. Coyne that the usual cut</p> <p>23 off value for "T" statistic on a regression</p> <p>24 coefficient that would denote it being</p> <p>25 statistically significant is around 2, is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 167</p> <p>1 percent confidence interval.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Do we observe from what you have here that</p> <p>4 the "T" stat for Canada yields is -1.49?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. Where is that to?</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. What was your question?</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Where is that?</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. It's on the same line that you looked at,</p> <p>15 the Canada bond yield line under "T" stat.</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17 Q. Okay, there you go. So there you see it.</p> <p>18 It's -1.49?</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. Right, the sine is consistent with the sine</p> <p>21 on the coefficient.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Okay, and does this not suggest that the</p> <p>24 Canada bond yields are statistically</p> <p>25 insignificant as predictors or MRPs?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 166</p> <p>1 that right?</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. At the 95 percent confidence, yes</p> <p>4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>5 Q. And I'm told that it's 1.96, if you want to</p> <p>6 be really precise about it, is that right?</p> <p>7 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>8 A. That's right.</p> <p>9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>10 Q. Okay, so you're familiar, obviously, by the</p> <p>11 sounds of it, with this cut off "T" stat for</p> <p>12 statistical significance, and you would</p> <p>13 agree with that number that I've put to you?</p> <p>14 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>17 Q. Okay.</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19 A. It's significant at a lower level of</p> <p>20 confidence than 95 percent. I think it's</p> <p>21 80.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. So let us see then -</p> <p>24 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>25 A. Statistically measurable, but not at the 95</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 168</p> <p>1 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>2 A. No. I'd suggest that it's significant at the</p> <p>3 80 percent confidence level, not at the 90</p> <p>4 percent confidence level.</p> <p>5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Now this model, if we go over to the</p> <p>7 left hand side of this screen, we see - go</p> <p>8 up a little bit, Samantha, if you could so</p> <p>9 we can see - is that the very top? It is,</p> <p>10 is it? Okay, there you go. So we have</p> <p>11 Canada long bond that provide the rates for</p> <p>12 each of those years, and then we have in the</p> <p>13 column a dummy variable, and in the third,</p> <p>14 the market risk premium, right?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Now let's scroll all the way down.</p> <p>19 We see dummy variables of 0000 all the way</p> <p>20 from '76 until we get to 2008, and then we</p> <p>21 have a 1 put in there for the dummy</p> <p>22 variable?</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>

Page 169

1 Q. So you inserted that dummy variable in there  
 2 for 2008. Would this be to suggest that  
 3 prior to 2008 market experts would have  
 4 expected a crash in the stock returns that  
 5 year, and an associated experienced MRP of a  
 6 -35.5 percent?  
 7 MR. COYNE:  
 8 A. They would have – is your question they  
 9 would have anticipated it?  
 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 11 Q. Yes, isn't that what's implied by the dummy  
 12 variable of 1 being put in this table?  
 13 MR. COYNE:  
 14 A. No.  
 15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 16 Q. No?  
 17 MR. COYNE:  
 18 A. No.  
 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 20 Q. Okay.  
 21 MR. COYNE:  
 22 A. What the dummy variable is there for is to  
 23 take – we know that 2008 was an anomalous  
 24 year because of the recession and the  
 25 dislocation in financial markets, so I want

Page 170

1 to remove that relationship from the longer  
 2 term trend between the market equity risk  
 3 premium and the bond yield. It's a way to  
 4 try to isolate the effects. It's a commonly  
 5 used technique in regression analysis.  
 6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 7 Q. In 1980, we see there was a -23.8 percent  
 8 drop. You have no dummy variable put in  
 9 there for that. Why would that be?  
 10 MR. COYNE:  
 11 A. I'm sorry, in 1980?  
 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 13 Q. 1981.  
 14 MR. COYNE:  
 15 A. I didn't put a dummy variable in for every  
 16 year that there was a negative market risk  
 17 premium. I was trying to capture the effect  
 18 of the largest event in recent history.  
 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 20 Q. I see. What would -  
 21 MR. COYNE:  
 22 A. I think Mr. Booth has queried me on this  
 23 issue through counsel, I believe, out of  
 24 BCUC, and if my recollection serves me well,  
 25 if we add a dummy for that period of time,

Page 171

1 the results are higher in terms of the  
 2 predicted market equity risk premium. I  
 3 don't recall if it was for that specific  
 4 year or not, but my suspicion is it was.  
 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 6 Q. Mr. Coyne, how do you justify including this  
 7 information in your model that you're using  
 8 for predictive purposes if the information,  
 9 as I understand it, is required to set this  
 10 dummy equal to 1 is not known in advance?  
 11 MR. COYNE:  
 12 A. Two things. When you're trying to explain  
 13 history, that's the common approach to use  
 14 when you want to isolate the effect of a  
 15 specific event in this type of regression  
 16 analysis. It's a commonly use econometric  
 17 technique. Econometricians use it all the  
 18 time. We've used it in multiple ways, in  
 19 multiple analyses for demand forecasting we  
 20 do for utilities in a number of ways. It's  
 21 a commonly employed technique, and it's  
 22 always done – when you do this type of  
 23 analysis, you don't have a forward look to  
 24 be able to run the regression analysis.  
 25 It's always done with history, so what

Page 172

1 you're trying to do is to isolate – you're  
 2 trying to look at a primary relationship and  
 3 isolate the effect of something you think is  
 4 not representative of entire history. I  
 5 don't think anybody would argue that the  
 6 year 2008 was representative of this entire  
 7 history. It can blow up your results if you  
 8 have one anomalous year or two anomalous  
 9 years.  
 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 11 Q. I understand in regression analysis that an  
 12 R-squared of 0 percent would mean that  
 13 there's absolutely no explanatory power  
 14 provided from the regression model. We  
 15 would agree on that?  
 16 MR. COYNE:  
 17 A. That would be right.  
 18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 19 Q. And I also understand that if the R-squared  
 20 was 100 percent, that would be complete  
 21 explanatory power?  
 22 MR. COYNE:  
 23 A. Yes, it would.  
 24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
 25 Q. Okay, and this model is using R-squared of

Page 173

1 19 percent?

2 MR. COYNE:

3 A. That's what it calculates, yes.

4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

5 Q. Okay.

6 MR. COYNE:

7 A. And when you say "this model", this is what

8 I've used to test this relationship over

9 time.

10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

11 Q. Yes, I understand, and so if we could look

12 at – could we look at what would happen if

13 we were to exclude this crisis dummy of 1

14 from this regression analysis, and for that

15 purpose, if you could look at the cross-aid

16 that we passed over having to do with this

17 regression analysis.

18 (12:30 p.m.)

19 MS. GLYNN:

20 Q. That will be entered as Information #25.

21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

22 Q. Mr. Coyne, you've seen this cross-aid?

23 MR. COYNE:

24 A. I didn't know what it was, but I have seen

25 it, yes.

Page 174

1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

2 Q. Okay, and essentially if we remove the dummy

3 variable, would you take, subject to check,

4 that your adjusted R-squared is -.0034?

5 MR. COYNE:

6 A. Well, I would check that.

7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

8 Q. You'd take it subject to check?

9 MR. COYNE:

10 A. I will.

11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

12 Q. And –

13 MR. COYNE:

14 A. But the thing is the dummy variable is there

15 for a reason, as we described.

16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

17 Q. I understand, I understand, but if we were

18 to remove the dummy variable, and I

19 understand you say it's there for a reason,

20 but if we were to remove the dummy variable,

21 this would have absolutely no predictive

22 ability essentially?

23 MR. COYNE:

24 A. Well, you're –

25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

Page 175

1 Q. Would that be right?

2 MR. COYNE:

3 A. That's a very – the R-squared at 0.2, yes,

4 is indicating a very low R-squared, but, you

5 know, it's there for a reason.

6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

7 Q. It would be .003, right?

8 MR. COYNE:

9 A. Well, I will - the number that you have

10 there is .02, and an adjusted R-squared of

11 .003.

12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

13 Q. Right.

14 MR. COYNE:

15 A. And I will check it.

16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

17 Q. Okay. Finally before we turn further, Mr.

18 Coyne, could you refer back to this

19 regression analysis exhibit that you did.

20 MR. COYNE:

21 A. Yes.

22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

23 Q. And if we bring it over a little bit

24 further, you see the dummy variable that you

25 have there towards the top of this – the mid

Page 176

1 part of the screen, -45.184734 right there?

2 MR. COYNE:

3 A. Right.

4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

5 Q. What's that telling us in relation to what

6 happened in 2008?

7 MR. COYNE:

8 A. It tells us that during the great recession

9 that we had, it had a considerable impact on

10 the relationship between the market equity

11 risk premium and the long term Canada bond

12 yields.

13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

14 Q. Did the market equity risk premium go up or

15 down?

16 MR. COYNE:

17 A. Well, ironically it's showing there that it

18 went down. Indeed anomalous. It's nothing

19 we would expect.

20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

21 Q. Does that make any sense to you?

22 MR. COYNE:

23 A. That the market equity risk premium would go

24 down, no, we know that it would go up during

25 a period like that, and that's one of the

Page 177	Page 179
<p>1 reasons why I carved it out. It's one of</p> <p>2 the reasons why you take it out of the</p> <p>3 analysis, it doesn't make sense, but this is</p> <p>4 what happened, this is the measurement, and</p> <p>5 we called it – the reason for that is we had</p> <p>6 a crash in stock market prices and we didn't</p> <p>7 in bond yields, and that's why you take it</p> <p>8 out of the analysis. It's a non-sensible</p> <p>9 result.</p> <p>10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. But that's the result that gives you the R-</p> <p>12 squared in your regression model, right?</p> <p>13 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>14 A. By taking it out.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Now can we turn to your beta estimates on</p> <p>17 page 28. So you're recording these beta</p> <p>18 estimates in Figure 12, and all well above</p> <p>19 where Dr. Booth would certainly have them;</p> <p>20 U.S. electric utility group at .76, North</p> <p>21 American electric utility group at .76</p> <p>22 according to Value Line, and Bloomberg would</p> <p>23 have those two respectively at .70 and .69,</p> <p>24 and the Canadian group at .64. Now if we</p> <p>25 could just turn to Dr. Booth's surrebuttal</p>	<p>1 recounting what the AUC said about these</p> <p>2 adjusted betas, and I'll just read it for</p> <p>3 the record from the 2009 proceeding, "The</p> <p>4 Commission is persuaded by the empirical</p> <p>5 analysis of Dr. Kryzanowski and Roberts that</p> <p>6 there's insufficient evidence to support the</p> <p>7 use of adjusted betas for Canadian utilities</p> <p>8 if the purpose of the adjustment is to</p> <p>9 adjust betas towards 1, and, therefore, beta</p> <p>10 should not be adjusted towards 1. Therefore,</p> <p>11 the Commission rejects Mr. Coyne's beta</p> <p>12 results as unreasonably high because he</p> <p>13 adjusted his beta estimates on the</p> <p>14 assumption that they would revert to 1. In</p> <p>15 other words, his analysis assumes that in</p> <p>16 time utilities would be as risky as the</p> <p>17 market as a whole". So they rejected your</p> <p>18 betas. Are you doing the same thing here as</p> <p>19 you did in Alberta?</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. The betas that I'm using here are adjusted</p> <p>22 by Bloomberg and Value Line in the same way</p> <p>23 as used there. I am not adjusting them so</p> <p>24 that they're going to revert to 1. This</p> <p>25 adjustment methodology, which is the</p>
Page 178	Page 180
<p>1 evidence at page – before we go there, I'm</p> <p>2 sorry. Just to confirm, these would have</p> <p>3 been considered adjusted betas, is that</p> <p>4 right?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. These are called adjusted betas, yes, from</p> <p>7 those sources.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. And you've used these adjusted betas</p> <p>10 previously before Canadian boards, right?</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. In the fashion that you're adjusting them</p> <p>15 here now?</p> <p>16 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>17 A. These are the standard adjustments to betas</p> <p>18 that are used for such purposes.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. That you say they're standard, right?</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. They are, yes.</p> <p>23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>24 Q. Okay, just turn to page 12 of Dr. Booth's</p> <p>25 surrebuttal. At line 17, Mr. Booth is</p>	<p>1 Bloomberg adjustment methodology is the</p> <p>2 standard way of adjusting raw betas, and it</p> <p>3 weights them 2/3rd according to the raw</p> <p>4 estimated beta, and 1/3rd according to the</p> <p>5 market beta, which is 1. So it moves them</p> <p>6 towards 1. You never get towards 1. That's</p> <p>7 why you get the betas that I have -</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Mr. Coyne -</p> <p>10 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>11 A. Excuse me, .76, .70, .76, and .69. Those</p> <p>12 are not 1. That's 2/3rd the raw, and 1/3rd</p> <p>13 the market equity risk premium. That's the</p> <p>14 standard approach.</p> <p>15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Just so that we don't lose people</p> <p>17 completely, is what you're doing here the</p> <p>18 same as what you did in Alberta that got</p> <p>19 rejected?</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. What I'm doing here is relying on the same</p> <p>22 sources for updated betas, and they treat</p> <p>23 them in the same way, yes. What the</p> <p>24 Commission perhaps did not understand is I'm</p> <p>25 not assuming that they're going to revert to</p>

Page 181	Page 183
<p>1 1. These are not 1's that I'm using, and</p> <p>2 I'm not sure in 2009 that the AUC had fully</p> <p>3 come to grips with that concept based on the</p> <p>4 cite that you read. I think up until that</p> <p>5 period of time in Canada, the CAPM model as</p> <p>6 I had seen it, was largely deployed using</p> <p>7 judgmental estimates of beta, but there's no</p> <p>8 reason to do so. That was done using</p> <p>9 Canadian samples because you didn't have</p> <p>10 enough publicly traded companies to derive</p> <p>11 those betas for. When you go to broad</p> <p>12 markets like the U.S., you can derive market</p> <p>13 estimated betas this way from broad samples</p> <p>14 of utilities and you can estimate the CAPM</p> <p>15 that way, as opposed to using judgment to</p> <p>16 say where I think beta is. We can estimate</p> <p>17 it this way statistically using a very</p> <p>18 standard adjustment methodology. So these</p> <p>19 are the betas that an investor would pull to</p> <p>20 look at their analysis. When we do analysis</p> <p>21 for companies, and we do analysis in cost of</p> <p>22 capital, these are the only ones that we use</p> <p>23 and these are the only ones that are used</p> <p>24 broadly in the industry for these purposes.</p> <p>25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p>	<p>1 152?</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. CA-NP-152.</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. Okay. That would be helpful, thank you.</p> <p>6 (12:45 p.m.)</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. It should be actually page 49 of 247.</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Now you're indicating here in your</p> <p>13 discussion of beta starting from line 1,</p> <p>14 you're saying, "I recognize that the BCUC</p> <p>15 expressed some reservation regarding the</p> <p>16 reversion of beta to the market mean in its</p> <p>17 2013 generic cost of capital decision, and</p> <p>18 adopted what it characterized as</p> <p>19 intermediate beta. I, therefore, provided an</p> <p>20 alternative specification of beta that</p> <p>21 reverts to the midpoint of the market mean</p> <p>22 and a utility industry indexed".</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. What page are you on? I see a different</p> <p>25 page on the screen than I'm looking at in</p>
Page 182	Page 184
<p>1 Q. So you're suggesting that the AUC, an expert</p> <p>2 tribunal, misinterpreted what you were</p> <p>3 putting before them, is that -</p> <p>4 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>5 A. I'm not sure that they understood the entire</p> <p>6 context at that point in time because at</p> <p>7 that point in time moving to U.S. samples</p> <p>8 for this type of data was a new concept for</p> <p>9 them. They were trying to come to grips with</p> <p>10 that, and I think it's been the course of</p> <p>11 the last decade more Canadian regulators</p> <p>12 understand this data, and they understand</p> <p>13 where it's coming from.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. You had been just giving cost of capital</p> <p>16 evidence for two years at that point, right?</p> <p>17 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Now could we turn to what you did before the</p> <p>21 BCUC recently, CA-NP-152, and if you could</p> <p>22 turn up page 44 of your report.</p> <p>23 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>24 A. I think I will need that attachment. Well,</p> <p>25 let's see what we have here. Did you say</p>	<p>1 the text here.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. I think it's page 44 of your report, but</p> <p>4 it's page 49 of 247 of this attachment.</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. I see. Yes, okay, I now see it.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. Okay, and so then you go on to say, "Based</p> <p>9 on the strength of academic literature</p> <p>10 practiced before regulatory commissions on</p> <p>11 such matters, and broader practice among</p> <p>12 financial analysts, I relied on market</p> <p>13 adjusted betas for my primary analysis. I</p> <p>14 present the alternative CAPM as a point of</p> <p>15 reference in the event the Commission</p> <p>16 determines that an alternative specification</p> <p>17 warrants any weight". So when you're</p> <p>18 setting out your betas adjusted to market</p> <p>19 mean, which would be your primary analysis,</p> <p>20 that's the one you normally use all the time</p> <p>21 -</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. Okay, where you're reporting the Canadian</p>

Page 185	Page 187
<p>1 group at .65, and your U.S. group at .78, 2 and these appear to be lower than what 3 you're putting forward in this matter. We 4 have a Canadian group at .64, I understand 5 in this proceeding, but in any event - 6 MR. COYNE: 7 A. Well, they're different proxy groups. We 8 measure the betas for the specific companies 9 that we're analyzing. 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 Q. And then you go on to say – you present an 12 adjusted to average of industry average and 13 market mean. That's the alternative 14 analysis which drops the beta, right? 15 MR. COYNE: 16 A. Yes. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 Q. Okay, and this was evidence that you 19 prepared two weeks before filing evidence 20 for Newfoundland Power? 21 MR. COYNE: 22 A. That's about right, yeah. 23 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 24 Q. I guess the first question would be why in 25 that case did you report betas adjusted to</p>	<p>1 recall whether or not they had expressed it 2 in the same way that the BC Commission had, 3 so I don't know the answer to your question. 4 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 Q. I guess, the Board is interested in your 6 expert opinion, so are you tailoring your 7 views – is it a tailoring exercise that 8 you're going through? 9 MR. COYNE: 10 A. There is a – I'm concerned with the 11 magnitude of this testimony whenever I 12 present it, and, yes, depending upon the 13 Commission I'm before, if I think there's a 14 specific issue that asked to see, then I 15 will try to provide them evidence that is 16 responsive to whatever those prior decisions 17 have been. I view it as our job to give 18 them the information they need to make an 19 informed decision, but I'm also looking at 20 specific concerns that may have been 21 addressed in a prior decision. 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 23 Q. You've decided not to put forward this 24 information before the Board in this 25 proceeding obviously?</p>
Page 186	Page 188
<p>1 the market being adjusted to 1, and also 2 betas adjusted to the industry mean, whereas 3 in this evidence you have dropped the 4 adjustment to the industry mean values? 5 MR. COYNE: 6 A. Well, I was reporting – I didn't utilize it 7 in my estimates, but the Commission in its 8 prior decision had expressed a specific 9 concern on this issue, so I thought I would 10 provide it some context around the issue in 11 case that concern continued. 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 13 Q. Okay, so you thought that the BCUC would not 14 accept betas adjusted to the market? 15 MR. COYNE: 16 A. No, they had expressed – they had indicated 17 that they wanted to see more evidence on 18 this issue, so I wanted to provide them with 19 some additional context. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 Q. Have you checked previous decisions of this 22 Board to see whether they have ever accepted 23 betas adjusted to the market? 24 MR. COYNE: 25 A. I've looked at prior decisions. I don't</p>	<p>1 MR. COYNE: 2 A. Yes, this is a shorter piece of testimony 3 than I provided in BC. The BC testimony also 4 serves as a benchmark piece of testimony, so 5 it's highly contested and the record there 6 tends to build. 7 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 8 Q. Okay, so – 9 MR. COYNE: 10 A. So I was trying to – knowing this was going 11 to come up as an issue, I was trying to be 12 responsive to the Commission to give it to 13 them in advance. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. So we certainly do see that there's a 16 significant difference in beta when you 17 start adjusting to the average of the 18 industry? 19 MR. COYNE: 20 A. Yes, I did not do so, but I show those 21 results, yes. 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 23 Q. And can you confirm that it will be a 24 similar difference for your Canadian sample 25 and similarly for your U.S. sample in this</p>

Page 189

1 case if you did such an adjustment?

2 MR. COYNE:

3 A. I expect it would.

4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

5 Q. And about .08 in each instance of a

6 reduction?

7 MR. COYNE:

8 A. Yes, because if you adjust – I think they're

9 close enough to start with. Let me just

10 look at that. Well, directionally so. I'd

11 have to do the analysis to see what the

12 exact adjustment would be.

13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

14 Q. Would you accept .08 as being fairly close

15 to it?

16 MR. COYNE:

17 A. Yes, I would accept that.

18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

19 Q. And we've noted earlier in your HQTD and

20 TransEnergie testimony that for a sample of

21 primarily T & D U.S. utilities, you used a

22 beta of .59. Do you recall that evidence

23 from yesterday?

24 MR. COYNE:

25 A. I recall we had that evidence. I don't

Page 190

1 recall what the beta was.

2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

3 Q. Would you accept that it's .59, subject to

4 check?

5 MR. COYNE:

6 A. Yes, I will accept that, subject to check.

7 Well, did I use that beta, is that what

8 you're saying? You want me to check the

9 beta that I used in Hydro Quebec? I can do

10 so.

11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

12 Q. Okay, and that would be at CA-NP-154 when

13 you go to check that.

14 MR. COYNE:

15 A. I recall that in Hydro Quebec, I reconciled

16 the results from that CAPM model to the DCF

17 models in order to get to the return

18 recommendations, but I will check the beta.

19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

20 Q. Why don't we just bring it up, CA-NP-154,

21 and I think it's page 13. Just come down a

22 little bit, please, Samantha.

23 MR. COYNE:

24 A. What was the number again, CA -

25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

Page 191

1 Q. NP-154.

2 MR. COYNE:

3 A. 154. Right.

4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

5 Q. So you used it, right?

6 MR. COYNE:

7 A. Yes. So what I did there is the Regie had

8 also expressed a concern around this issue,

9 and a desire to look at betas reverting to

10 the grand mean of the utility versus the

11 market, and that's what that .59 represented

12 there, and then what I did is illustrated

13 the kind of adjustment that would be

14 required if you used those assumptions for

15 the CAPM, and that is the .75 percent

16 adjustment for other models that the Regie

17 had relied on in the past in order to

18 reconcile results from these models and what

19 a reasonable return was, and in this case

20 that .75 percent adjustment is what's

21 required to get that CAPM to within the

22 range of the other model estimates.

23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

24 Q. Okay.

25 MR. COYNE:

Page 192

1 A. So you have to look at those things

2 together, not in isolation.

3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

4 Q. So the .59 beta used in Quebec, you're

5 comfortable with that approach?

6 MR. COYNE:

7 A. I was taking guidance from the Regie. No, my

8 comfort is with the standard betas.

9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

10 Q. Anything that would lead us to believe -

11 your HQ testimony was in 2013. Anything to

12 lead us to believe that the betas has

13 increased for utilities from 2013 to when

14 you filed your evidence in 2015?

15 MR. COYNE:

16 A. Has decreased?

17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

18 Q. Has increased in the interim between your HQ

19 filing and this filing?

20 MR. COYNE:

21 A. I don't know if they have increased over

22 that period of time or not. I could check

23 that.

24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

25 Q. I'm not asking you to. I was just wondering



Page 193	Page 195
<p>1 if you thought that they had.</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. There's something else that I would point to</p> <p>4 here, if I might, because I think it would</p> <p>5 be informative for the Board. I refer to</p> <p>6 CA-NP-094.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. Uh-hm.</p> <p>9 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>10 A. I wanted to test this issue here as I did in</p> <p>11 BC as to whether or not betas really do need</p> <p>12 to be adjusted, and whether or not even</p> <p>13 adjusted betas could predict the returns for</p> <p>14 Canadian utilities, and at the bottom of –</p> <p>15 there should be a graph in that CA-NP-094.</p> <p>16 Yes, okay, there's the chart. So what this</p> <p>17 shows is that if you go back over the period</p> <p>18 of time from 2005 through 2014, and you look</p> <p>19 at the actual return, the actual returns for</p> <p>20 Canadian utilities versus those that would</p> <p>21 have been predicted by the bond yield at the</p> <p>22 time, the market equity – the historic</p> <p>23 market equity risk premium, and either raw</p> <p>24 or adjusted betas, the lines you see below</p> <p>25 show that neither one of them could get to</p>	<p>1 risk premium. Are you aware of that – I'm</p> <p>2 advised that that's been rejected.</p> <p>3 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>4 A. I would have to see the – I'm not aware of</p> <p>5 whatever rejection you may be referring to,</p> <p>6 but this is – this should be fairly</p> <p>7 straightforward. What I'm trying to show</p> <p>8 here is that if you look at the betas for</p> <p>9 these companies, you would have taken</p> <p>10 adjusted betas and/or raw betas, and tried</p> <p>11 to predict the actual returns for utilities</p> <p>12 or this decade, both of them would have been</p> <p>13 too low in terms of predicting the actual</p> <p>14 return for the TSX utilities companies. So</p> <p>15 it reinforces to me what we know from the</p> <p>16 empirical literature, and that is that betas</p> <p>17 for low risk companies, such as utilities,</p> <p>18 underestimate those returns.</p> <p>19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>22 A. And that's why this is the standard</p> <p>23 methodology. That's why everyone that would</p> <p>24 be coming out of a Finance Class 101 in a</p> <p>25 basic university would be using these betas</p>
Page 194	Page 196
<p>1 the actual returns that were earned by these</p> <p>2 utilities during that period of time. So</p> <p>3 that says that not only are these adjusted</p> <p>4 betas conservative to get what these</p> <p>5 companies actually earned during that period</p> <p>6 of time, that they're too low.</p> <p>7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. The actual return methodology, I understand,</p> <p>9 has been rejected by the AUC as an approach</p> <p>10 to the beta?</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. As an approach to the beta?</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. As an approach to estimating the risk</p> <p>15 premium?</p> <p>16 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>17 A. The Alberta – well, there have been many</p> <p>18 decisions before the Alberta decision. If</p> <p>19 it's comparable earnings, yes, they rejected</p> <p>20 that approach. I'm not estimating a</p> <p>21 comparable earnings model.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. No, I don't believe this has anything to do</p> <p>24 with comparable earnings, sir. This has to</p> <p>25 do with using actual returns to determine</p>	<p>1 to inform their models, certainly if they</p> <p>2 were coming out of a U.S. college. It's the</p> <p>3 standard that's used in the industry when</p> <p>4 you start to do this type of financial</p> <p>5 analysis and it's the standard that's used –</p> <p>6 it's the standard to estimate the cost of</p> <p>7 capital when you are using a CAPM model and</p> <p>8 before every regulators in the U.S., these</p> <p>9 are the betas that are presented, and I'm</p> <p>10 not aware of any regulator in the U.S.</p> <p>11 that's rejected that. This is only a</p> <p>12 Canadian discussion that in my experience</p> <p>13 when it comes to whether or not these</p> <p>14 adjustments to betas are indeed necessary or</p> <p>15 not. That's the only place that I've</p> <p>16 experienced it.</p> <p>17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>18 Q. Well, it's pretty significant, though, don't</p> <p>19 you think, that it's a Canadian discussion,</p> <p>20 and excuse me, we're in Canada at a</p> <p>21 regulatory proceeding.</p> <p>22 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>23 A. I understand – I've done a lot of work on</p> <p>24 this issue trying to give regulators and</p> <p>25 stakeholders some comfort and this type of</p>

Page 197	Page 199
<p>1 analysis, I hope, serves that purpose, but</p> <p>2 if you use raw betas or if you use</p> <p>3 judgmental betas, I don't think you have</p> <p>4 much to really hang your hat on because you</p> <p>5 can't repeat that analysis from time to</p> <p>6 time. We're pulling these from Bloomberg or</p> <p>7 from Value Line or from Merrill Lynch, who</p> <p>8 always do it the way, and that way you have</p> <p>9 reliable numbers, and as the markets move,</p> <p>10 you can take market based information to</p> <p>11 form your analysis, as opposed to guessing</p> <p>12 what beta is from any one given period of</p> <p>13 time. It's well known that betas change as</p> <p>14 market circumstances change, and this allows</p> <p>15 you to estimate how the markets are</p> <p>16 impacting required returns for all</p> <p>17 companies, let alone utilities.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. If we could turn up JMC-8, page 1, for a</p> <p>20 moment. That's where you have your betas.</p> <p>21 Now we see that you report Bloomberg and</p> <p>22 Value Line betas for each of the proxy group</p> <p>23 firms, but not what you would term "raw</p> <p>24 betas", is that right?</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>	<p>1 able to see what we have here versus the</p> <p>2 Newfoundland Power evidence because it's</p> <p>3 impossible to flick back and forth. So, the</p> <p>4 JMC 8 of the Newfoundland Power evidence</p> <p>5 would be helpful as a guide. Mr. Coyne, I</p> <p>6 see in B.C., what we have up on the screen</p> <p>7 here, that we've got a risk free rate of</p> <p>8 3.68 percent right on down through for the</p> <p>9 U.S. proxy group and the Canadian proxy</p> <p>10 group.</p> <p>11 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>12 A. Right.</p> <p>13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>14 Q. That's the Canadian risk free rate?</p> <p>15 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And do you have the –</p> <p>19 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>20 A. I'm sorry, yes, it is.</p> <p>21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>22 Q. Yes, and do you have your JMC 5, Schedule 2</p> <p>23 up with you, or one second now, it would be</p> <p>24 JMC 8 of your Newfoundland Power evidence.</p> <p>25 MR. COYNE:</p>
Page 198	Page 200
<p>1 A. Yes, these are the standard betas we pull</p> <p>2 from those sources.</p> <p>3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. And the raw betas would be simply the</p> <p>5 unadjusted betas?</p> <p>6 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Could we just pull up CA-NP-152, and at page</p> <p>10 240 of 247. This is your JMC-5, Schedule 2,</p> <p>11 that you filed in the BC proceeding.</p> <p>12 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>13 A. I think I have it here. On which page?</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. It's 240 of 247. This is what you would</p> <p>16 have filed in B.C. a couple of weeks prior</p> <p>17 to the Newfoundland Power's case.</p> <p>18 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>19 A. Yes, I see it.</p> <p>20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. At this point, if we could keep that</p> <p>22 on the screen, for anybody who has a paper</p> <p>23 copy of Mr. Coyne's exhibit in the</p> <p>24 Newfoundland Power case which would be JMC 8</p> <p>25 at page 1 of 1, it would be useful to be</p>	<p>1 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Do you notice anything different about risk</p> <p>4 free rate?</p> <p>5 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>6 A. Yeah, it seems like in that case, the</p> <p>7 Canadian one is being use with the U.S.</p> <p>8 group, whereas I typically use the U.S. with</p> <p>9 the U.S. and the Canadian with the Canadian</p> <p>10 one. That was in this alternative</p> <p>11 analysis, let me just check my primary</p> <p>12 analysis. No, I recorded them both on that</p> <p>13 same sheet, yeah.</p> <p>14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. I wonder would we be—in Newfoundland Power's</p> <p>16 case, why would we be using an American risk</p> <p>17 free rate in the capital asset pricing</p> <p>18 model. We should be using the Canadian risk</p> <p>19 free rate.</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. No, I typically apply the risk free rate</p> <p>22 that's appropriate for the country that I'm</p> <p>23 deriving the proxy group from and I don't</p> <p>24 understand why, frankly, it's 3.68 in the</p> <p>25 case of BCC. It should have been, I believe</p>

Page 201

1 it should have been the same as used here  
2 and that is the 4.29. I think that was an  
3 oversight on my part.  
4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
5 Q. Did you prepare this, Mr. Coyne, in both  
6 B.C. and Newfoundland?  
7 MR. COYNE:  
8 A. Well, I have analysts that help me prepare  
9 these and I oversee them, yes.  
10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
11 Q. What were –  
12 MR. COYNE:  
13 A. My greater concern right now is why I didn't  
14 have the U.S. numbers in there for B.C. as I  
15 did here. That may have been an oversight.  
16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
17 Q. Just to confirm for the record that your  
18 evidence would be that it's appropriate to  
19 use an American interest rate here in  
20 Canada?  
21 MR. COYNE:  
22 A. The risk free rate that I use for the U.S.  
23 proxy sample is the U.S. risk free rate and  
24 I do the same for the Canadian sample.  
25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

Page 202

1 Q. But you're applying it to a firm in Canada.  
2 MR. COYNE:  
3 A. That's correct.  
4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
5 Q. And that's fine?  
6 MR. COYNE:  
7 A. As we talked about it, it's the risk free  
8 rate, remember we talked about the credit  
9 spreads being bigger in Canada than they are  
10 in the U.S. and this is in the capita model,  
11 right. That's the risk free portion of the  
12 rate. We're trying to get at the equity  
13 return.  
14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
15 Q. But how can we have two risk free rates in  
16 Canada?  
17 MR. COYNE:  
18 A. We don't have two risk free rates. We have  
19 a risk free rate for the U.S. proxy group  
20 and we have another one for the Canadian  
21 proxy group which match the market equity,  
22 risk premium that I've used that marks the  
23 betas that I've used for these companies.  
24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
25 Q. Did you just say –

Page 203

1 MR. COYNE:  
2 A. So, I'm deriving U.S. data for the U.S.  
3 companies, U.S./Canadian Data for the  
4 Canadian companies. Where I mix them is in  
5 terms of the market equity risk premium  
6 which I am amalgamating to create one. So,  
7 that's the common entry across both of the  
8 CAPMs. But the risk free rates I typically  
9 hold separately.  
10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
11 Q. And are you familiar with or do you know of  
12 any Canadian regulator that has accepted the  
13 use of an American risk free rate in a CAPM  
14 analysis in Canada?  
15 MR. COYNE:  
16 A. I know that this is the way that we  
17 typically present risk free rates and this  
18 is for the CAPM model. When I use the DCF  
19 model, of course, you don't need to do this.  
20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
21 Q. Well, that's not what I asked you.  
22 MR. COYNE:  
23 A. Yes.  
24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
25 Q. Answer my question, please.

Page 204

1 MR. COYNE:  
2 A. My experience in Canada is usually that the  
3 Board looks at evidence from a variety of  
4 different experts pertaining to the risk  
5 free rate and then they determine on the sum  
6 body of that evidence what that risk free  
7 rate should be.  
8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
9 Q. Is that a long and about way of saying that  
10 you're not aware of any Canadian board that  
11 has ever accepted this type of approach?  
12 MR. COYNE:  
13 A. I've presented it this way in every case.  
14 We use—we keep it separate.  
15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
16 Q. Well, you don't do it every case; you didn't  
17 present it like it in B.C..  
18 MR. COYNE:  
19 A. Well, a bit of an oversight in that  
20 particular case for that group.  
21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:  
22 Q. So, if an American board was considering  
23 evidence of a Canadian utilities return,  
24 let's say that they looked North, would you  
25 expect them to use a Canadian risk free rate

Page 205	Page 207
<p>1 in their analysis?</p> <p>2 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>3 A. It wouldn't be necessary because there they</p> <p>4 have the capital market information that</p> <p>5 they need to derive from a U.S. sample. So,</p> <p>6 I'm not aware of a U.S. regulator that</p> <p>7 requires or asks for U.S. samples in order</p> <p>8 to do so. You could rely on strictly the</p> <p>9 Canadian CAPM model that I presented to this</p> <p>10 Board for that purpose. I try to keep them</p> <p>11 separate so I have a Canadian risk free</p> <p>12 rate, Canadian betas and the appropriate</p> <p>13 market equity risk premium. So, I like to</p> <p>14 keep them separate and then I like to</p> <p>15 present the entirety of the results for the</p> <p>16 U.S. sample and the Canadian sample; in this</p> <p>17 case, the North American sample.</p> <p>18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>19 Q. So this makes sense to you?</p> <p>20 MR. COYNE:</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. I've got nothing further for today if</p> <p>24 you want to get Mr. Burry underway.</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN:</p>	<p>1 encourage people from outside of the Avalon</p> <p>2 to come to those hearings. I feel</p> <p>3 surrounded by townies and mainlanders here</p> <p>4 today. I know the Telegram, for example, is</p> <p>5 discontinued in our area; we don't even get</p> <p>6 it anymore. That happened recently. So,</p> <p>7 maybe the Board should consider, like maybe,</p> <p>8 contacting large municipalities like</p> <p>9 Clarenville, Gander and Grand Falls and some</p> <p>10 of those and give them a heads up that these</p> <p>11 hearings are going ahead and suggest that</p> <p>12 maybe half a dozen could have their way</p> <p>13 paid, say, a night at a hotel and meals</p> <p>14 because otherwise they're just not going to</p> <p>15 come here and spend their own dime and</p> <p>16 travel several hundreds of miles and so on,</p> <p>17 right. So, that's just a suggestion that</p> <p>18 maybe in the future it would be more of a</p> <p>19 balanced approach; you'd get more</p> <p>20 Newfoundlanders from across the Province</p> <p>21 participating in hearings like this.</p> <p>22 As I say, we were on our way to</p> <p>23 Florida and I got this enclosure with our</p> <p>24 light and I was very interested and I think</p> <p>25 more should be done here in this province.</p>
Page 206	Page 208
<p>1 Q. Okay, we'll just take a few minutes.</p> <p>2 (1:15 P.M. - BREAK)</p> <p>3 (1:20 P.M. - RESUME)</p> <p>4 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>5 Q. Okay, Mr. Burry, there's no need to swear</p> <p>6 you in, sir, this is not a—in the nature of</p> <p>7 evidence. So, I guess we'll turn the</p> <p>8 proceedings over to you.</p> <p>9 MR. BURRY:</p> <p>10 Q. Good afternoon, my name is Terry Burry and</p> <p>11 I'm from Glovertown out in Central</p> <p>12 Newfoundland. First of all I'd like to</p> <p>13 apologize for the short notice that I gave</p> <p>14 the Board for this hearing. What sort of</p> <p>15 triggered my interest is when I saw Mr.</p> <p>16 Johnson on NTV last week doing a little</p> <p>17 piece, a blip on this hearing. And we were</p> <p>18 on our way to Florida and also in my light</p> <p>19 bill with Duke Energy there was some</p> <p>20 information about getting your home free</p> <p>21 evaluation done, a list of improvements and</p> <p>22 efficiencies and all that. So that kind of</p> <p>23 sparked my interest to come here today,</p> <p>24 those two items. First of all I should say</p> <p>25 that I think more should be done to</p>	<p>1 I know you go to a Kent's store one day or</p> <p>2 you go to Walmart the next day and</p> <p>3 Newfoundland Power with Newfoundland Hydro</p> <p>4 has a special on a certain LED bulb and you</p> <p>5 go and the next week and it's gone; every</p> <p>6 move—they've got it gone to a different—so,</p> <p>7 it's very spotty what's done here in terms</p> <p>8 of improvements that way. Because with the</p> <p>9 rates going up and up all the time and, of</p> <p>10 course, this 2.5 is only going to be like a</p> <p>11 mini stroke when we get to the Muskrat Falls</p> <p>12 later on. So, we have to be conscious of</p> <p>13 our consumption because the rates are going</p> <p>14 to go up anyway. That's inevitable, it</p> <p>15 seems to me, right. So, as I say, Duke</p> <p>16 Energy, they have \$150.00 back on attic</p> <p>17 insulation; \$200.00 back on upgrades to</p> <p>18 windows; heat pump, \$800.00 back; efficiency</p> <p>19 in windows, I think, is \$400.00 and so on.</p> <p>20 On March 24 I attended the Nalcor AGM and I</p> <p>21 asked three questions of Mr. Martin, the CEO</p> <p>22 and never got any straight answers, because</p> <p>23 we know this is around the corner, Muskrat</p> <p>24 Falls. I indicated that from my just simple</p> <p>25 math Muskrat Falls will cost ten times as</p>

Page 209	Page 211
<p>1 much in nominal dollars to build as the 2 Upper Churchill. If you do the math with 3 1/6 of the power produced at Muskrat Falls, 4 you're talking about 60 times more higher 5 costs than the Upper Churchill. Even if you 6 convert that to 1970 dollars, it's still 7 going to be over 550 percent more for that 8 project. So, this 2.5, what we're dealing 9 with today is only going to be very minor on 10 the scale. And also, you know, I'm 11 concerned about the Muskrat Falls 825 12 megawatts at Riverside, minus 20 percent to 13 Nova Scotia, minus 450 megawatt offline to 14 replace Holyrood, minus the line loss, I 15 think it's about 10 percent on that 1200 16 kilometre transmission line into Soldier's 17 Pond. So, I'm thinking that maybe Muskrat 18 Falls is going to be less than 100 megawatts 19 that's going to be available by the time you 20 get the take home pay cheque out of it. And 21 also a recent report came out that this 22 winter 67 percent more expensive to heat 23 your home with electricity than with furnace 24 oil. So, now what does that say, if you go 25 ahead five or ten years from now, in terms</p>	<p>1 wind turbine, solar panels, small hydro, 2 mass bio-generators and so on. And, of 3 course, requires, I understand, a bio- 4 directional meter such that in July maybe 5 you can send some power back to the grid. 6 And maybe at the end of the year your light 7 bill would be—the net light bill would 8 probably be 10, 15, 20 percent lower than it 9 would be without that bio-directional meter. 10 So, basically my recommendation is, here 11 today, is that any increases granted to 12 Newfoundland Power be tied to a beefed up 13 rebate program on home improvements for 14 energy efficiency and an attractable subsidy 15 to the home owner such that it would 16 encourage the homeowner to go out and buy 17 more LED lights, to probably consider to put 18 a heat pump in, maybe to put extra 19 insulation in the attic and that sort of 20 thing. There has to be an incentive large 21 enough for the home owner to get them on 22 board and do those things. I understand 23 there's been some spotty things done over 24 the last few years, but not near enough. 25 And the last one is the net metering.</p>
Page 210	Page 212
<p>1 of—with the rate increases that's going to 2 be given today or when this hearing 3 concludes and with Muskrat Falls coming on 4 stream? 5 The third item I wanted to talk about 6 is the net metering. I understand that the 7 Newfoundland government back in 2014, they 8 did some kind of a study on net metering 9 through a company in Toronto called 10 Navigate, I think it was called. Now, I 11 understand as well that Ontario, B.C., Nova 12 Scotia, New Brunswick, other provinces allow 13 for net metering and has been doing so for 14 some time. Now, last year I think the then 15 minister of Natural Resources announced a 16 new net metering policy framework, but I'm 17 not sure where that's to now; if that's 18 stuck somewhere, unless they had it from 19 reading the report (phonetic). The Board is 20 supposed to be involved as well as the other 21 players in terms of fleshing out this net 22 metering policy to completion. And in Nova 23 Scotia, I understand net metering services 24 has been offered for many years, a recently 25 expanded program to enhance net metering,</p>	<p>1 Before any more rates are, increases are 2 granted in rates more needs to be done in 3 terms of the net metering program because I 4 think we're stuck with the rates going up, 5 pretty much. So, the only way to get our 6 light bill lower, I think, is through a 7 lower consumption. Anyway, sorry, I never 8 had more to present because I only found out 9 about it a few days ago. If I had more 10 time, I would have probably have more to say 11 on those topics, but that's about all I got 12 to say for today. If there's any questions, 13 you can ask me questions. 14 CHAIRMAN: 15 Q. Does anybody in the Applicant or the 16 Intervenor have any – 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 Q. No questions. 19 KELLY, Q.C.: 20 Q. No questions, thank you, Mr. Burry. 21 CHAIRMAN: 22 Q. Thank you, sir. 23 MR. BURRY: 24 Q. Thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN:</p>

Page 213

1 Q. We're adjourned.  
2 Upon conclusion at 1:30 p.m.  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Page 214

## CERTIFICATE

I, Judy Moss, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of a hearing in the matter of a General Rate Application by Newfoundland Power Inc. to establish customer electricity rates for 2016 and 2017 heard on the 5th day of April, 2016 at the Public Utilities Commission office, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador and was transcribed by me to the best of my ability by means of a sound apparatus.

Dated at St. John's, NL this  
5th day of April

Judy Moss  
Discoveries Unlimited Inc.

A				
<p><b>Ability</b> - 34:14, 34:25, 46:5, 48:15, 174:22</p> <p><b>Able</b> - 24:16, 25:7, 31:4, 31:17, 32:17, 33:16, 60:11, 171:24, 199:1</p> <p><b>Abnormal</b> - 147:19, 158:13</p> <p><b>Abnormally</b> - 136:11</p> <p><b>Above</b> - 40:22, 85:23, 99:2, 124:9, 156:20, 158:24, 177:18</p> <p><b>Academic</b> - 184:9</p> <p><b>Accept</b> - 49:12, 60:24, 79:12, 80:8, 82:5, 85:1, 85:8, 88:16, 93:10, 95:4, 95:20, 99:10, 111:16, 111:24, 144:22, 186:14, 189:14, 189:17, 190:3, 190:6</p> <p><b>Accepted</b> - 76:5, 186:22, 203:12, 204:11</p> <p><b>Access</b> - 11:17, 34:7, 48:16</p> <p><b>According</b> - 14:20, 39:2, 77:15, 78:12, 120:2, 163:16, 177:22, 180:3, 180:4</p> <p><b>Account</b> - 90:16, 146:25, 147:5, 165:11, 165:16</p> <p><b>Accounting</b> - 25:7</p> <p><b>Accurate</b> - 38:7</p> <p><b>Achieve</b> - 28:23</p> <p><b>Across</b> - 14:12, 15:9, 15:10, 15:15, 15:25, 16:3, 19:3, 34:6, 50:18, 62:22, 97:17, 106:18, 118:4, 203:7, 207:20</p> <p><b>Act</b> - 58:7, 58:11, 58:12, 58:23, 59:16</p> <p><b>Acting</b> - 66:21</p> <p><b>Actively</b> - 62:25</p> <p><b>Activity</b> - 18:25</p> <p><b>Actual</b> - 37:22, 84:17, 139:12, 193:19, 194:1, 194:8, 194:25, 195:11, 195:13</p> <p><b>Actuarial</b> - 84:3, 85:3, 107:13,</p>	<p>107:16, 107:23, 107:24</p> <p><b>Add</b> - 10:4, 115:14, 127:13, 138:20, 170:25</p> <p><b>Adding</b> - 116:4, 116:16, 144:12</p> <p><b>Addition</b> - 126:21</p> <p><b>Address</b> - 32:14, 57:5</p> <p><b>Addressed</b> - 187:21</p> <p><b>Adhered</b> - 62:11</p> <p><b>Adjourned</b> - 213:1</p> <p><b>Adjust</b> - 91:24, 94:18, 109:25, 153:18, 179:9, 189:8</p> <p><b>Adjusted</b> - 72:18, 174:4, 175:10, 178:3, 178:6, 178:9, 179:2, 179:7, 179:10, 179:13, 179:21, 184:13, 184:18, 185:12, 185:25, 186:1, 186:2, 186:14, 186:23, 193:12, 193:13, 193:24, 194:3, 195:10</p> <p><b>Adjusting</b> - 178:14, 179:23, 180:2, 188:17</p> <p><b>Adjustment</b> - 80:2, 82:4, 91:5, 91:16, 91:21, 91:23, 92:12, 115:7, 115:24, 133:4, 143:11, 179:8, 179:25, 180:1, 181:18, 186:4, 189:1, 189:12, 191:13, 191:16, 191:20</p> <p><b>Adjustments</b> - 143:17, 178:17, 196:14</p> <p><b>Adopted</b> - 183:18</p> <p><b>Advance</b> - 171:10, 188:13</p> <p><b>Advised</b> - 195:2</p> <p><b>Advisory</b> - 133:3, 136:23</p> <p><b>Advocate</b> - 132:5, 135:10, 145:18</p> <p><b>Afternoon</b> - 206:10</p> <p><b>Against</b> - 110:22</p> <p><b>Agencies</b> - 10:25, 34:17</p> <p><b>Aggregated</b> -</p>	<p>101:6</p> <p><b>Aggressive</b> - 103:15</p> <p><b>Aggressively</b> - 57:12</p> <p><b>AGM</b> - 208:20</p> <p><b>Agree</b> - 13:1, 22:19, 31:2, 31:9, 53:9, 55:16, 78:1, 79:19, 86:15, 86:17, 91:15, 93:7, 97:7, 98:14, 112:7, 147:18, 150:25, 164:13, 166:13, 172:15</p> <p><b>Agreed</b> - 72:7</p> <p><b>Agreement</b> - 149:10</p> <p><b>Ahead</b> - 106:12, 207:11, 209:25</p> <p><b>Ahern</b> - 8:20, 9:15, 10:15</p> <p><b>Aid</b> - 6:10, 13:9, 46:23, 57:21, 61:1, 126:9, 126:10, 139:21, 173:15, 173:22</p> <p><b>Akin</b> - 112:9</p> <p><b>Alberta</b> - 72:16, 179:19, 180:18, 194:17, 194:18</p> <p><b>ALLETE</b> - 14:3</p> <p><b>Allocations</b> - 83:22</p> <p><b>Allow</b> - 210:12</p> <p><b>Allowed</b> - 5:5, 5:12, 14:10, 14:19, 15:11, 15:16, 15:18, 15:25, 16:8, 18:7, 18:8, 19:4, 19:9, 22:1, 22:15, 23:21, 24:7, 25:11, 25:24, 27:22, 28:13, 28:15, 28:17, 29:10, 31:15, 33:10, 33:17</p> <p><b>Allows</b> - 197:14</p> <p><b>Alone</b> - 197:17</p> <p><b>Alternate</b> - 140:10</p> <p><b>Alternative</b> - 183:20, 184:14, 184:16, 185:13, 200:10</p> <p><b>Amalgamating</b> - 203:6</p> <p><b>Amazed</b> - 135:16</p> <p><b>Amended</b> - 58:7</p> <p><b>America</b> - 51:5</p> <p><b>American</b> - 25:23, 27:19, 137:5, 177:21, 200:16, 201:19, 203:13,</p>	<p>204:22, 205:17</p> <p><b>Among</b> - 10:23, 184:11</p> <p><b>Amount</b> - 62:20, 62:21</p> <p><b>Analyses</b> - 84:14, 84:15, 84:20, 171:19</p> <p><b>Analyst</b> - 100:17, 100:24, 101:2, 101:9, 101:10, 101:12, 104:19, 153:19</p> <p><b>Analysts</b> - 21:14, 136:13, 153:9, 184:12, 201:8</p> <p><b>Analysts'</b> - 100:7, 154:17, 154:18, 155:25</p> <p><b>Analyzing</b> - 185:9</p> <p><b>And/Or</b> - 38:6, 195:10</p> <p><b>Annalists</b> - 17:3</p> <p><b>Announced</b> - 210:15</p> <p><b>Annual</b> - 10:22, 25:13, 77:23, 88:20, 89:12, 89:19, 90:1, 99:8, 112:7, 145:24</p> <p><b>Annually</b> - 28:20</p> <p><b>Anomalous</b> - 159:16, 169:23, 172:8, 176:18</p> <p><b>Anticipated</b> - 169:9</p> <p><b>Anymore</b> - 207:6</p> <p><b>Anyway</b> - 7:25, 55:2, 108:2, 208:14, 212:7</p> <p><b>AON</b> - 82:24, 83:18, 84:6, 84:21, 85:1, 85:11, 85:12, 86:11, 87:4, 89:8, 92:22, 95:10, 97:4, 98:22, 99:14, 105:2, 107:8, 107:19, 111:2, 120:13, 145:8, 162:8</p> <p><b>Apologies</b> - 12:10</p> <p><b>Apologize</b> - 206:13</p> <p><b>Apparently</b> - 9:15, 22:19, 88:4</p> <p><b>Appear</b> - 131:13, 136:10, 164:14, 185:2</p> <p><b>Appears</b> - 5:8, 16:5, 27:14, 58:13, 61:16</p> <p><b>Apples</b> - 4:23, 19:6, 21:16</p>	<p><b>Applicant</b> - 212:15</p> <p><b>Applied</b> - 154:3</p> <p><b>Apply</b> - 99:15, 114:20, 119:6, 143:7, 149:7, 149:25, 155:19, 158:20, 159:1, 200:21</p> <p><b>Applying</b> - 119:8, 149:22, 202:1</p> <p><b>Appreciation</b> - 127:19, 139:11</p> <p><b>Approach</b> - 136:20, 139:15, 156:25, 171:13, 180:14, 192:5, 194:9, 194:12, 194:14, 194:20, 204:11, 207:19</p> <p><b>Approaching</b> - 99:16</p> <p><b>Appropriate</b> - 38:7, 117:3, 117:7, 143:12, 149:16, 200:22, 201:18, 205:12</p> <p><b>Appropriateness</b> - 161:3</p> <p><b>April</b> - 6:11, 46:24, 46:25</p> <p><b>April/May</b> - 70:22</p> <p><b>Area</b> - 207:5</p> <p><b>Aren't</b> - 20:17, 52:1, 53:18, 117:18</p> <p><b>Argue</b> - 158:14, 158:24, 172:5</p> <p><b>Arithmetic</b> - 78:3, 79:10, 79:13, 80:5, 89:2, 89:15, 90:23, 122:16, 146:20</p> <p><b>Arithmetically</b> - 99:9</p> <p><b>Armour</b> - 150:16</p> <p><b>Arrive</b> - 112:21, 113:12, 116:23, 143:17</p> <p><b>Arrives</b> - 79:3</p> <p><b>Articles</b> - 84:17</p> <p><b>Assertion</b> - 29:23, 44:8</p> <p><b>Asset</b> - 81:12, 88:8, 98:24, 102:15, 111:3, 112:20, 131:2, 200:17</p> <p><b>Assets</b> - 52:9, 52:12, 81:17, 112:10</p> <p><b>Associated</b> - 16:20, 87:18, 91:10, 169:5</p>

<p><b>Association</b> - 48:2</p> <p><b>Assumption</b> - 55:25, 85:25, 102:7, 102:10, 110:16, 148:15, 151:16, 152:21, 153:3, 179:14</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b> - 82:24, 83:19, 83:25, 84:5, 84:19, 104:9, 148:24, 153:14, 154:23, 191:14</p> <p><b>Astronomical</b> - 150:5</p> <p><b>Attachment</b> - 3:19, 37:7, 37:13, 38:16, 82:10, 82:23, 83:13, 135:2, 135:7, 182:24, 184:4</p> <p><b>Attended</b> - 208:20</p> <p><b>Attic</b> - 208:16, 211:19</p> <p><b>Attorneys</b> - 11:1</p> <p><b>Attractable</b> - 211:14</p> <p><b>Attractive</b> - 53:7</p> <p><b>AUC</b> - 73:10, 73:12, 179:1, 181:2, 182:1, 194:9</p> <p><b>August</b> - 115:17</p> <p><b>AUS</b> - 6:5, 6:21, 7:1, 7:25, 8:4, 8:21, 9:15, 10:1, 10:9, 10:17, 10:23, 12:3, 13:6, 13:18, 16:7, 35:9</p> <p><b>Auspice</b> - 8:4</p> <p><b>Authored</b> - 149:12</p> <p><b>Authoritative</b> - 12:25, 84:24</p> <p><b>Authorization</b> - 18:13</p> <p><b>Authorized</b> - 4:2, 5:2</p> <p><b>Authorizing</b> - 18:15</p> <p><b>Available</b> - 17:19, 17:23, 18:21, 48:21, 48:24, 58:13, 84:12, 107:19, 125:6, 125:7, 140:17, 143:2, 162:7, 209:19</p> <p><b>Avalon</b> - 104:12, 104:18, 207:1</p> <p><b>Average</b> - 4:1, 5:4, 5:14, 6:1, 17:20, 17:21, 18:18, 19:3,</p>	<p>22:14, 24:9, 24:10, 28:14, 28:16, 29:24, 36:20, 36:23, 42:21, 77:23, 78:25, 79:21, 88:20, 89:12, 89:15, 89:19, 90:23, 99:7, 109:3, 110:21, 112:6, 114:8, 114:20, 116:2, 116:15, 118:14, 120:19, 131:3, 131:5, 131:9, 136:17, 141:17, 143:14, 145:23, 146:19, 151:25, 159:18, 185:12, 188:17</p> <p><b>Averaged</b> - 109:2</p> <p><b>Averages</b> - 18:12</p> <p><b>Aversion</b> - 72:2</p> <p><b>Awarded</b> - 124:4</p> <p><b>Aware</b> - 11:3, 12:4, 27:20, 28:4, 29:19, 39:12, 40:12, 46:14, 46:16, 46:18, 51:4, 51:22, 55:2, 55:3, 55:9, 55:11, 56:8, 56:18, 56:24, 58:13, 58:16, 60:16, 65:8, 74:7, 77:19, 88:9, 114:8, 116:8, 116:20, 117:1, 124:19, 195:1, 195:4, 196:10, 204:10, 205:6</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center; width: 40px; margin: 10px auto;">B</div> <p><b>Back</b> - 1:15, 3:13, 13:9, 15:10, 15:24, 30:24, 35:9, 48:16, 53:12, 69:12, 70:15, 72:17, 76:13, 77:12, 88:15, 107:5, 108:17, 111:2, 119:14, 123:4, 123:17, 134:15, 145:12, 145:20, 159:10, 175:18, 193:17, 199:3, 208:16, 208:17, 208:18, 210:7, 211:5</p> <p><b>Backwards</b> - 106:2, 110:8, 119:25</p> <p><b>Balance</b> - 19:2</p> <p><b>Balanced</b> - 207:19</p>	<p><b>Bank</b> - 86:23, 105:3, 136:12, 143:5</p> <p><b>Bankrupt</b> - 2:15</p> <p><b>Banks</b> - 66:21</p> <p><b>Based</b> - 17:21, 18:13, 23:25, 33:5, 48:22, 75:2, 95:20, 100:6, 101:8, 104:9, 122:15, 133:25, 141:5, 144:10, 154:17, 181:3, 184:8, 197:10</p> <p><b>Basic</b> - 195:25</p> <p><b>Basis</b> - 10:22, 21:15, 67:4, 67:9, 72:8, 72:17, 78:15, 83:24, 100:2, 102:8, 115:14, 115:23, 116:4, 119:4, 120:6, 120:9, 120:15, 120:18, 138:22, 141:9, 144:21, 145:24, 147:19</p> <p><b>Basket</b> - 98:5, 98:7</p> <p><b>Bay</b> - 150:9</p> <p><b>BC</b> - 48:3, 155:13, 187:2, 188:3, 193:11, 198:11</p> <p><b>BCC</b> - 200:25</p> <p><b>BCUC</b> - 6:25, 47:16, 170:24, 182:21, 183:14, 186:13</p> <p><b>Becomes</b> - 82:3, 121:5</p> <p><b>Beefed</b> - 211:12</p> <p><b>Beforehand</b> - 32:15</p> <p><b>Behind</b> - 32:23, 32:24, 144:22</p> <p><b>Believes</b> - 30:15</p> <p><b>Below</b> - 15:22, 30:15, 40:20, 42:10, 43:10, 48:17, 54:12, 65:6, 193:24</p> <p><b>Benchmark</b> - 121:5, 188:4</p> <p><b>Benefit</b> - 76:25, 77:6, 140:5</p> <p><b>Benefits</b> - 96:25</p> <p><b>Bet</b> - 30:16</p> <p><b>Beta</b> - 96:1, 96:6, 96:12, 158:14, 177:16, 177:17, 179:9, 179:11, 179:13, 180:4, 180:5, 181:7,</p>	<p>181:16, 183:13, 183:16, 183:19, 183:20, 185:14, 188:16, 189:22, 190:1, 190:7, 190:9, 190:18, 192:4, 194:10, 194:12, 197:12</p> <p><b>Betas</b> - 96:17, 178:3, 178:6, 178:9, 178:17, 179:2, 179:7, 179:9, 179:18, 179:21, 180:2, 180:7, 180:22, 181:11, 181:13, 181:19, 184:13, 184:18, 185:8, 185:25, 186:2, 186:14, 186:23, 191:9, 192:8, 192:12, 193:11, 193:13, 193:24, 194:4, 195:8, 195:10, 195:16, 195:25, 196:9, 196:14, 197:2, 197:3, 197:13, 197:20, 197:22, 197:24, 198:1, 198:4, 198:5, 202:23, 205:12</p> <p><b>Betting</b> - 30:22</p> <p><b>Bias</b> - 153:20</p> <p><b>Big</b> - 27:7, 29:22, 34:24, 51:23, 145:4</p> <p><b>Bill</b> - 206:19, 211:7, 212:6</p> <p><b>Billed</b> - 104:3</p> <p><b>Bills</b> - 99:3</p> <p><b>Bio</b> - 211:2, 211:3, 211:9</p> <p><b>Bit</b> - 8:18, 13:10, 13:14, 14:17, 15:15, 63:5, 70:19, 82:11, 129:25, 131:8, 131:13, 133:12, 133:13, 168:8, 175:23, 190:22, 204:19</p> <p><b>Blend</b> - 105:10</p> <p><b>Blip</b> - 206:17</p> <p><b>Bloomberg</b> - 48:22, 48:23, 49:11, 53:19, 54:15, 70:6, 177:22, 179:22, 180:1, 197:6, 197:21</p> <p><b>Blow</b> - 172:7</p> <p><b>Blundon</b> - 6:11</p> <p><b>Blurb</b> - 133:15</p>	<p><b>Board</b> - 20:23, 21:23, 22:3, 22:25, 23:18, 41:12, 45:12, 66:11, 108:7, 118:4, 126:1, 127:6, 140:23, 145:12, 154:1, 155:13, 186:22, 187:5, 187:24, 193:5, 204:3, 204:10, 204:22, 205:10, 206:14, 207:7, 210:19, 211:22</p> <p><b>Boards</b> - 178:10</p> <p><b>Board's</b> - 3:18, 9:4</p> <p><b>Body</b> - 204:6</p> <p><b>Bonds</b> - 77:24, 78:12, 78:15, 78:19, 80:4, 80:7, 81:14, 81:20, 85:16, 85:17, 99:2, 121:1, 122:2, 134:10, 136:25, 139:3, 139:14, 143:2</p> <p><b>Book</b> - 17:9, 18:23, 19:10, 19:11, 25:16, 81:2, 130:21, 135:19</p> <p><b>Books</b> - 80:23</p> <p><b>Booth</b> - 6:23, 13:8, 65:4, 76:14, 77:15, 78:23, 86:15, 88:10, 90:1, 90:3, 90:7, 107:9, 133:16, 144:2, 148:23, 149:9, 170:22, 177:19, 178:25</p> <p><b>Booth's</b> - 64:24, 75:5, 75:15, 76:11, 77:10, 80:10, 117:23, 133:11, 157:18, 177:25, 178:24</p> <p><b>Border</b> - 57:6, 57:9, 63:2, 73:18, 74:24, 92:8</p> <p><b>Borders</b> - 57:8, 62:23</p> <p><b>Borrow</b> - 3:18</p> <p><b>Borrowing</b> - 118:21</p> <p><b>Both</b> - 4:14, 34:4, 52:4, 52:12, 62:13, 65:7, 71:10, 71:15, 71:16, 92:16, 100:25, 107:2, 108:18, 132:19, 134:8, 139:6, 143:22, 164:3,</p>
--	---	---	---	---



<p>195:12, 200:12, 201:5, 203:7 <b>Bottom</b> - 35:21, 35:22, 76:18, 99:1, 131:4, 131:6, 135:22, 156:17, 193:14 <b>Bottomed</b> - 68:25 <b>Bought</b> - 124:16 <b>Boundaries</b> - 50:18 <b>Box</b> - 67:14, 141:20 <b>Break</b> - 12:12, 145:10, 206:2 <b>Brief</b> - 8:19 <b>British</b> - 155:4, 156:24 <b>Broad</b> - 34:3, 100:13, 150:12, 160:17, 181:11, 181:13 <b>Broader</b> - 51:2, 96:14, 184:11 <b>Broadest</b> - 102:21 <b>Broadly</b> - 44:24, 46:5, 50:8, 56:2, 62:17, 153:19, 181:24 <b>Broken</b> - 49:4 <b>Broker</b> - 58:21 <b>Brokerage</b> - 10:25 <b>Brookfield</b> - 102:15 <b>Brought</b> - 22:8 <b>Brunswick</b> - 210:12 <b>Bs</b> - 35:20, 35:21 <b>Build</b> - 98:17, 188:6, 209:1 <b>Building</b> - 20:20, 20:22, 97:14 <b>Built</b> - 117:12 <b>Bulb</b> - 208:4 <b>Bullet</b> - 28:8 <b>Bumpy</b> - 71:14 <b>Bunch</b> - 72:25 <b>Burry</b> - 123:19, 205:24, 206:5, 206:9, 206:10, 212:20, 212:23 <b>Business</b> - 2:10, 38:4 <b>Buy</b> - 58:20, 59:3, 60:5, 109:14, 211:16 <b>Buyer</b> - 58:23 <b>Buying</b> - 59:6 <b>B'y</b> - 104:22</p>	<p><b>C</b></p> <p><b>CA</b> - 3:3, 3:16, 10:9, 10:10, 37:1, 37:17, 80:21, 82:9, 82:22, 154:13, 182:21, 183:3, 190:12, 190:20, 190:24, 193:6, 193:15, 198:9 <b>Cabot</b> - 150:17 <b>Calculate</b> - 80:3, 121:17, 121:25, 122:1, 122:4 <b>Calculated</b> - 122:18, 127:9 <b>Calculates</b> - 173:3 <b>Calculating</b> - 81:16, 121:13 <b>Calculation</b> - 79:2, 79:19, 80:8, 125:21 <b>Call</b> - 64:2 <b>Called</b> - 73:18, 92:24, 102:17, 131:17, 177:5, 178:6, 210:9, 210:10 <b>Cameco</b> - 150:7 <b>Canada/US</b> - 50:23 <b>Canada's</b> - 83:18, 84:6, 86:23 <b>Canadians</b> - 55:25 <b>Can't</b> - 19:9, 19:10, 55:24, 58:20, 79:5, 91:21, 92:12, 94:14, 95:3, 105:22, 139:10, 165:16, 197:5 <b>Capita</b> - 202:10 <b>Capital</b> - 4:14, 7:12, 11:20, 18:24, 21:3, 24:1, 43:18, 45:19, 51:14, 62:1, 62:13, 62:14, 62:18, 62:21, 63:2, 67:2, 67:5, 71:9, 73:9, 73:13, 75:18, 76:1, 76:21, 76:23, 82:24, 83:19, 83:25, 84:4, 112:20, 121:19, 131:1, 143:8, 159:1, 162:8, 181:22, 182:15, 183:17, 196:7, 200:17, 205:4 <b>CAPM</b> - 121:9, 139:16, 158:10, 181:5, 181:14, 184:14, 190:16, 191:15, 191:21, 196:7, 203:13,</p>	<p>203:18, 205:9 <b>Capms</b> - 203:8 <b>Capture</b> - 170:17 <b>Captured</b> - 164:19 <b>Careful</b> - 98:5 <b>Carefully</b> - 43:1 <b>Carved</b> - 177:1 <b>Case</b> - 4:10, 19:15, 21:20, 22:6, 59:12, 68:22, 73:1, 73:9, 86:22, 110:7, 128:23, 135:18, 135:23, 152:9, 158:5, 185:25, 186:11, 189:1, 191:19, 198:17, 198:24, 200:6, 200:16, 200:25, 204:13, 204:16, 204:20, 205:17 <b>Cases</b> - 25:15, 33:18 <b>Cash</b> - 77:24 <b>Catch</b> - 83:5 <b>Category</b> - 36:4 <b>Caterpillar</b> - 150:15 <b>Caused</b> - 2:10, 2:11, 160:21 <b>Caution</b> - 140:14 <b>Central</b> - 66:21, 73:18, 75:18, 75:22, 76:2, 124:3, 136:12, 143:5, 206:11 <b>Centre</b> - 18:13 <b>CEO</b> - 208:21 <b>Certain</b> - 13:12, 208:4 <b>Certainly</b> - 23:1, 28:24, 38:9, 43:13, 57:10, 57:11, 62:24, 64:2, 64:9, 83:7, 108:10, 132:19, 135:1, 140:17, 177:19, 188:15, 196:1 <b>Cetera</b> - 10:2, 102:16 <b>CHAIRMAN</b> - 1:2, 1:9, 1:13, 1:14, 9:10, 103:16, 103:23, 104:21, 123:8, 123:10, 123:16, 140:20, 205:25, 206:4, 212:14, 212:21, 212:25 <b>Challenged</b> - 2:12 <b>Chance</b> - 32:16, 67:12, 83:2, 145:9</p>	<p><b>Change</b> - 130:20, 161:18, 197:13, 197:14 <b>Changes</b> - 130:11 <b>Chapter</b> - 2:16 <b>Characterized</b> - 108:22, 183:18 <b>Characterizes</b> - 85:2 <b>Characterizing</b> - 86:23 <b>Chart</b> - 3:15, 4:25, 5:8, 5:10, 48:17, 54:11, 65:1, 68:17, 69:11, 95:5, 97:5, 99:1, 99:21, 193:16 <b>Check</b> - 60:21, 74:18, 88:17, 124:2, 131:19, 132:14, 140:13, 150:18, 174:3, 174:6, 174:8, 175:15, 190:4, 190:6, 190:8, 190:13, 190:18, 192:22, 200:11 <b>Checked</b> - 80:12, 84:22, 186:21 <b>Cheque</b> - 209:20 <b>Choose</b> - 92:17 <b>Churchill</b> - 209:2, 209:5 <b>Circumstances</b> - 142:25, 197:14 <b>Cite</b> - 181:4 <b>Citing</b> - 145:21, 145:25 <b>Claiming</b> - 163:20 <b>Clarenville</b> - 207:9 <b>Clarification</b> - 117:25 <b>Clarify</b> - 113:1 <b>Class</b> - 98:24, 111:3, 195:24 <b>Classes</b> - 88:8, 97:17 <b>Cleary</b> - 149:11 <b>Clients</b> - 33:20, 34:4, 85:4 <b>Close</b> - 137:19, 146:4, 189:9, 189:14 <b>CMA</b> - 84:10 <b>Cmas</b> - 83:20, 84:4, 84:20 <b>Coefficient</b> - 95:25, 96:2, 96:7, 96:8, 96:22, 163:4, 165:24, 167:21 <b>Coefficients</b> - 96:17, 98:15</p>	<p><b>Colleagues</b> - 84:22 <b>College</b> - 196:2 <b>Columbia</b> - 155:5, 156:24 <b>Column</b> - 14:13, 14:21, 15:13, 19:20, 19:23, 35:10, 35:15, 88:20, 101:16, 126:24, 131:3, 151:3, 168:13 <b>Columns</b> - 69:15 <b>Combination</b> - 10:20, 13:19, 15:22, 35:23, 146:10 <b>Come</b> - 8:9, 13:14, 14:17, 15:9, 16:3, 30:24, 33:18, 62:18, 69:3, 82:11, 93:17, 93:22, 105:11, 110:20, 157:17, 181:3, 182:9, 188:11, 190:21, 206:23, 207:2, 207:15 <b>Comes</b> - 68:20, 78:17, 130:21, 149:21, 196:13 <b>Comfort</b> - 149:21, 192:8, 196:25 <b>Comfortable</b> - 192:5 <b>Coming</b> - 72:20, 74:25, 182:13, 195:24, 196:2, 210:3 <b>Comment</b> - 38:6 <b>Comments</b> - 28:4 <b>Commission</b> - 7:1, 18:15, 18:19, 179:4, 179:11, 180:24, 184:15, 186:7, 187:2, 187:13, 188:12 <b>Commissioners</b> - 23:18 <b>Commissions</b> - 1:20, 10:24, 184:10 <b>Committee</b> - 84:8, 84:19 <b>Commodity</b> - 64:10 <b>Common</b> - 14:21, 16:1, 17:9, 17:19, 17:20, 17:21, 18:9, 18:23, 19:17, 19:22, 19:24, 20:5, 118:22, 149:18, 171:13, 203:7 <b>Commonly</b> -</p>
--	--	---	---	---

122:21, 170:4, 171:16, 171:21  
**Companies** - 4:3, 4:4, 4:6, 4:11, 4:16, 4:22, 5:2, 13:15, 13:20, 16:7, 18:10, 18:12, 18:16, 20:25, 21:13, 21:24, 22:22, 23:20, 24:18, 25:4, 27:1, 35:22, 43:1, 45:4, 51:23, 51:24, 92:18, 100:12, 102:13, 119:9, 137:5, 144:17, 152:17, 153:7, 181:10, 181:21, 185:8, 194:5, 195:9, 195:14, 195:17, 197:17, 202:23, 203:3, 203:4  
**Company** - 2:2, 10:5, 14:5, 15:7, 15:8, 15:23, 17:24, 18:3, 19:2, 19:11, 19:12, 20:8, 20:10, 21:15, 24:21, 24:22, 25:9, 27:7, 29:6, 41:3, 43:3, 45:18, 62:11, 62:25, 69:5, 81:12, 101:5, 109:24, 124:16, 210:9  
**Company's** - 24:25  
**Comparable** - 2:13, 43:2, 142:7, 159:8, 194:19, 194:21, 194:24  
**Compare** - 30:4, 67:21, 92:12, 119:10, 119:12  
**Compared** - 5:2, 22:23  
**Compares** - 142:2  
**Comparing** - 4:10, 19:6, 20:17  
**Comparison** - 4:23, 139:25  
**Complete** - 123:23, 172:20  
**Completely** - 62:1, 119:2, 130:15, 180:17  
**Completion** - 210:22  
**Complex** - 165:19  
**Compound** - 79:20, 81:22, 88:21, 89:2, 90:22, 99:6

**Comprised** - 84:9  
**Concept** - 45:23, 63:6, 181:3, 182:8  
**Concern** - 186:9, 186:11, 191:8, 201:13  
**Concerned** - 23:19, 187:10, 209:11  
**Concerning** - 154:23  
**Concerns** - 53:20, 187:20  
**Conclude** - 141:4  
**Concludes** - 210:3  
**Conclusion** - 29:4, 29:17, 213:2  
**Conclusions** - 30:20  
**Conditional** - 140:19  
**Conditions** - 84:7, 133:23, 134:1  
**Conducted** - 100:5, 105:25, 106:5, 106:15  
**Confidence** - 149:25, 166:3, 166:20, 167:1, 168:3, 168:4  
**Confirm** - 4:25, 5:3, 16:4, 66:3, 77:9, 117:14, 118:10, 124:3, 131:18, 132:16, 154:16, 178:2, 188:23, 201:17  
**Confirmed** - 3:3, 159:15  
**Confused** - 1:25  
**Confusion** - 135:14  
**Connection** - 145:1  
**Conscious** - 208:12  
**Consensus** - 116:3, 116:15  
**Conservative** - 156:25, 157:7, 194:4  
**Consider** - 117:20, 136:14, 163:23, 207:7, 211:17  
**Considerable** - 176:9  
**Considerably** - 136:4  
**Considerations** - 57:7  
**Considered** - 36:4,

38:22, 92:7, 143:11, 178:3  
**Considering** - 76:14, 204:22  
**Consistency** - 84:23  
**Consistent** - 21:15, 58:16, 61:25, 86:25, 118:16, 127:17, 136:18, 136:19, 167:20  
**Consistently** - 21:4  
**Consolidated** - 2:2  
**Constant** - 55:14, 102:5, 148:19, 148:22, 149:17, 151:15, 153:13  
**Consultants** - 8:21, 9:16, 12:4  
**Consulting** - 10:2, 26:4, 29:22  
**Consumer** - 132:5, 135:9, 145:17  
**Consumers** - 48:3  
**Consumption** - 208:13, 212:7  
**Contacting** - 207:8  
**Contained** - 140:12  
**CONT'd** - 1:18  
**Contested** - 188:5  
**Context** - 64:8, 76:12, 106:14, 110:24, 121:9, 182:6, 186:10, 186:19  
**Continue** - 71:17  
**Continued** - 186:11  
**Continuously** - 11:1  
**Contradict** - 13:2  
**Controversy** - 24:14  
**Conversion** - 79:15, 90:16, 99:10  
**Convert** - 78:23, 81:21, 82:3, 82:17, 89:14, 99:9, 209:6  
**Converted** - 78:3, 78:7, 79:12, 79:17  
**Converting** - 79:9  
**Converts** - 80:6  
**Copies** - 12:11  
**Copy** - 6:4, 198:23  
**Copyrighted** - 27:13  
**Corner** - 208:23  
**Corporate** - 68:23, 153:1  
**Corporation** - 52:3  
**Corporations** - 152:14

**Correlated** - 95:19, 95:22, 95:23, 98:7  
**Correlation** - 93:2, 93:9, 93:13, 93:24, 94:5, 95:25, 96:7, 96:13, 96:16, 96:22, 97:4, 97:13, 98:15  
**Correlations** - 92:25, 95:13, 97:17  
**Correlative** - 95:8  
**Correspondence** - 26:12, 26:23  
**Corresponds** - 68:11  
**Corroborate** - 105:4  
**Corroboration** - 145:3  
**Cost** - 7:11, 11:19, 24:1, 28:9, 44:13, 44:14, 45:19, 63:10, 67:15, 67:20, 67:25, 69:6, 72:19, 73:9, 73:13, 75:18, 76:1, 76:21, 76:23, 102:10, 118:22, 140:5, 143:7, 158:25, 181:21, 182:15, 183:17, 196:6, 208:25  
**Costs** - 31:4, 34:15, 34:25, 43:17, 72:3, 118:21, 209:5  
**Counsel** - 6:25, 170:23  
**Count** - 7:13  
**Countries** - 64:1, 64:9, 92:1  
**Country** - 57:3, 64:17, 200:22  
**Couple** - 15:17, 198:16  
**Coupon** - 139:13  
**Course** - 4:10, 65:6, 182:10, 203:19, 208:10, 211:3  
**Courses** - 107:9  
**Cover** - 160:17  
**Coyne's** - 179:11, 198:23  
**Crash** - 169:4, 177:6  
**Create** - 203:6  
**Credible** - 144:23  
**Credit** - 2:10, 34:16, 37:4, 37:5, 40:17, 42:16,

42:21, 43:2, 45:5, 55:4, 67:7, 118:25, 119:4, 202:8  
**Cribbing** - 150:16  
**Crisis** - 173:13  
**Criteria** - 2:7  
**Critical** - 114:1  
**CROSS** - 1:17, 6:4, 6:10, 13:9, 26:7, 46:23, 57:6, 57:9, 57:21, 61:1, 63:1, 92:8, 126:8, 126:10, 139:21, 173:15, 173:22  
**CRRA** - 9:15  
**Crucial** - 97:6, 97:9, 97:11  
**Crutches** - 158:10  
**Currencies** - 64:19  
**Currency** - 90:16, 91:7, 92:9  
**Current** - 65:5, 85:13, 86:12, 101:1, 101:8, 106:4, 106:19, 106:22, 109:9, 109:10, 109:11, 109:13, 115:16, 116:17, 134:1, 138:8, 156:19, 158:15  
**Currently** - 1:12, 143:20  
**Cursor** - 70:18  
**Curve** - 85:19, 85:23, 87:14, 87:24  
**Curves** - 70:7, 85:14  
**Customers** - 124:10  
**Cut** - 38:1, 165:22, 166:11

D

**Darn** - 34:18  
**Data** - 7:8, 7:11, 7:13, 10:18, 12:3, 16:25, 24:17, 25:7, 25:10, 25:16, 29:6, 29:7, 30:13, 48:21, 48:24, 49:16, 54:16, 54:25, 69:25, 117:8, 120:1, 122:7, 127:9, 131:25, 132:6, 132:18, 132:20, 135:5, 135:18, 135:19, 140:9, 140:10, 144:16, 182:8, 182:12, 203:2, 203:3

<b>Databases</b> - 11:16 <b>Date</b> - 18:14, 18:17, 48:21, 69:22, 70:7, 70:11, 83:1 <b>Dates</b> - 125:4 <b>Day</b> - 30:12, 33:11, 99:3, 208:1, 208:2 <b>Days</b> - 50:15, 212:9 <b>DBRS</b> - 39:17 <b>DCF</b> - 20:18, 20:21, 20:23, 21:12, 100:3, 100:5, 100:13, 100:23, 101:4, 102:6, 108:22, 113:4, 113:12, 113:15, 113:20, 113:23, 148:16, 149:7, 153:12, 153:25, 154:15, 154:20, 155:8, 156:25, 157:8, 158:17, 190:16, 203:18 <b>Deal</b> - 124:15 <b>Dealer</b> - 58:21 <b>Dealing</b> - 209:8 <b>Debt</b> - 44:13, 44:14, 62:13, 67:5, 67:15, 67:20, 67:25, 68:22, 69:6, 71:7, 71:10, 71:12, 72:3, 93:3 <b>Decade</b> - 77:12, 182:11, 195:12 <b>December</b> - 47:15 <b>Decided</b> - 2:1, 2:3, 73:10, 187:23 <b>Decision</b> - 62:12, 124:5, 183:17, 186:8, 187:19, 187:21, 194:18 <b>Decisions</b> - 186:21, 186:25, 187:16, 194:18 <b>Decrease</b> - 157:5 <b>Decreased</b> - 74:5, 192:16 <b>Deduct</b> - 108:23, 108:25 <b>Deemed</b> - 144:12 <b>Deficit</b> - 77:2 <b>Define</b> - 63:17 <b>Defined</b> - 16:7, 76:25, 77:6 <b>Definition</b> - 93:13, 111:19, 111:23 <b>Definitions</b> - 111:13 <b>Degree</b> - 97:13 <b>Deliver</b> - 27:18	<b>Demand</b> - 72:1, 171:19 <b>Denote</b> - 165:24 <b>Deployed</b> - 181:6 <b>Derive</b> - 4:15, 100:23, 157:1, 181:10, 181:12, 205:5 <b>Derived</b> - 18:18, 18:24 <b>Deriving</b> - 200:23, 203:2 <b>Describe</b> - 85:9 <b>Described</b> - 29:8, 83:24, 109:8, 110:23, 174:15 <b>Describes</b> - 87:16, 117:5 <b>Describing</b> - 10:8, 112:9 <b>Determination</b> - 17:13, 19:13, 21:5, 83:21, 84:10 <b>Determinations</b> - 30:14 <b>Determine</b> - 20:21, 39:25, 75:25, 77:1, 84:1, 101:6, 194:25, 204:5 <b>Determines</b> - 184:16 <b>Determining</b> - 29:9, 57:16 <b>Developing</b> - 134:3 <b>Deviation</b> - 89:20, 89:25, 90:2 <b>Deviations</b> - 91:13, 96:9 <b>Didn't</b> - 2:12, 5:4, 7:12, 67:12, 74:11, 122:4, 127:5, 147:8, 153:24, 170:15, 173:24, 177:6, 181:9, 186:6, 201:13, 204:16 <b>Difference</b> - 44:13, 78:17, 90:3, 90:17, 115:18, 120:17, 120:18, 125:21, 146:1, 146:21, 188:16, 188:24 <b>Differences</b> - 91:25 <b>Different</b> - 18:20, 18:25, 19:5, 64:18, 91:16, 112:14, 115:24, 129:13, 131:14, 157:14, 183:24, 185:7, 200:3, 204:4, 208:6 <b>Differential</b> - 67:9,	119:2, 119:5 <b>Differentiate</b> - 43:8 <b>Differentiation</b> - 44:25 <b>Differently</b> - 64:17 <b>Difficult</b> - 28:23 <b>Dig</b> - 17:3 <b>Dime</b> - 207:15 <b>Dip</b> - 70:17 <b>Dipped</b> - 69:1 <b>Directional</b> - 211:4, 211:9 <b>Directionally</b> - 189:10 <b>Directly</b> - 58:22, 68:11, 149:7, 149:22, 149:25, 154:5, 158:20, 159:3, 159:6, 159:11 <b>Disabled</b> - 158:10 <b>Disagree</b> - 118:1 <b>Discontinued</b> - 207:5 <b>Discount</b> - 134:3, 143:18 <b>Discussing</b> - 110:15 <b>Dislocation</b> - 66:20, 71:6, 160:21, 169:25 <b>Disparity</b> - 66:24 <b>Dispute</b> - 79:22 <b>Distance</b> - 137:16 <b>Distress</b> - 143:10 <b>Distribute</b> - 12:11 <b>Distribution</b> - 10:16, 112:10 <b>Diversification</b> - 50:18, 55:23, 56:1, 96:24, 97:20, 98:8 <b>Divide</b> - 19:10 <b>Divided</b> - 17:19 <b>Dividend</b> - 55:4, 55:7, 57:2, 101:2, 101:8, 104:2, 104:19, 121:15, 121:18, 148:9 <b>Dividends</b> - 56:10, 56:12, 56:20, 151:13, 151:18, 152:23 <b>Dividing</b> - 21:9 <b>Document</b> - 8:19, 9:8, 9:17, 12:10, 14:20, 26:3, 27:12, 28:3, 83:2, 83:17, 84:5, 84:24, 145:13 <b>Documents</b> - 26:7, 136:6 <b>Doesn't</b> - 5:10,	21:10, 41:23, 53:16, 54:21, 57:5, 87:15, 110:10, 158:1, 177:3 <b>Dollar</b> - 61:22, 92:13 <b>Dollars</b> - 209:1, 209:6 <b>Domestic</b> - 62:19 <b>Double</b> - 36:9, 42:1, 103:19, 131:19 <b>Doubling</b> - 103:10 <b>Dozen</b> - 207:12 <b>Dr</b> - 6:23, 13:7, 64:24, 65:4, 75:4, 75:15, 76:11, 76:14, 77:15, 78:23, 80:10, 86:14, 88:10, 90:1, 90:3, 90:7, 107:9, 117:22, 133:11, 133:16, 144:2, 148:23, 149:9, 149:10, 157:17, 177:19, 177:25, 178:24, 179:5 <b>Drastic</b> - 157:5 <b>Drop</b> - 170:8 <b>Dropped</b> - 186:3 <b>Drops</b> - 185:14 <b>DSF</b> - 20:21 <b>Due</b> - 91:7, 136:11 <b>Duff</b> - 122:6, 122:12, 125:7, 131:10, 131:11, 132:24, 133:16, 133:18, 133:21, 134:1, 134:5, 136:22, 140:8, 141:6, 142:13, 142:23, 144:1, 145:3, 147:20 <b>Duke</b> - 13:17, 15:23, 206:19, 208:15 <b>Dummy</b> - 160:19, 168:13, 168:19, 168:21, 169:1, 169:11, 169:22, 170:8, 170:15, 170:25, 171:10, 173:13, 174:2, 174:14, 174:18, 174:20, 175:24 <b>Dunk</b> - 31:22	67:5, 101:5, 119:12, 128:23, 168:12, 189:5, 197:22 <b>Earlier</b> - 118:25, 142:25, 145:1, 145:8, 145:19, 148:7, 189:19 <b>Early</b> - 107:6 <b>Earn</b> - 22:1, 22:14, 24:7, 28:13, 28:15, 28:17, 31:5, 31:14, 33:16, 34:15, 46:6 <b>Earned</b> - 4:1, 5:12, 15:18, 16:1, 16:4, 16:8, 17:14, 19:9, 21:11, 23:20, 24:19, 25:11, 25:13, 25:23, 29:10, 104:6, 194:1, 194:5 <b>Earning</b> - 23:21, 30:21, 124:8 <b>Earnings</b> - 22:21, 28:25, 30:18, 124:9, 151:14, 151:18, 194:19, 194:21, 194:24 <b>Earns</b> - 31:13 <b>Econometric</b> - 171:16 <b>Econometricians</b> - 171:17 <b>Economic</b> - 66:16, 71:19, 84:7, 133:22, 143:10 <b>Economics</b> - 77:4, 77:17, 116:3, 116:15 <b>Economy</b> - 152:8, 152:13, 152:15, 152:16, 153:9 <b>Edison</b> - 2:2, 2:4, 2:5 <b>Effect</b> - 149:11, 170:17, 171:14, 172:3 <b>Effects</b> - 170:4 <b>Efficiencies</b> - 206:22 <b>Efficiency</b> - 208:18, 211:14 <b>Efficiently</b> - 62:13 <b>Effort</b> - 140:4, 140:21 <b>Elect</b> - 92:18 <b>Electric</b> - 10:19, 10:20, 13:19, 13:20, 15:23, 16:6, 43:6, 72:7, 72:25, 177:20, 177:21 <b>Electricity</b> - 209:23 <b>Electrics</b> - 35:24
---	--	---	---	--

## E

**Each** - 5:13, 24:24, 38:3, 48:6, 62:3, 62:10, 62:11, 64:17,

<p><b>Electronically</b> - 11:17</p> <p><b>Elsewhere</b> - 87:17, 117:2</p> <p><b>Emera</b> - 151:3</p> <p><b>Empirical</b> - 179:4, 195:16</p> <p><b>Employed</b> - 171:21</p> <p><b>Enbridge</b> - 52:4</p> <p><b>Enclosure</b> - 207:23</p> <p><b>Encourage</b> - 207:1, 211:16</p> <p><b>Ending</b> - 17:22</p> <p><b>Ends</b> - 121:15, 152:25</p> <p><b>Energy</b> - 15:14, 47:15, 206:19, 208:16, 211:14</p> <p><b>Engineering</b> - 8:13</p> <p><b>Enhance</b> - 210:25</p> <p><b>Enter</b> - 12:16, 47:8, 61:5, 126:12</p> <p><b>Entered</b> - 1:4, 6:13, 26:13, 173:20</p> <p><b>Entire</b> - 36:13, 45:7, 135:22, 172:4, 172:6, 182:5</p> <p><b>Entirety</b> - 103:1, 110:24, 152:13, 152:16, 205:15</p> <p><b>Entries</b> - 69:15</p> <p><b>Entry</b> - 203:7</p> <p><b>Environment</b> - 71:18, 106:5, 106:23, 138:9, 138:18, 138:25, 139:1, 158:16</p> <p><b>Equal</b> - 171:10</p> <p><b>Equally</b> - 95:8, 110:19</p> <p><b>Equation</b> - 155:24</p> <p><b>Equilibrium</b> - 66:23, 108:24, 117:3, 117:6, 158:12</p> <p><b>Equities</b> - 77:24, 78:12, 78:14, 78:18, 81:13, 81:14, 81:18, 89:8, 90:10, 90:11, 93:5, 93:15, 93:17, 93:25, 94:6, 94:7, 95:7, 95:9, 99:15, 99:16, 99:20, 110:10, 120:16, 120:25, 149:18</p> <p><b>Equivalent</b> - 62:4</p> <p><b>ERP</b> - 133:25, 134:2, 134:6, 134:8</p> <p><b>Essence</b> - 102:3</p> <p><b>Essentially</b> - 8:16,</p>	<p>174:2, 174:22</p> <p><b>Established</b> - 84:8, 134:7, 148:15</p> <p><b>Estimate</b> - 79:18, 84:6, 109:20, 112:22, 114:19, 115:17, 117:23, 121:11, 133:5, 156:20, 158:17, 158:25, 159:5, 160:22, 163:4, 165:18, 181:14, 181:16, 196:6, 197:15</p> <p><b>Estimated</b> - 108:14, 108:15, 147:24, 148:8, 154:4, 161:24, 180:4, 181:13</p> <p><b>Estimates</b> - 20:21, 76:16, 78:24, 108:15, 114:2, 118:3, 134:8, 150:2, 150:20, 150:23, 153:18, 154:15, 154:17, 162:7, 177:16, 177:18, 179:13, 181:7, 186:7, 191:22</p> <p><b>Estimating</b> - 45:19, 76:20, 114:14, 136:15, 143:13, 154:8, 194:14, 194:20</p> <p><b>Et</b> - 10:2, 102:16</p> <p><b>Evaluation</b> - 85:3, 206:21</p> <p><b>Eversource</b> - 13:18, 16:3</p> <p><b>Everybody</b> - 102:15, 116:11</p> <p><b>Everyone</b> - 195:23</p> <p><b>Everything</b> - 127:23, 152:25, 158:4, 164:17</p> <p><b>Evident</b> - 16:5</p> <p><b>Evidently</b> - 34:10</p> <p><b>EXAMINATION</b> - 1:17, 6:4, 26:7, 126:8</p> <p><b>Examine</b> - 45:6, 45:13</p> <p><b>Example</b> - 63:7, 207:4</p> <p><b>Except</b> - 143:9</p> <p><b>Exception</b> - 80:15</p> <p><b>Excerpt</b> - 133:15, 142:7</p> <p><b>Exchange</b> - 14:4, 51:8, 51:16, 57:15, 62:18, 91:4, 91:10,</p>	<p>91:16, 92:9, 100:25, 111:11</p> <p><b>Exchanges</b> - 20:20</p> <p><b>Exclude</b> - 173:13</p> <p><b>Exempt</b> - 59:2, 59:9, 59:11</p> <p><b>Exemption</b> - 58:11</p> <p><b>Exercise</b> - 158:22, 158:23, 187:7</p> <p><b>Exhibit</b> - 68:7, 102:14, 130:25, 150:4, 160:2, 175:19, 198:23</p> <p><b>Exhibits</b> - 148:10</p> <p><b>Existed</b> - 106:17</p> <p><b>Expanded</b> - 210:25</p> <p><b>Expect</b> - 39:18, 40:3, 75:7, 106:22, 138:21, 176:19, 189:3, 204:25</p> <p><b>Expectation</b> - 99:25, 101:19, 146:25, 147:5</p> <p><b>Expectations</b> - 71:25, 104:2, 109:18, 117:18, 147:11, 152:23</p> <p><b>Expected</b> - 76:16, 76:24, 77:1, 81:15, 81:17, 81:19, 81:21, 84:1, 88:8, 100:1, 101:24, 103:8, 139:14, 161:3, 169:4</p> <p><b>Expecting</b> - 104:7, 104:8</p> <p><b>Expense</b> - 28:23</p> <p><b>Expenses</b> - 28:19</p> <p><b>Expensive</b> - 209:22</p> <p><b>Experience</b> - 22:15, 196:12, 204:2</p> <p><b>Experienced</b> - 107:4, 169:5, 196:16</p> <p><b>Experiencing</b> - 85:24</p> <p><b>Expert</b> - 55:12, 182:1, 187:6</p> <p><b>Experts</b> - 169:3, 204:4</p> <p><b>Explain</b> - 100:18, 116:12, 154:19, 171:12</p> <p><b>Explanatory</b> - 172:13, 172:21</p> <p><b>Exposed</b> - 91:12</p> <p><b>Express</b> - 23:1</p> <p><b>Expressed</b> - 6:1, 128:6, 164:1,</p>	<p>164:3, 183:15, 186:8, 186:16, 187:1, 191:8</p> <p><b>Expresses</b> - 5:14, 128:6</p> <p><b>Extended</b> - 55:5</p> <p><b>Extent</b> - 66:11, 93:9, 105:14</p> <p><b>External</b> - 84:15</p> <p><b>Extra</b> - 120:24, 211:18</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>F</b></div> <p><b>Face</b> - 55:6, 56:19, 85:8</p> <p><b>Facing</b> - 143:20</p> <p><b>Factors</b> - 92:4, 113:16, 143:8</p> <p><b>Fair</b> - 68:14, 76:20, 85:25, 99:25, 114:14, 118:2, 121:7, 153:4</p> <p><b>Fairly</b> - 27:14, 163:24, 189:14, 195:6</p> <p><b>Fairness</b> - 23:12</p> <p><b>Falls</b> - 207:9, 208:11, 208:24, 208:25, 209:3, 209:11, 209:18, 210:3</p> <p><b>Far</b> - 53:12, 69:11, 70:6, 80:12, 95:21, 126:23, 137:15</p> <p><b>Fashion</b> - 6:25, 80:6, 98:7, 116:23, 139:20, 178:14</p> <p><b>Fast</b> - 103:14, 135:16</p> <p><b>Faster</b> - 152:8, 153:8</p> <p><b>February</b> - 134:7</p> <p><b>Federal</b> - 10:24, 145:22</p> <p><b>Feel</b> - 2:12, 33:16, 80:18, 149:16, 207:2</p> <p><b>FEI</b> - 48:15</p> <p><b>Fenced</b> - 40:14, 40:16, 40:24</p> <p><b>Figure</b> - 68:18, 108:12, 110:16, 115:11, 116:12, 119:15, 119:18, 119:20, 124:25, 126:2, 141:24, 177:18</p> <p><b>Figures</b> - 18:24, 64:19, 124:24, 125:18</p> <p><b>File</b> - 24:16, 25:12</p>	<p><b>Filed</b> - 47:14, 69:5, 192:14, 198:11, 198:16</p> <p><b>Filing</b> - 185:19, 192:19</p> <p><b>Finally</b> - 15:21, 16:2, 175:17</p> <p><b>Finance</b> - 195:24</p> <p><b>Financial</b> - 10:18, 11:2, 18:25, 50:13, 77:11, 133:23, 160:22, 169:25, 184:12, 196:4</p> <p><b>Financials</b> - 2:11</p> <p><b>Find</b> - 12:24, 12:25, 13:1, 17:7, 23:16, 50:17, 53:6, 104:11, 110:11, 123:6, 124:21, 158:12</p> <p><b>Fine</b> - 33:2, 62:16, 202:5</p> <p><b>Firm</b> - 8:13, 12:2, 26:4, 33:23, 34:5, 75:18, 76:1, 132:23, 138:15, 202:1</p> <p><b>Firms</b> - 10:25, 148:9, 149:2, 149:6, 149:14, 150:5, 150:15, 151:25, 152:21, 197:23</p> <p><b>First</b> - 28:14, 48:4, 52:22, 59:7, 60:22, 66:2, 77:8, 88:20, 100:10, 114:22, 120:22, 140:3, 157:25, 185:24, 206:12, 206:24</p> <p><b>Five</b> - 49:18, 101:10, 101:12, 102:2, 102:3, 103:11, 103:24, 123:8, 150:22, 209:25</p> <p><b>Fixed</b> - 61:23</p> <p><b>Fleshing</b> - 210:21</p> <p><b>Flick</b> - 199:3</p> <p><b>Flight</b> - 136:11, 143:4</p> <p><b>Flip</b> - 37:21, 145:24</p> <p><b>Flipped</b> - 28:3</p> <p><b>Florida</b> - 206:18, 207:23</p> <p><b>Flowing</b> - 62:21</p> <p><b>Flows</b> - 63:2</p> <p><b>Fluctuations</b> - 91:7, 133:22</p> <p><b>Focus</b> - 28:8</p> <p><b>Focussed</b> - 45:4</p> <p><b>Folks</b> - 132:24</p>
---	--	---	--	---

**Following** - 38:2, 57:24  
**Footnote** - 131:21, 132:17  
**Footnotes** - 16:20, 17:7, 131:16  
**Forecast** - 65:3, 65:6, 65:7, 66:1, 86:5, 87:4, 87:5, 100:18, 100:24, 109:10, 109:11, 109:15, 114:25, 115:5, 116:2, 117:12, 118:11, 118:13, 118:16, 151:8, 154:17, 154:19  
**Forecasting** - 171:19  
**Forecasts** - 71:16, 100:7, 101:2, 101:9, 101:10, 101:12, 102:2, 104:3, 104:20, 108:4  
**Foreign** - 50:6, 50:15, 53:5, 55:15, 56:9, 56:12, 57:15, 62:19, 91:7  
**Forever** - 151:15  
**Form** - 58:4, 61:19, 61:22, 197:11  
**Formally** - 10:9, 61:3  
**Forth** - 199:3  
**Fortis** - 39:11, 40:4, 40:8, 46:8, 48:5, 52:18, 58:1, 58:14, 61:24, 63:2, 73:17  
**Fortisbc** - 47:4, 47:15  
**Fortnightly** - 8:3, 8:7  
**Found** - 212:8  
**Foundation** - 27:17  
**Four** - 5:3, 9:5, 38:22, 103:11  
**Fourth** - 65:12, 66:2  
**Framework** - 210:16  
**Frankly** - 200:24  
**Freeze** - 124:14, 124:18  
**Front** - 27:15, 60:14, 95:16, 111:14, 116:12, 126:15  
**Fuel** - 28:18  
**Fulfilled** - 1:7

**Full** - 11:17, 74:5, 157:16  
**Fully** - 31:9, 62:14, 63:7, 63:14, 63:16, 63:18, 63:20, 64:2, 181:2  
**Fund** - 27:7, 77:2, 107:17, 107:25  
**Funds** - 56:25, 76:25  
**Furnace** - 209:23  
**Further** - 13:14, 14:18, 75:5, 82:12, 111:1, 134:5, 156:23, 175:17, 175:24, 205:23  
**Future** - 28:25, 71:20, 84:7, 207:18

### G

**Gain** - 121:20  
**Gander** - 207:9  
**Gas** - 10:20, 13:19, 15:23, 35:23  
**Gave** - 32:20, 130:5, 132:9, 206:13  
**GDP** - 21:14, 151:2, 151:8, 152:1, 152:4, 152:17, 152:22, 152:24, 153:3, 155:23, 159:9  
**General** - 28:20, 71:7  
**Generally** - 55:11  
**Generates** - 127:24  
**Generators** - 211:2  
**Generic** - 73:13, 183:17  
**Geographic** - 50:18  
**Geometric** - 78:2, 78:6  
**Geometric** - 78:10, 78:15, 79:9, 81:25  
**Get** - 55:4, 93:2, 107:2, 109:3, 116:5, 116:18, 127:13, 128:1, 135:17, 139:6, 140:5, 148:4, 152:25, 155:22, 159:5, 160:7, 168:20, 180:6, 180:7, 190:17, 191:21, 193:25, 194:4, 202:12, 205:24, 207:5, 207:19, 208:11, 209:20, 211:21, 212:5

**Gets** - 109:1, 109:12, 117:5, 144:14, 144:15  
**Give** - 19:15, 34:21, 40:13, 40:17, 110:10, 111:23, 157:19, 187:17, 188:12, 196:24, 207:10  
**Given** - 16:19, 18:17, 31:13, 31:16, 32:15, 33:5, 142:8, 157:17, 197:12, 210:2  
**Gives** - 116:15, 177:11  
**Global** - 51:2, 63:12, 64:3, 64:13, 84:23, 93:5, 95:9, 99:15, 133:22  
**Globally** - 50:15, 64:10  
**Globe** - 84:22  
**Glovertown** - 206:11  
**GLYNN** - 1:5, 3:20, 6:12, 12:8, 12:15, 12:20, 26:11, 26:17, 26:21, 47:3, 47:7, 61:4, 76:4, 76:8, 126:11, 140:24, 173:19  
**Going** - 3:13, 9:10, 13:8, 13:17, 23:12, 24:23, 35:23, 63:19, 64:12, 79:1, 79:18, 79:19, 91:8, 98:8, 107:5, 108:16, 110:5, 120:15, 123:1, 123:18, 138:22, 139:9, 139:13, 144:6, 147:1, 147:6, 147:18, 148:16, 152:21, 158:23, 158:24, 163:1, 164:17, 165:16, 179:24, 180:25, 187:8, 188:10, 207:11, 207:14, 208:9, 208:10, 208:13, 209:7, 209:9, 209:18, 209:19, 210:1, 212:4  
**Gold** - 63:9, 63:10, 63:12, 63:20, 64:9, 64:14  
**Gone** - 130:4, 130:8, 130:14, 208:5, 208:6

**Good** - 1:20, 1:23, 7:25, 10:7, 31:18, 45:11, 77:17, 84:18, 137:21, 206:10  
**Got** - 8:17, 9:5, 47:11, 72:18, 98:4, 156:11, 180:18, 199:7, 205:23, 207:23, 208:6, 208:22, 212:11  
**Government** - 66:20, 85:22, 118:17, 122:2, 143:2, 160:9, 163:12, 210:7  
**GRA** - 47:16, 69:1, 69:6, 126:10, 130:2  
**Grade** - 34:17, 38:23  
**Grand** - 191:10, 207:9  
**Grant** - 98:13  
**Granted** - 211:11, 212:2  
**Graph** - 44:12, 193:15  
**Graphed** - 38:20  
**Greater** - 66:18, 149:21, 201:13  
**Greatest** - 149:9  
**Grid** - 30:16, 211:5  
**Grips** - 181:3, 182:9  
**Group** - 3:7, 4:2, 4:5, 4:11, 4:17, 29:22, 42:22, 45:14, 51:6, 113:24, 119:7, 150:1, 158:21, 177:20, 177:21, 177:24, 185:1, 185:4, 197:22, 199:9, 199:10, 200:8, 200:23, 202:19, 202:21, 204:20  
**Groups** - 21:25, 42:17, 149:8, 185:7  
**Grow** - 27:18, 71:17, 151:25, 152:22, 153:8  
**Growing** - 151:14, 152:8  
**Grown** - 71:8  
**Grows** - 152:1, 152:4  
**Growth** - 21:13, 71:19, 100:24, 102:5, 102:7, 102:10, 103:15, 105:8, 148:17, 148:19, 148:22,

149:17, 150:1, 150:6, 150:22, 151:2, 151:8, 151:15, 152:22, 153:3, 153:13, 153:14, 154:24, 155:24, 156:1, 159:7, 159:9  
**Guess** - 1:15, 31:24, 64:11, 86:13, 108:2, 111:24, 118:10, 127:4, 137:15, 144:14, 164:3, 185:24, 187:5, 206:7  
**Guessing** - 197:11  
**Guidance** - 134:5, 192:7  
**Guide** - 199:5

### H

**Half** - 103:24, 207:12  
**Hand** - 69:16, 69:19, 70:17, 146:20, 146:21, 160:17, 163:8, 168:7  
**Hands** - 148:4  
**Hang** - 197:4  
**Hat** - 197:4  
**Haven't** - 32:15, 79:24, 104:17  
**Hear** - 123:19  
**Heard** - 10:10, 26:25, 27:5, 27:10, 57:24  
**Hearing** - 37:25, 206:14, 206:17, 210:2  
**Hearings** - 207:2, 207:11, 207:21  
**Heat** - 208:18, 209:22, 211:18  
**Hedge** - 91:3, 91:11, 91:20, 91:23, 92:12, 92:17, 92:18  
**Hedged** - 90:11, 90:24  
**Hedges** - 92:3, 92:7  
**Held** - 143:8  
**Help** - 201:8  
**Helpful** - 116:11, 183:5, 199:5  
**Herein** - 83:24  
**He's** - 79:9  
**Hewitt** - 82:24, 83:18, 84:6, 84:21, 85:2, 85:11, 85:12, 86:11, 87:4, 89:8,

<p>92:22, 95:10, 97:5, 98:22, 99:14, 105:2, 107:8, 107:19, 111:2, 120:13, 162:9  <b>High</b> - 103:8, 108:3, 143:5, 179:12  <b>Higher</b> - 40:3, 40:8, 40:17, 43:17, 65:22, 66:13, 67:7, 67:16, 67:23, 67:25, 69:4, 69:7, 69:12, 86:4, 96:16, 96:17, 106:24, 107:3, 109:18, 109:19, 110:4, 118:12, 118:21, 118:22, 120:5, 120:20, 146:9, 147:18, 147:23, 159:17, 159:21, 171:1, 209:4  <b>Highlighted</b> - 163:10  <b>Highly</b> - 34:18, 35:2, 63:24, 64:5, 64:13, 95:22, 98:6, 188:5  <b>Hill</b> - 7:21  <b>Histogram</b> - 38:2, 38:5, 38:9, 38:11  <b>Historic</b> - 105:11, 106:2, 106:16, 108:16, 109:6, 120:6, 120:9, 125:18, 130:3, 134:20, 134:24, 144:11, 156:2, 157:13, 161:19, 193:22  <b>Historical</b> - 84:14, 84:15, 119:25, 122:15, 124:23, 128:16, 131:10, 131:12, 159:18  <b>Historically</b> - 104:5, 107:4, 110:3, 127:18, 128:24, 138:19  <b>History</b> - 22:21, 23:21, 109:22, 110:19, 138:2, 138:5, 138:21, 144:17, 158:3, 170:18, 171:13, 171:25, 172:4, 172:7  <b>Hold</b> - 23:4, 55:15, 164:14, 203:9  <b>Holding</b> - 17:23,</p>	<p>18:3, 19:1, 19:2, 19:10, 19:12, 20:8, 20:10, 20:25, 21:15, 23:20, 24:18, 24:21, 25:9, 29:6, 56:25  <b>Holdings</b> - 48:23  <b>Holyrood</b> - 209:14  <b>Home</b> - 62:15, 206:20, 209:20, 209:23, 211:13, 211:15, 211:21  <b>Homeowner</b> - 211:16  <b>Honesty</b> - 104:25  <b>Hope</b> - 68:20, 197:1  <b>Host</b> - 73:11, 92:4, 112:13  <b>Hotel</b> - 207:13  <b>Hour</b> - 123:8  <b>House</b> - 84:14  <b>HQ</b> - 192:11, 192:18  <b>HQTD</b> - 3:14, 189:19  <b>Hudson</b> - 73:19, 75:19, 75:22, 76:2, 124:3, 150:9  <b>Huge</b> - 52:9  <b>Human</b> - 27:8  <b>Hundred</b> - 110:9  <b>Hundreds</b> - 207:16  <b>Hydro</b> - 22:7, 30:2, 190:9, 190:15, 208:3, 211:1</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center; width: 100px; margin: 10px auto;">I</div> <p><b>Ibbotson</b> - 122:6, 125:3, 129:10, 135:19  <b>I'd</b> - 23:2, 88:15, 131:20, 149:5, 168:2, 189:10, 206:12  <b>Identical</b> - 119:6  <b>Identically</b> - 96:23  <b>Ignoring</b> - 130:15  <b>I'll</b> - 12:14, 23:16, 38:1, 80:11, 95:4, 98:13, 105:3, 108:9, 110:2, 132:14, 132:16, 132:18, 140:19, 179:2  <b>Illustrated</b> - 191:12  <b>Impact</b> - 176:9  <b>Impacting</b> - 197:16  <b>Implied</b> - 101:7, 104:1, 108:4, 146:2, 146:22,</p>	<p>147:21, 169:11  <b>Important</b> - 17:7, 22:20, 31:16, 67:1, 67:6, 76:19, 110:7, 136:3  <b>Impossible</b> - 95:5, 199:3  <b>Improve</b> - 28:21, 28:25  <b>Improvements</b> - 206:21, 208:8, 211:13  <b>Inappropriately</b> - 143:19  <b>Inc</b> - 40:4, 40:8, 47:15  <b>Incentive</b> - 55:15, 57:2, 211:20  <b>Incidentally</b> - 102:12  <b>Income</b> - 17:18, 19:10, 55:7, 110:9, 125:22, 125:25, 126:4, 126:23, 127:10, 127:21, 127:24, 130:18, 139:24, 140:16  <b>Incorporated</b> - 151:3  <b>Increase</b> - 86:2, 134:2, 152:24  <b>Increased</b> - 192:13, 192:18, 192:21  <b>Increases</b> - 133:18, 210:1, 211:11, 212:1  <b>Increasing</b> - 72:1  <b>Indeed</b> - 176:18, 196:14  <b>Index</b> - 78:16, 102:18, 102:19  <b>Indexed</b> - 183:22  <b>Indicated</b> - 140:8, 150:22, 156:21, 186:16, 208:24  <b>Indicating</b> - 23:17, 81:11, 93:23, 141:7, 141:8, 141:15, 156:16, 175:4, 183:12  <b>Indications</b> - 159:16  <b>Indicator</b> - 102:22, 105:12, 137:22, 157:11  <b>Indirectly</b> - 159:12  <b>Indulgence</b> - 9:4, 145:12  <b>Industry</b> - 7:7, 7:23, 11:3, 62:22,</p>	<p>181:24, 183:22, 185:12, 186:2, 186:4, 188:18, 196:3  <b>Inevitable</b> - 208:14  <b>Infinite</b> - 100:2, 100:3, 102:8  <b>Infinity</b> - 148:17  <b>Inflation</b> - 91:17, 91:24  <b>Inflationary</b> - 66:18, 86:25  <b>Influence</b> - 163:22  <b>Influenced</b> - 110:16  <b>Informative</b> - 45:12, 45:21, 135:4, 193:5  <b>Informed</b> - 187:19  <b>Infrastructure</b> - 99:17, 99:18, 111:5, 111:8, 112:6, 112:8, 112:14  <b>Inserted</b> - 169:1  <b>Insignificant</b> - 25:5, 25:20, 167:25  <b>Insisted</b> - 41:12  <b>Institution</b> - 145:4  <b>Institutional</b> - 48:19, 53:14, 53:16, 54:4, 54:14, 54:15, 54:22, 97:12, 98:16, 107:20  <b>Institutions</b> - 63:25  <b>Instrument</b> - 139:12  <b>Instruments</b> - 93:3, 93:4  <b>Insufficient</b> - 179:6  <b>Insulated</b> - 41:7  <b>Insulation</b> - 208:17, 211:19  <b>Integrated</b> - 50:13, 51:1, 62:1, 63:6, 63:8, 63:14, 63:16, 63:18, 63:20, 64:2, 64:5, 64:7, 64:13, 66:10  <b>Integration</b> - 45:23, 50:23  <b>Intent</b> - 164:20  <b>Interest</b> - 91:17, 91:25, 106:5, 106:18, 106:19, 106:23, 109:8, 109:9, 109:10, 109:12, 109:16, 118:11, 138:17, 147:1, 147:6, 157:18, 201:19,</p>	<p>206:15, 206:23  <b>Interim</b> - 72:17, 192:18  <b>Intermediate</b> - 183:19  <b>International</b> - 2:4, 2:6  <b>Internationally</b> - 77:25  <b>Interval</b> - 167:1  <b>Intervenor</b> - 212:16  <b>Intervention</b> - 143:6  <b>Interventions</b> - 136:13  <b>Introducing</b> - 154:23, 155:23  <b>Inverse</b> - 106:21, 164:8  <b>Invest</b> - 53:5, 57:2, 57:17  <b>Invested</b> - 56:2, 98:5  <b>Investing</b> - 57:8, 62:25, 120:25  <b>Investment</b> - 55:23, 56:1, 57:6, 57:9, 84:9, 84:21, 117:21  <b>Investments</b> - 53:6, 53:7, 57:12, 71:8, 97:18, 98:6, 112:15  <b>Investor</b> - 27:19, 41:14, 41:17, 41:19, 42:8, 42:9, 43:5, 43:6, 44:18, 44:23, 76:23, 101:17, 103:10, 117:20, 181:19  <b>Investors</b> - 50:15, 53:5, 53:17, 54:4, 54:17, 56:6, 57:17, 59:3, 59:6, 62:3, 71:7, 71:13, 97:12, 97:16, 98:16, 104:7, 104:8, 107:20, 109:17, 120:24, 143:20  <b>Involves</b> - 84:11  <b>Ironic</b> - 138:15  <b>Ironically</b> - 176:17  <b>Isn't</b> - 8:4, 103:20, 107:19, 169:11  <b>Isolate</b> - 170:4, 171:14, 172:1, 172:3  <b>Isolation</b> - 192:2  <b>Issuance</b> - 62:15  <b>Issue</b> - 24:14, 24:21, 24:22,</p>
--	---	--	---	---

62:20, 62:24,  
68:12, 170:23,  
186:9, 186:10,  
186:18, 187:14,  
188:11, 191:8,  
193:10, 196:24  
**Issued** - 18:19,  
134:5  
**Issues** - 17:8,  
72:23, 72:25, 73:7,  
92:6  
**Item** - 6:10, 15:14,  
46:25, 210:5  
**Items** - 206:24  
**I've** - 63:18, 64:8,  
108:13, 109:25,  
110:1, 110:2, 132:6,  
132:18, 135:25,  
136:19, 136:20,  
166:13, 173:8,  
186:25, 196:15,  
196:23, 202:22,  
202:23, 204:13,  
205:23

## J

**JAMES** - 1:17  
**January** - 6:4,  
65:5, 70:14, 82:25,  
88:2, 134:4  
**JMC** - 95:18, 100:9,  
100:10, 131:1,  
150:4, 150:14,  
151:1, 160:2,  
197:19, 198:10,  
198:24, 199:4,  
199:22, 199:24  
**Job** - 187:17  
**JOHNSON** - 117:24  
**Judging** - 121:6  
**Judgment** - 84:18,  
181:15  
**Judgmental** -  
181:7, 197:3  
**July** - 74:4, 76:3,  
211:4  
**June** - 76:3, 124:5  
**Junk** - 67:14  
**Jurisdiction** -  
116:21  
**Jurisdictions** -  
18:11, 18:17, 19:4,  
34:6  
**Justify** - 162:10,  
171:6

## K

**KELLY** - 1:11, 9:9,  
14:22, 23:11, 47:10,  
76:6, 140:2,

140:18, 141:1,  
145:14, 212:19  
**Kent's** - 208:1  
**Kicks** - 124:8  
**Kilometre** - 209:16  
**Knowing** - 157:16,  
160:20, 188:10  
**Known** - 153:19,  
171:10, 197:13  
**Kryzanowski** -  
179:5

## L

**Language** - 149:11  
**Large** - 36:2,  
63:25, 152:17,  
207:8, 211:20  
**Largely** - 181:6  
**Larger** - 133:13,  
152:18  
**Largest** - 7:22,  
152:14, 170:18  
**Late** - 8:18, 9:6  
**Later** - 123:3,  
208:12  
**Layman** - 98:13  
**Lead** - 192:10,  
192:12  
**Leading** - 76:2  
**Leave** - 90:7,  
107:14  
**Leaving** - 46:4  
**LED** - 208:4,  
211:17  
**Left** - 42:6, 160:17,  
163:8, 168:7  
**Length** - 150:19  
**Let's** - 9:14, 12:7,  
12:23, 18:7, 37:1,  
45:23, 52:21, 75:4,  
81:2, 92:11, 111:19,  
120:22, 141:24,  
144:25, 160:6,  
163:1, 168:18,  
182:25, 204:24  
**Letter** - 6:10  
**Level** - 4:17, 17:24,  
18:3, 18:8, 19:11,  
19:12, 21:16,  
24:25, 25:10, 93:2,  
102:7, 118:18,  
166:19, 168:3,  
168:4  
**Levels** - 143:5,  
150:6  
**Lifted** - 57:25  
**Light** - 162:18,  
206:18, 207:24,  
211:6, 211:7, 212:6  
**Lights** - 211:17  
**Likewise** - 15:2

**Limit** - 40:21  
**Limited** - 84:13  
**Line** - 15:9, 37:25,  
54:11, 61:16, 81:11,  
82:18, 116:13,  
154:21, 156:18,  
167:14, 167:15,  
177:22, 178:25,  
179:22, 183:13,  
197:7, 197:22,  
209:14, 209:16  
**Lines** - 15:17,  
48:14, 122:10,  
193:24  
**Liquid** - 92:8  
**Liquidity** - 92:5  
**List** - 48:4, 206:21  
**Listed** - 46:12,  
46:13, 51:7, 51:15,  
51:24, 52:5, 99:17,  
102:13, 111:5,  
111:8, 111:10,  
111:11, 111:17,  
112:5  
**Listing** - 52:19  
**Lists** - 13:18  
**Literature** - 161:15,  
184:9, 195:16  
**Lock** - 91:9, 91:11  
**Logarithmically** -  
164:1  
**Logic** - 158:1,  
159:4  
**Long** - 24:24,  
28:24, 65:3, 77:5,  
78:11, 78:24, 79:20,  
81:12, 81:15, 84:1,  
84:15, 85:13,  
85:14, 85:15,  
85:17, 85:22, 86:1,  
86:12, 86:19,  
86:23, 87:4, 87:11,  
87:17, 88:8, 89:7,  
108:17, 115:8,  
123:4, 128:22,  
136:17, 142:13,  
143:15, 145:22,  
147:25, 150:20,  
151:1, 153:14,  
160:9, 160:24,  
161:10, 163:4,  
163:9, 163:21,  
168:11, 176:11,  
204:9  
**Longer** - 10:4,  
38:6, 71:14, 83:24,  
170:1  
**Looked** - 29:8,  
30:1, 42:5, 45:18,  
66:25, 167:14,  
186:25, 204:24

**Lose** - 180:16  
**Loss** - 209:14  
**Lot** - 12:2, 34:7,  
35:20, 71:5, 117:1,  
144:18, 147:13,  
147:15, 153:6,  
161:15, 196:23  
**Low** - 50:21, 99:2,  
99:20, 106:4,  
106:19, 106:22,  
109:17, 121:6,  
136:11, 143:19,  
146:10, 149:2,  
149:6, 149:13,  
175:4, 194:6,  
195:13, 195:17  
**Lower** - 41:15,  
43:17, 55:6, 72:7,  
117:22, 118:3,  
137:7, 138:1,  
138:2, 138:18,  
138:21, 141:22,  
143:6, 143:7,  
155:22, 155:23,  
156:1, 156:2,  
157:13, 157:19,  
158:2, 158:3,  
159:18, 166:19,  
185:2, 211:8, 212:6,  
212:7  
**Lowered** - 157:3  
**Lowers** - 38:11  
**Lows** - 147:19  
**Lynch** - 197:7

## M

**Magnitude** -  
161:18, 187:11  
**Mail** - 143:6  
**Mainlanders** -  
207:3  
**Mainly** - 13:20  
**Maintenance** -  
28:19  
**Major** - 48:3  
**Make** - 17:13,  
19:12, 19:14, 21:5,  
25:17, 27:21,  
29:24, 30:14,  
32:17, 75:10,  
90:15, 91:4, 94:14,  
115:7, 133:12,  
139:25, 152:20,  
153:2, 176:21,  
177:3, 187:18  
**Making** - 21:5,  
25:19, 44:8, 44:24,  
58:3, 97:18, 117:21  
**Mall** - 104:12,  
104:18, 104:22  
**Manage** - 31:4,

98:1  
**Management** -  
28:9, 28:22, 31:17,  
31:18, 84:9, 84:21,  
102:16  
**Managers** - 52:18  
**Managing** - 8:21,  
9:25, 10:1  
**Many** - 10:24,  
18:21, 33:20,  
38:10, 69:15,  
144:2, 194:17,  
210:24  
**Map** - 135:1  
**March** - 32:21,  
70:2, 133:4,  
133:17, 208:20  
**Maritime** - 72:6,  
72:25  
**Mark** - 145:6  
**Marketplace** -  
144:19, 158:7  
**Markets** - 50:13,  
51:2, 56:2, 66:10,  
66:21, 66:22, 71:6,  
71:7, 71:11, 71:12,  
75:7, 95:9, 160:22,  
169:25, 181:12,  
197:9, 197:15  
**Marks** - 202:22  
**Marsh** - 27:1, 30:5  
**Martin** - 208:21  
**Mass** - 211:2  
**Massive** - 136:12  
**Match** - 202:21  
**Material** - 12:25,  
21:23, 88:12, 112:4,  
129:4, 129:7  
**Math** - 78:21,  
79:24, 80:12,  
80:15, 208:25,  
209:2  
**Mathematical** -  
79:1  
**Matters** - 184:11  
**Maturity** - 87:16,  
143:16  
**Mcgraw** - 7:21  
**McLennan** - 27:1,  
27:7, 30:5  
**Mcshane** - 38:2,  
130:1, 130:16,  
139:20  
**Mcshane's** - 38:8,  
126:9, 126:14  
**Meals** - 207:13  
**Means** - 19:13,  
58:25, 96:23,  
111:10, 111:17  
**Measurable** -  
166:25

<p><b>Measure</b> - 96:12, 161:17, 185:8  <b>Measured</b> - 134:9, 136:23, 160:25  <b>Measurement</b> - 177:4  <b>Measuring</b> - 164:8  <b>Mechanism</b> - 124:8  <b>Median</b> - 5:22  <b>Medium</b> - 85:16  <b>Meet</b> - 5:4  <b>Megawatt</b> - 209:13  <b>Megawatts</b> - 209:12, 209:18  <b>Mercer</b> - 81:4, 82:17, 162:9  <b>Merging</b> - 94:6, 95:8, 95:9  <b>Merrill</b> - 197:7  <b>Met</b> - 2:6  <b>Meter</b> - 211:4, 211:9  <b>Metering</b> - 210:6, 210:8, 210:13, 210:16, 210:22, 210:23, 210:25, 211:25, 212:3  <b>Methodology</b> - 82:25, 83:23, 127:6, 153:13, 179:25, 180:1, 181:18, 194:8, 195:23  <b>Midpoint</b> - 183:21  <b>Miles</b> - 207:16  <b>Million</b> - 61:22  <b>Minerals</b> - 150:9  <b>Mini</b> - 208:11  <b>Minister</b> - 210:15  <b>Minor</b> - 209:9  <b>Minus</b> - 35:21, 35:22, 35:23, 36:24, 39:2, 39:12, 42:22, 43:11, 45:1, 209:12, 209:13, 209:14  <b>Misinterpreted</b> - 182:2  <b>Missed</b> - 82:16  <b>Mix</b> - 81:12, 81:14, 203:4  <b>Mixing</b> - 21:16  <b>Model</b> - 99:8, 101:4, 102:6, 112:20, 131:2, 139:16, 148:16, 148:19, 148:24, 148:25, 149:17, 153:2, 154:3, 154:20, 155:20, 157:8, 158:9,</p>	<p>158:20, 159:2, 159:6, 159:9, 163:16, 168:6, 171:7, 172:14, 172:25, 173:7, 177:12, 181:5, 190:16, 191:22, 194:21, 196:7, 200:18, 202:10, 203:18, 203:19, 205:9  <b>Modelling</b> - 83:22  <b>Models</b> - 76:17, 112:21, 190:17, 191:16, 191:18, 196:1  <b>Modern</b> - 97:6, 97:11  <b>Modified</b> - 21:14  <b>Monetary</b> - 136:12  <b>Money</b> - 72:1, 103:11  <b>Month</b> - 17:22, 18:25, 133:17  <b>Monthly</b> - 10:22, 13:6, 35:9, 92:24  <b>Moody's</b> - 34:24  <b>Morning</b> - 1:20, 1:23  <b>Morningstar</b> - 122:12, 125:4, 129:10  <b>Move</b> - 12:9, 66:22, 93:10, 112:4, 197:9, 208:6  <b>Moved</b> - 134:16  <b>Moves</b> - 96:23, 98:6, 180:5  <b>Moving</b> - 17:22, 112:5, 182:7  <b>MRP</b> - 122:15, 141:8, 156:21, 169:5  <b>Mrps</b> - 167:25  <b>Much</b> - 87:14, 90:3, 140:4, 140:21, 147:10, 147:23, 149:24, 152:18, 156:1, 158:3, 159:21, 197:4, 209:1, 212:5  <b>Multi</b> - 153:25, 154:3, 154:20, 154:22, 155:7, 155:19, 156:25, 157:7, 158:8, 158:19, 159:2, 159:4, 159:6, 159:9  <b>Multiple</b> - 18:10, 18:16, 18:19, 44:15, 165:6,</p>	<p>171:18, 171:19  <b>Multiples</b> - 152:22  <b>Multiplied</b> - 17:20, 96:8  <b>Municipalities</b> - 207:8  <b>Muskat</b> - 208:11, 208:23, 208:25, 209:3, 209:11, 209:17, 210:3</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>N</b></div> <p><b>Nalcor</b> - 208:20  <b>Names</b> - 13:15  <b>NASDAQ</b> - 51:8, 51:24  <b>National</b> - 84:8, 84:18  <b>Natural</b> - 10:20, 210:15  <b>Navigate</b> - 210:10  <b>Near</b> - 30:19, 71:20, 211:24  <b>NEB</b> - 37:25  <b>Necessary</b> - 45:3, 51:14, 158:25, 196:14, 205:3  <b>Necessity</b> - 4:16  <b>Needed</b> - 77:6  <b>Neither</b> - 51:5, 193:25  <b>Net</b> - 210:6, 210:8, 210:13, 210:16, 210:21, 210:23, 210:25, 211:7, 211:25, 212:3  <b>Nevertheless</b> - 72:20  <b>New</b> - 14:4, 27:15, 30:16, 30:17, 51:7, 51:15, 75:21, 182:8, 210:12, 210:16  <b>Newfoundland</b> - 1:6, 2:13, 4:11, 7:11, 9:7, 20:18, 20:24, 22:22, 34:15, 34:18, 37:6, 39:16, 39:23, 46:7, 80:21, 81:10, 99:24, 108:5, 114:7, 114:14, 114:23, 115:21, 115:25, 159:8, 185:20, 198:17, 198:24, 199:2, 199:4, 199:24, 200:15, 201:6, 206:12, 208:3, 210:7, 211:12  <b>Newfoundlanders</b></p>	<p>- 207:20  <b>News</b> - 11:12  <b>Night</b> - 17:3, 67:13, 207:13  <b>Nominal</b> - 146:15, 209:1  <b>Non</b> - 28:18, 48:5, 48:18, 49:5, 49:19, 50:22, 52:17, 54:13, 55:5, 55:8, 177:8  <b>Nor</b> - 5:22, 51:5, 164:19  <b>Normalization</b> - 143:11, 143:12  <b>Normalize</b> - 138:8, 138:16, 138:24  <b>Normalized</b> - 134:9, 136:24, 137:16, 141:5, 142:4  <b>Normalizing</b> - 136:14, 136:15  <b>Normally</b> - 91:24, 131:20, 184:20  <b>North</b> - 27:19, 177:20, 204:24, 205:17  <b>Note</b> - 75:10, 117:22  <b>Noted</b> - 76:9, 140:25, 189:19  <b>Notice</b> - 200:3, 206:13  <b>Nova</b> - 209:13, 210:11, 210:22  <b>November</b> - 17:5, 17:6  <b>NP</b> - 3:4, 3:16, 37:1, 37:17, 80:21, 82:9, 82:22, 154:13, 182:21, 183:3, 190:12, 190:20, 191:1, 193:6, 193:15, 198:9  <b>NTV</b> - 206:16  <b>Numbers</b> - 21:12, 43:10, 50:22, 77:22, 87:18, 94:9, 109:1, 110:15, 132:7, 132:9, 136:19, 147:9, 162:24, 197:9, 201:14  <b>Numerically</b> - 38:21  <b>Nutshell</b> - 163:12  <b>NYSE</b> - 51:24</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>O</b></div> <p><b>Objection</b> - 9:8, 9:11  <b>Observe</b> - 167:3  <b>Observed</b> - 143:7  <b>Obtained</b> - 48:21  <b>October</b> - 77:3  <b>Odd</b> - 7:20, 41:14  <b>Offered</b> - 58:4, 58:9, 61:18, 210:24  <b>Offering</b> - 58:2  <b>Offers</b> - 96:24  <b>Offline</b> - 209:13  <b>Offset</b> - 119:2  <b>Offsets</b> - 67:8  <b>OGE</b> - 15:13, 15:14  <b>Oil</b> - 150:17, 209:24  <b>Oliver</b> - 26:4, 27:5, 27:9, 27:12, 27:16, 29:15, 29:21, 30:15, 30:24, 31:25  <b>Ones</b> - 117:19, 157:13, 157:15, 181:22, 181:23  <b>Ontario</b> - 210:11  <b>Onwards</b> - 48:24  <b>Operating</b> - 4:3, 4:6, 4:12, 4:22, 5:1, 5:12, 18:10, 18:16, 24:22, 24:24, 28:19  <b>Opinion</b> - 187:6  <b>Opposed</b> - 129:15, 155:24, 158:22, 162:6, 181:15, 197:11  <b>Opposite</b> - 120:14, 143:9  <b>Optimism</b> - 153:19  <b>Option</b> - 33:17  <b>Oranges</b> - 21:16  <b>Order</b> - 18:15, 22:7, 31:4, 40:17, 58:22, 76:3, 101:6, 110:19, 190:17, 191:17, 205:7  <b>Orders</b> - 18:19  <b>Osisko</b> - 150:8  <b>Other's</b> - 62:4  <b>Otherwise</b> - 2:6, 25:15, 40:20, 109:21, 207:14  <b>Ounce</b> - 63:10  <b>Ours</b> - 77:10  <b>Outfit</b> - 137:24  <b>Outlook</b> - 66:16, 102:3, 116:14  <b>Outsize</b> - 153:3  <b>Outstanding</b> - 1:8, 1:12  <b>Oversee</b> - 201:9</p>
---	---	---	---	---



<p><b>Oversight</b> - 201:3, 201:15, 204:19</p> <p><b>Owed</b> - 8:6</p> <p><b>Own</b> - 57:3, 57:8, 62:10, 62:12, 62:18, 77:5, 207:15</p> <p><b>Owned</b> - 7:20, 8:12, 41:14, 41:17, 41:19, 42:8, 42:9, 43:6</p> <p><b>Owner</b> - 211:15, 211:21</p> <p><b>Ownership</b> - 48:20, 49:19, 50:7, 53:14, 53:15, 53:16, 53:17, 54:14, 54:15, 54:22</p>	<p><b>Performing</b> - 84:3, 85:3</p> <p><b>Perhaps</b> - 6:24, 12:24, 55:22, 57:22, 63:16, 131:24, 133:10, 140:3, 164:4, 180:24</p> <p><b>Period</b> - 5:23, 5:24, 17:23, 24:24, 49:19, 66:1, 68:25, 71:9, 73:6, 87:20, 95:14, 100:3, 101:24, 103:22, 109:21, 122:24, 123:4, 124:22, 128:5, 128:9, 128:22, 129:2, 129:25, 130:9, 135:22, 136:2, 146:9, 148:1, 153:9, 160:18, 160:19, 170:25, 176:25, 181:5, 192:22, 193:17, 194:2, 194:5, 197:12</p> <p><b>Periodic</b> - 133:24</p> <p><b>Periods</b> - 19:1, 19:5, 128:22, 129:13, 130:7, 136:10</p> <p><b>Perpetuity</b> - 110:6, 151:8</p> <p><b>Perry</b> - 22:19</p> <p><b>Persimmons</b> - 19:6, 21:20</p> <p><b>Persistent</b> - 66:4</p> <p><b>Perspective</b> - 47:14, 65:2, 75:6, 149:23</p> <p><b>Persuaded</b> - 179:4</p> <p><b>Persuasive</b> - 144:5</p> <p><b>Phelps</b> - 122:6, 122:13, 125:7, 131:10, 131:12, 132:24, 133:17, 133:18, 133:21, 134:1, 134:6, 136:23, 140:9, 141:6, 142:3, 142:13, 142:23, 144:1, 145:3, 147:20</p> <p><b>Phrase</b> - 57:24</p> <p><b>Pick</b> - 15:23, 105:4</p> <p><b>Piece</b> - 47:13, 75:2, 188:2, 188:4, 206:17</p> <p><b>PIERCEY</b> - 13:11</p> <p><b>Pinnacle</b> - 15:17</p>	<p><b>Pipeline</b> - 52:9</p> <p><b>Place</b> - 114:23, 196:15</p> <p><b>Places</b> - 44:15, 93:4</p> <p><b>Plains</b> - 15:3, 15:8</p> <p><b>Plans</b> - 77:6</p> <p><b>Plants</b> - 7:21</p> <p><b>Platform</b> - 30:18</p> <p><b>Players</b> - 210:21</p> <p><b>Plays</b> - 57:16</p> <p><b>Plugged</b> - 161:25</p> <p><b>Pluses</b> - 73:15</p> <p><b>Pointed</b> - 136:22</p> <p><b>Points</b> - 67:5, 67:10, 72:8, 115:14, 116:4, 119:4</p> <p><b>Policy</b> - 210:16, 210:22</p> <p><b>Pond</b> - 209:17</p> <p><b>Populating</b> - 21:25</p> <p><b>Portfolio</b> - 83:21, 84:2, 97:6, 97:11</p> <p><b>Portfolios</b> - 97:14, 98:17</p> <p><b>Portion</b> - 127:21, 202:11</p> <p><b>Posed</b> - 37:23</p> <p><b>Position</b> - 162:10</p> <p><b>Power</b> - 1:6, 2:13, 4:11, 9:7, 22:22, 34:15, 34:18, 37:6, 39:16, 46:7, 48:3, 81:10, 108:5, 114:7, 114:15, 115:21, 115:25, 159:8, 164:14, 172:13, 172:21, 185:20, 198:24, 199:2, 199:4, 199:24, 208:3, 209:3, 211:5, 211:12</p> <p><b>Power's</b> - 7:11, 20:24, 80:21, 99:25, 198:17, 200:15</p> <p><b>PP&amp;L</b> - 19:16, 20:4</p> <p><b>Practice</b> - 10:2, 184:11</p> <p><b>Practiced</b> - 184:10</p> <p><b>Practices</b> - 31:18</p> <p><b>Practitioners</b> - 84:10</p> <p><b>Precise</b> - 166:6</p> <p><b>Precisely</b> - 20:25, 63:17, 148:2</p> <p><b>Predict</b> - 193:13, 195:11</p> <p><b>Predicted</b> - 162:3, 171:2, 193:21</p> <p><b>Predicting</b> - 195:13</p>	<p><b>Predictive</b> - 164:14, 171:8, 174:21</p> <p><b>Predictors</b> - 167:25</p> <p><b>Prefer</b> - 143:1, 149:5, 149:7</p> <p><b>Preference</b> - 58:2, 61:23</p> <p><b>Premia</b> - 119:15, 124:23, 136:4</p> <p><b>Premise</b> - 106:1</p> <p><b>Premiums</b> - 108:16, 156:3, 163:22</p> <p><b>Prepare</b> - 201:5, 201:8</p> <p><b>Prepared</b> - 185:19</p> <p><b>Preparing</b> - 11:19</p> <p><b>Present</b> - 116:21, 117:8, 124:24, 127:4, 127:5, 184:14, 185:11, 187:12, 203:17, 204:17, 205:15, 212:8</p> <p><b>Presented</b> - 38:21, 84:5, 84:16, 136:6, 144:7, 196:9, 204:13, 205:9</p> <p><b>Presenting</b> - 117:5, 126:1, 126:3, 153:25, 162:6, 162:7</p> <p><b>Presents</b> - 24:1, 130:17</p> <p><b>Pressures</b> - 66:18</p> <p><b>Presumption</b> - 73:6</p> <p><b>Previous</b> - 65:1, 156:17, 186:21</p> <p><b>PREVIOUSLY</b> - 1:17, 74:7, 178:10</p> <p><b>Priced</b> - 64:16</p> <p><b>Prices</b> - 101:1, 101:8, 104:2, 104:19, 177:6</p> <p><b>Pricing</b> - 112:20, 131:2, 200:17</p> <p><b>Principal</b> - 8:21, 9:25, 109:16, 110:8</p> <p><b>Principals</b> - 120:22</p> <p><b>Prior</b> - 22:7, 53:13, 73:11, 124:15, 134:5, 169:3, 186:8, 186:25, 187:16, 187:21, 198:16</p> <p><b>Privacy</b> - 53:20</p> <p><b>Probability</b> - 60:6</p> <p><b>Proceedings</b> -</p>	<p>206:8</p> <p><b>Proceeds</b> - 78:23</p> <p><b>Produced</b> - 77:4, 209:3</p> <p><b>Producing</b> - 76:17</p> <p><b>Product</b> - 92:5</p> <p><b>Production</b> - 10:16</p> <p><b>Profits</b> - 152:23, 153:1</p> <p><b>Program</b> - 210:25, 211:13, 212:3</p> <p><b>Project</b> - 209:8</p> <p><b>Projected</b> - 21:13, 109:15, 120:18, 120:20, 153:8</p> <p><b>Projection</b> - 83:23, 87:20, 108:3, 116:24, 146:12</p> <p><b>Projections</b> - 77:11, 87:19</p> <p><b>Proper</b> - 30:13</p> <p><b>Properly</b> - 41:7</p> <p><b>Prospects</b> - 104:13</p> <p><b>Prospectus</b> - 57:25, 58:1, 58:5, 60:18, 61:19, 61:22</p> <p><b>Prospectuses</b> - 58:14, 60:15</p> <p><b>Provide</b> - 98:8, 101:20, 101:25, 124:11, 131:25, 135:5, 139:19, 154:18, 155:7, 155:13, 161:2, 168:11, 186:10, 186:18, 187:15</p> <p><b>Provided</b> - 11:2, 13:7, 17:4, 22:5, 22:6, 38:2, 126:24, 132:6, 172:14, 183:19, 188:3</p> <p><b>Provider</b> - 7:22</p> <p><b>Providers</b> - 7:6</p> <p><b>Provides</b> - 10:17, 24:17, 65:7, 122:6, 130:6, 140:9</p> <p><b>Providing</b> - 105:9, 126:21, 126:22</p> <p><b>Province</b> - 207:20, 207:25</p> <p><b>Provinces</b> - 210:12</p> <p><b>Provisions</b> - 124:19</p> <p><b>Proxy</b> - 2:3, 3:6, 4:2, 4:5, 4:11, 4:17, 21:25, 42:17, 42:22, 45:13, 51:6, 113:23, 119:7, 143:3, 149:8, 150:1, 185:7, 197:22, 199:9,</p>
---	--	---	---	---

## P

**Package** - 73:8

**Paid** - 207:13

**Panels** - 211:1

**Parallel** - 135:3

**Parent** - 40:21, 41:7

**Participants** - 105:13, 162:8

**Participate** - 27:18

**Participating** - 207:21

**Parties** - 147:17

**Party** - 105:2, 105:17, 145:3

**Pason** - 150:8

**Pass** - 8:19, 158:1

**Passed** - 6:3, 8:17, 26:3, 173:16

**Past** - 71:19, 95:18, 191:17

**Pauline** - 8:20

**Pay** - 43:17, 56:9, 57:1, 91:8, 91:11, 209:20

**Paying** - 57:2, 67:2, 67:4, 68:21, 148:9

**Pays** - 121:15

**Pension** - 27:7, 56:25, 76:25, 77:6, 107:16, 107:25, 147:10

**People** - 12:1, 12:24, 30:11, 30:12, 104:14, 144:2, 180:16, 207:1

**Percentage** - 48:5, 48:18, 50:6, 54:12, 74:5

**Perfectly** - 95:23

**Performance** - 28:22

200:23, 201:23,  
202:19, 202:21  
**Public** - 4:16, 8:6,  
10:19, 36:7  
**Publicly** - 48:22,  
152:17, 181:10  
**Publics** - 41:21,  
41:23, 41:25  
**Published** - 8:2,  
84:16  
**Publisher** - 10:8  
**Publishing** - 10:16  
**Pull** - 181:19,  
198:1, 198:9  
**Pulling** - 197:6  
**Pump** - 208:18,  
211:18  
**Purchaser** - 59:3,  
59:9, 59:11  
**Pursue** - 57:12  
**Putting** - 157:6,  
182:3, 185:3

### Q

**Qualifications** -  
8:20  
**Qualitative** - 84:12  
**Quality** - 136:11,  
143:4  
**Quantitative** -  
84:12  
**Quarter** - 65:12,  
66:2, 66:3  
**Quarterly** - 10:22  
**Quebec** - 22:7,  
30:2, 190:9,  
190:15, 192:4  
**Queried** - 170:22  
**Quote** - 58:16,  
142:24

### R

**Raise** - 51:14,  
62:17  
**Raised** - 9:7  
**Raises** - 62:13  
**Ran** - 101:4,  
157:15  
**Range** - 35:25,  
36:24, 38:10, 99:5,  
106:18, 119:12,  
136:1, 157:13,  
160:18, 191:22  
**Ranged** - 134:24  
**Ranges** - 152:24  
**Rank** - 35:2, 40:13  
**Ranked** - 43:17  
**Ranking** - 34:21  
**Rated** - 67:4  
**Rates** - 21:13,

64:18, 81:15,  
91:17, 105:8,  
106:18, 106:19,  
109:8, 109:17,  
109:19, 114:23,  
117:19, 134:3,  
136:10, 138:17,  
143:15, 147:1,  
147:6, 154:24,  
159:7, 168:11,  
202:15, 202:18,  
203:8, 203:17,  
208:9, 208:13,  
212:1, 212:2, 212:4  
**Rather** - 7:20,  
120:25  
**Rating** - 2:10,  
25:19, 34:17,  
35:16, 37:4, 37:5,  
38:4, 39:11, 39:17,  
39:18, 39:21,  
39:25, 40:3, 40:18,  
42:17, 42:21, 143:3  
**Ratings** - 40:13,  
43:2, 45:5  
**Ratio** - 19:17,  
19:22, 19:25, 20:5  
**Ratios** - 10:18  
**Raw** - 180:2, 180:3,  
180:12, 193:23,  
195:10, 197:2,  
197:23, 198:4  
**RBC** - 65:5, 65:6,  
105:3  
**Reach** - 29:4,  
29:17  
**Reaction** - 29:1  
**Reason** - 2:5, 22:5,  
92:17, 118:20,  
144:4, 159:11,  
174:15, 174:19,  
175:5, 177:5, 181:8  
**Reasonable** -  
77:20, 82:7, 146:11,  
147:17, 148:4,  
162:18, 191:19  
**Reasons** - 37:3,  
177:1, 177:2  
**Reassessments** -  
133:24  
**Rebate** - 211:13  
**Rebut** - 29:23  
**Rebuttal** - 44:11,  
68:16, 70:1, 80:16,  
133:11, 156:5,  
156:10  
**Receive** - 132:23,  
133:3  
**Received** - 18:12,  
133:16  
**Recent** - 17:22,

18:8, 27:12, 27:14,  
48:20, 58:1, 82:23,  
125:5, 170:18,  
209:21  
**Recently** - 29:20,  
72:6, 73:23, 85:24,  
155:5, 182:21,  
207:6, 210:24  
**Recession** -  
160:19, 169:24,  
176:8  
**Recessionary** -  
71:18  
**Recognition** -  
72:19, 74:24  
**Recognize** - 47:22,  
183:14  
**Recollected** -  
67:14  
**Recommendation**  
- 211:10  
**Recommendations** - 73:14,  
190:18  
**Recommended** -  
133:19, 133:24,  
134:6  
**Recommends** -  
134:2  
**Reconcile** -  
131:18, 191:18  
**Reconciled** -  
190:15  
**Recorded** - 200:12  
**Recording** -  
177:17  
**Records** - 107:5,  
108:17  
**Recounting** -  
179:1  
**Recover** - 34:15,  
34:25  
**Redeemable** -  
61:23  
**Reduce** - 28:18,  
73:1  
**Reduction** - 28:23,  
189:6  
**Referencing** -  
130:1  
**Referred** - 131:25  
**Refers** - 76:18,  
76:25, 77:3  
**Reflect** - 53:16,  
84:20, 115:7  
**Reflected** - 72:23  
**Reflects** - 91:16,  
136:16, 143:14  
**Regie** - 22:7,  
191:7, 191:16,  
192:7

**Registered** - 58:6,  
58:10, 58:18,  
58:22, 61:20  
**Registration** -  
58:12  
**Regression** -  
105:25, 106:15,  
107:1, 109:5, 110:3,  
110:22, 146:7,  
147:25, 159:19,  
160:1, 160:8,  
160:20, 161:25,  
162:5, 164:16,  
164:19, 165:17,  
165:19, 165:23,  
170:5, 171:15,  
171:24, 172:11,  
172:14, 173:14,  
173:17, 175:19,  
177:12  
**Regular** - 34:22  
**Regularly** - 133:21  
**Regulated** - 19:8,  
19:14, 20:4, 25:16  
**Regulation** - 58:17  
**Regulator** -  
196:10, 203:12,  
205:6  
**Regulators** -  
182:11, 196:8,  
196:24  
**Regulatory** -  
10:24, 184:10,  
196:21  
**Reinforces** -  
195:15  
**Rejected** - 179:17,  
180:19, 194:9,  
194:19, 195:2,  
196:11  
**Rejection** - 195:5  
**Rejects** - 179:11  
**Relation** - 58:1,  
61:21, 61:23, 176:5  
**Relationship** -  
98:24, 106:1,  
106:16, 106:21,  
109:6, 111:4, 136:5,  
143:21, 160:23,  
161:9, 164:8,  
165:14, 165:18,  
170:1, 172:2,  
173:8, 176:10  
**Relative** - 38:10,  
96:8, 134:9, 136:23  
**Relatively** - 50:21  
**Reliable** - 19:7,  
25:7, 157:10,  
157:19, 197:9  
**Reliably** - 144:17  
**Reliance** - 108:13

**Relied** - 7:7,  
108:10, 108:15,  
122:4, 184:12,  
191:17  
**Relies** - 153:12  
**Rely** - 7:2, 12:2,  
12:3, 25:14, 34:12,  
77:17, 153:14,  
205:8  
**Relying** - 108:5,  
109:21, 155:25,  
180:21  
**Remove** - 170:1,  
174:2, 174:18,  
174:20  
**Replace** - 209:14  
**Report** - 13:6,  
16:20, 17:2, 18:8,  
18:14, 25:9, 29:20,  
30:25, 32:24,  
34:10, 35:9, 64:24,  
76:12, 80:3, 87:18,  
95:16, 100:10,  
108:12, 111:14,  
112:18, 120:3,  
120:7, 120:13,  
136:9, 138:23,  
139:3, 142:13,  
142:23, 143:21,  
147:9, 182:22,  
184:3, 185:25,  
197:21, 209:21,  
210:19  
**Reportable** - 48:23  
**Reported** - 15:12,  
18:14, 18:15,  
18:18, 53:18, 150:6  
**Reporting** - 142:3,  
184:25, 186:6  
**Reports** - 6:5, 6:20,  
6:21, 7:2, 8:1, 8:3,  
10:9, 10:10, 10:11,  
10:17, 25:13,  
54:16, 140:13,  
145:8  
**Representative** -  
172:4, 172:6  
**Represented** -  
191:11  
**Reputable** - 137:24  
**Request** - 37:24,  
108:6, 157:16  
**Requested** - 22:8,  
48:16  
**Requests** - 132:20  
**Require** - 24:23,  
120:25, 154:22  
**Required** - 18:22,  
76:22, 101:17,  
121:6, 171:9,  
191:14, 191:21,

197:16 <b>Requirements</b> - 58:12 <b>Requires</b> - 205:7, 211:3 <b>Research</b> - 22:9, 24:8, 24:23, 32:3, 32:13, 74:14, 84:16, 84:20, 104:17 <b>Researched</b> - 22:5, 104:18 <b>Reservation</b> - 183:15 <b>Residents</b> - 52:17, 55:4, 55:5, 55:6, 56:8, 56:18 <b>Resolve</b> - 135:14 <b>Resources</b> - 27:8, 84:13, 210:15 <b>Respective</b> - 38:4 <b>Respectively</b> - 128:11, 128:25, 129:11, 132:21, 137:13, 157:5, 177:23 <b>Respond</b> - 23:2 <b>Response</b> - 48:14, 54:7, 54:9, 132:5, 132:19, 135:9, 145:17 <b>Responses</b> - 132:3 <b>Responsible</b> - 10:1, 10:15 <b>Responsive</b> - 187:16, 188:12 <b>Restrictions</b> - 60:7 <b>Result</b> - 56:24, 66:17, 66:24, 71:13, 71:25, 100:6, 152:2, 155:23, 159:16, 177:9, 177:11 <b>Results</b> - 119:11, 156:24, 171:1, 172:7, 179:12, 188:21, 190:16, 191:18, 205:15 <b>Resume</b> - 71:19, 206:3 <b>Retrospective</b> - 24:6 <b>Reverberations</b> - 71:12 <b>Reversion</b> - 183:16 <b>Revert</b> - 179:14, 179:24, 180:25 <b>Reverting</b> - 191:9 <b>Reverts</b> - 183:21 <b>Reward</b> - 111:3 <b>Ring</b> - 40:14,	40:16, 40:24 <b>Riskier</b> - 43:22 <b>Risks</b> - 143:19 <b>Risky</b> - 179:16 <b>Riverside</b> - 209:12 <b>Road</b> - 71:15 <b>Roberts</b> - 179:5 <b>ROE</b> - 4:2, 5:3, 16:1, 16:9, 17:14, 18:7, 18:8, 18:9, 18:13, 18:18, 19:9, 20:24, 72:7, 73:2, 73:8, 76:20, 99:25, 114:14 <b>Roes</b> - 18:16, 19:4 <b>Royal</b> - 150:16 <b>Rule</b> - 2:1, 2:3 <b>Ruled</b> - 2:5 <b>Rules</b> - 40:12 <b>Run</b> - 66:19, 77:5, 78:11, 78:24, 79:20, 88:8, 89:7, 109:4, 151:2, 171:24 <div style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center; width: fit-content; margin: 10px auto;">S</div> <b>S&amp;P</b> - 35:15, 36:4, 38:23, 39:3, 39:11, 39:19, 39:21, 40:12 <b>Samantha</b> - 13:9, 14:18, 15:7, 15:19, 76:13, 83:16, 94:17, 131:8, 133:14, 168:8, 190:22 <b>Sample</b> - 2:3, 16:8, 119:8, 188:24, 188:25, 189:20, 201:23, 201:24, 205:5, 205:16, 205:17 <b>Samples</b> - 181:9, 181:13, 182:7, 205:7 <b>Saputo</b> - 102:16 <b>Saw</b> - 9:2, 71:6, 206:15 <b>Scale</b> - 209:10 <b>Scenario</b> - 121:14 <b>Schedule</b> - 88:11, 88:16, 198:10, 199:22 <b>Scope</b> - 154:25 <b>Scores</b> - 38:5 <b>Scotia</b> - 209:13, 210:12, 210:23 <b>Screen</b> - 3:25, 15:10, 15:25, 19:16, 43:1, 61:12, 70:10, 70:18, 94:14, 94:18, 112:4, 135:16, 138:12,	163:2, 165:3, 168:7, 176:1, 183:25, 198:22, 199:6 <b>Screened</b> - 37:4, 42:16 <b>Screening</b> - 2:7 <b>Scroll</b> - 116:13, 131:7, 133:13, 168:18 <b>Second</b> - 9:17, 54:11, 88:21, 154:23, 156:18, 163:3, 199:23 <b>Secondary</b> - 101:17 <b>Secondly</b> - 158:7 <b>Securities</b> - 58:3, 58:7, 58:8, 58:10, 58:17, 58:18, 58:20, 59:1, 60:5, 61:18, 62:10, 93:10, 96:16, 121:7 <b>Security</b> - 96:9, 96:14, 96:23 <b>Seen</b> - 6:20, 71:5, 71:10, 71:11, 173:22, 173:24, 181:6 <b>Select</b> - 92:24 <b>Selected</b> - 93:3 <b>Sell</b> - 58:18, 58:22 <b>Sensible</b> - 177:8 <b>Sent</b> - 32:20, 46:24, 57:21, 126:8, 144:1 <b>Separate</b> - 204:14, 205:11, 205:14 <b>Separately</b> - 128:7, 203:9 <b>September</b> - 69:13 <b>Serves</b> - 170:24, 188:4, 197:1 <b>Services</b> - 210:23 <b>Set</b> - 74:6, 98:23, 171:9 <b>Setting</b> - 116:22, 131:5, 184:18 <b>Settled</b> - 73:7 <b>Settlement</b> - 72:24, 73:1, 124:6, 124:7 <b>Seven</b> - 11:20 <b>Seventy</b> - 41:14 <b>Several</b> - 155:6, 207:16 <b>Share</b> - 18:22, 22:23, 23:5, 58:2, 98:11, 124:9, 152:24 <b>Shareholders</b> - 48:6, 48:19, 49:6,	50:22, 54:13 <b>Shareholdings</b> - 49:4 <b>Shares</b> - 46:12, 57:3, 61:24 <b>Sharing</b> - 124:8 <b>Sheet</b> - 19:16, 200:13 <b>Sheets</b> - 19:3 <b>She's</b> - 10:4, 10:8 <b>Shift</b> - 42:6 <b>Shorter</b> - 188:2 <b>Show</b> - 89:19, 111:4, 188:20, 193:25, 195:7 <b>Showed</b> - 22:10, 67:3, 95:17 <b>Showing</b> - 4:1, 15:11, 21:12, 38:9, 44:12, 77:23, 176:17 <b>Shown</b> - 5:4, 14:20, 81:18, 85:12, 108:14, 124:25 <b>Shows</b> - 19:16, 22:10, 24:8, 48:17, 54:12, 68:22, 86:8, 87:16, 95:18, 97:5, 106:20, 108:12, 120:1, 120:14, 193:17 <b>Side</b> - 69:16, 69:17, 76:20, 160:17, 163:8, 168:7 <b>Significance</b> - 166:12 <b>Significant</b> - 24:23, 63:1, 165:25, 166:19, 168:2, 188:16, 196:18 <b>Significantly</b> - 65:22, 66:12, 85:23 <b>Similar</b> - 6:24, 77:10, 112:9, 188:24 <b>Similarly</b> - 5:10, 130:13, 188:25 <b>Simple</b> - 25:8, 78:11, 79:20, 89:14, 94:4, 132:16, 165:17, 165:19, 208:24 <b>Simply</b> - 96:7, 198:4 <b>Sine</b> - 167:20 <b>Single</b> - 42:1 <b>Sky</b> - 108:3 <b>Slam</b> - 31:22 <b>Slew</b> - 102:13 <b>Slightly</b> - 99:2,	129:13 <b>Slip</b> - 44:5 <b>Small</b> - 34:24, 37:13, 61:12, 94:10, 163:24, 211:1 <b>Smaller</b> - 152:25 <b>Smart</b> - 30:16 <b>Smattering</b> - 35:24 <b>Smith</b> - 100:11 <b>SNL</b> - 7:6, 7:10, 7:13 <b>Solar</b> - 211:1 <b>Sold</b> - 58:9, 59:1, 59:2, 59:9 <b>Soldier's</b> - 209:16 <b>Solely</b> - 16:6 <b>Solid</b> - 27:17, 34:21 <b>Sophisticated</b> - 63:25 <b>Sound</b> - 31:17 <b>Sounds</b> - 79:15, 79:24, 82:7, 99:12, 166:11 <b>Source</b> - 49:10, 49:11, 56:9, 56:12, 56:19, 77:17, 77:20, 105:2, 105:17, 122:21, 129:4, 131:8, 131:9, 145:21, 154:18 <b>Sources</b> - 62:19, 62:20, 71:9, 107:10, 107:12, 107:14, 122:5, 122:19, 125:3, 144:15, 178:7, 180:22, 198:2 <b>South</b> - 73:18, 74:24 <b>Space</b> - 29:16 <b>Sparked</b> - 206:23 <b>Special</b> - 208:4 <b>Specialized</b> - 63:24 <b>Specific</b> - 28:4, 87:20, 96:13, 171:3, 171:15, 185:8, 186:8, 187:14, 187:20 <b>Specification</b> - 183:20, 184:16 <b>Specify</b> - 34:2 <b>Speculation</b> - 40:10 <b>Spend</b> - 207:15 <b>Spent</b> - 147:9 <b>Spot</b> - 143:1, 143:15 <b>Spotty</b> - 208:7,
--	--	---	--	--

<p>211:23  <b>Spread</b> - 66:4, 67:16, 80:4, 116:17, 119:5  <b>Spreads</b> - 67:7, 118:25, 202:9  <b>Square</b> - 164:24  <b>Squared</b> - 165:6, 172:12, 172:19, 172:25, 174:4, 175:3, 175:4, 175:10, 177:12  <b>Stage</b> - 153:25, 154:3, 154:20, 154:22, 154:24, 155:8, 155:20, 156:25, 157:8, 158:8, 158:20, 159:2, 159:4, 159:6, 159:9  <b>Stakeholders</b> - 196:25  <b>Stand</b> - 28:21, 132:4, 132:10  <b>Standard</b> - 89:20, 89:25, 90:1, 96:9, 178:17, 178:20, 180:2, 180:14, 181:18, 192:8, 195:22, 196:3, 196:5, 196:6, 198:1  <b>Standpoint</b> - 55:18, 55:22, 55:24  <b>Start</b> - 120:22, 156:18, 188:17, 189:9, 196:4  <b>Starting</b> - 112:19, 183:13  <b>Starts</b> - 121:14  <b>Stat</b> - 166:11, 167:4, 167:15  <b>State</b> - 7:22, 10:24, 18:8, 84:17  <b>State's</b> - 58:8, 118:11  <b>Statistic</b> - 165:23  <b>Statistical</b> - 166:12  <b>Statistically</b> - 165:25, 166:25, 167:24, 181:17  <b>Statistics</b> - 11:2, 164:16  <b>Steady</b> - 49:17  <b>Stipulate</b> - 60:4, 153:7  <b>Stock</b> - 14:4, 20:20, 51:8, 51:15, 62:18, 89:24, 100:25, 101:1, 102:22, 104:1, 104:18, 111:11,</p>	<p>121:14, 121:20, 130:22, 169:4, 177:6  <b>Stocks</b> - 55:16, 62:4, 64:16  <b>Store</b> - 208:1  <b>Straight</b> - 113:20, 113:23, 208:22  <b>Straightforward</b> - 195:7  <b>Strategic</b> - 83:21  <b>Stream</b> - 210:4  <b>Strength</b> - 184:9  <b>Strictly</b> - 155:25, 205:8  <b>Strike</b> - 50:11  <b>Strikes</b> - 50:8  <b>Stroke</b> - 208:11  <b>Strong</b> - 27:18, 30:18, 130:22, 163:21  <b>Stronger</b> - 66:15  <b>Structure</b> - 97:4  <b>Stuck</b> - 210:18, 212:4  <b>Studies</b> - 83:23  <b>Study</b> - 210:8  <b>Submitted</b> - 6:24, 69:25  <b>Subs</b> - 4:12  <b>Subscribe</b> - 11:16, 17:1  <b>Subscribed</b> - 62:15  <b>Subscriber</b> - 132:24  <b>Subscribers</b> - 10:23  <b>Subsidiaries</b> - 40:14  <b>Subsidiary</b> - 4:6, 7:21, 40:16  <b>Subsidy</b> - 211:14  <b>Substantial</b> - 52:12, 57:9  <b>Subtracting</b> - 146:15  <b>Suffer</b> - 145:11  <b>Suggested</b> - 53:1  <b>Suggestion</b> - 207:17  <b>Suggests</b> - 30:17, 53:11, 156:19, 161:16  <b>Sum</b> - 204:5  <b>Summarize</b> - 31:24  <b>Summarizes</b> - 83:18  <b>Summary</b> - 88:7  <b>Sun</b> - 102:14  <b>Support</b> - 105:18, 161:2, 179:6</p>	<p><b>Suppose</b> - 107:22  <b>Supposed</b> - 210:20  <b>Surplus</b> - 77:2  <b>Surprised</b> - 131:20  <b>Surprising</b> - 130:23  <b>Surrebuttal</b> - 177:25, 178:25  <b>Surrounded</b> - 207:3  <b>Surrounding</b> - 135:15  <b>Suspicion</b> - 171:4  <b>Sustain</b> - 28:24  <b>Sustainable</b> - 86:13, 136:17, 143:14, 144:13  <b>Swear</b> - 206:5  <b>Sweat</b> - 88:19  <b>SWORN</b> - 1:17  <b>Systems</b> - 150:8</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>T</b></div> <p><b>Table</b> - 15:22, 81:18, 92:22, 92:24, 93:1, 93:23, 98:14, 128:5, 135:25, 139:19, 139:21, 169:12  <b>Tailoring</b> - 187:6, 187:7  <b>Taking</b> - 71:14, 90:16, 126:2, 141:17, 177:14, 192:7  <b>Target</b> - 45:18, 81:14, 85:13, 86:20, 86:24, 86:25, 87:12, 87:17  <b>Task</b> - 25:5, 25:20  <b>Tax</b> - 55:4, 55:6, 55:11, 55:18, 55:22, 56:9, 56:19, 57:1, 57:7  <b>Taxes</b> - 56:25  <b>TD</b> - 77:4, 77:11, 77:17, 78:12, 78:13, 79:18, 105:3, 107:8, 162:9  <b>Team</b> - 12:1, 30:11, 31:17  <b>Technique</b> - 170:5, 171:17, 171:21  <b>Telegram</b> - 207:4  <b>Telephone</b> - 10:21  <b>Telling</b> - 74:17, 95:11, 105:7, 113:7, 176:5  <b>Tells</b> - 95:22, 104:7, 146:7, 146:11, 164:25,</p>	<p>165:11, 165:15, 176:8  <b>Ten</b> - 5:24, 11:22, 28:20, 28:22, 114:25, 115:4, 115:5, 115:6, 120:19, 208:25, 209:25  <b>Tended</b> - 22:19  <b>Term</b> - 30:19, 63:18, 64:12, 66:15, 71:20, 81:12, 81:15, 83:25, 84:2, 84:15, 85:13, 85:16, 85:17, 86:20, 86:24, 87:11, 87:17, 136:17, 143:15, 145:22, 153:14, 160:9, 161:10, 170:2, 176:11, 197:23  <b>Terminology</b> - 157:7  <b>Terms</b> - 29:19, 34:14, 36:1, 62:12, 69:22, 75:6, 77:22, 78:18, 92:8, 93:8, 100:13, 117:2, 128:4, 141:20, 147:15, 154:15, 161:8, 164:4, 171:1, 195:13, 203:5, 208:7, 209:25, 210:21, 212:3  <b>Terry</b> - 206:10  <b>Test</b> - 87:5, 87:12, 100:16, 104:5, 106:16, 106:25, 110:2, 113:15, 114:8, 114:13, 114:20, 114:24, 156:23, 158:1, 159:19, 160:1, 161:8, 162:16, 162:23, 173:8, 193:10  <b>Tested</b> - 110:22  <b>Testimony</b> - 75:5, 187:11, 188:2, 188:3, 188:4, 189:20, 192:11  <b>Text</b> - 184:1  <b>Textbook</b> - 149:12  <b>Thanks</b> - 47:11, 61:9  <b>Theory</b> - 97:6, 97:12  <b>Therefore</b> - 179:9, 179:10, 183:19  <b>There's</b> - 33:4,</p>	<p>36:2, 40:21, 57:22, 63:12, 64:17, 64:18, 66:15, 66:20, 72:2, 74:23, 76:19, 79:22, 90:2, 91:9, 92:3, 92:7, 93:24, 106:20, 117:1, 147:13, 147:14, 153:6, 159:11, 161:9, 161:15, 165:15, 172:13, 179:6, 181:7, 187:13, 188:15, 193:3, 193:16, 206:5, 211:23, 212:12  <b>They'd</b> - 17:3  <b>They've</b> - 11:1, 29:4, 29:17, 32:13, 32:16, 98:4, 134:25, 208:6  <b>Third</b> - 9:21, 105:2, 105:17, 145:2, 154:24, 168:13, 210:5  <b>Thirde</b> - 113:4  <b>THOMAS</b> - 1:18  <b>Thorough</b> - 84:11  <b>Three</b> - 73:6, 73:11, 74:6, 109:24, 114:24, 116:2, 116:14, 116:23, 124:6, 130:22, 208:21  <b>Tied</b> - 211:12  <b>Timeframe</b> - 87:15  <b>Times</b> - 18:20, 143:4, 143:10, 143:16, 208:25, 209:4  <b>Tiny</b> - 131:8  <b>Title</b> - 92:23  <b>Today</b> - 69:7, 73:10, 73:12, 104:7, 104:9, 109:23, 157:15, 161:20, 205:23, 206:23, 207:4, 209:9, 210:2, 211:11, 212:12  <b>Took</b> - 3:6, 80:15, 122:19  <b>Tool</b> - 149:16, 158:8  <b>Tools</b> - 98:19  <b>Top</b> - 60:22, 61:11, 61:16, 99:5, 99:21, 102:17, 119:5, 134:19, 138:12, 168:9, 175:25  <b>Topics</b> - 212:11</p>
---	---	--	---	---

**Toronto** - 210:9  
**Tortured** - 158:23  
**Total** - 18:23, 53:21, 121:17, 126:25, 127:18, 130:16, 139:3, 139:8, 139:22, 140:15, 164:16  
**Towards** - 70:17, 117:6, 175:25, 179:9, 179:10, 180:6  
**Townies** - 207:3  
**Track** - 7:1, 22:21, 23:21, 102:21  
**Traded** - 4:16, 14:4, 64:10, 152:17, 181:10  
**Traders** - 63:25  
**Trading** - 46:12, 46:13  
**Transcanada** - 52:3  
**Transcript** - 23:13, 23:17, 67:13  
**Transenergie** - 189:20  
**Translate** - 118:22  
**Transmission** - 10:21, 112:10, 209:16  
**Travel** - 207:16  
**Treasuries** - 136:18  
**Treasury** - 99:3, 134:10, 136:25  
**Treat** - 180:22  
**Tremendous** - 57:6  
**Trend** - 170:2  
**Tribunal** - 182:2  
**Tries** - 93:1  
**Triggered** - 206:15  
**Triple** - 35:20, 35:21, 36:8, 41:15, 41:25, 42:10, 43:10, 44:13  
**Trouble** - 158:17  
**Troubled** - 2:9  
**Truly** - 142:6  
**Trust** - 146:6  
**TSX** - 59:4, 59:6, 60:6, 95:19, 100:1, 100:25, 101:19, 101:24, 102:17, 102:19, 102:25, 103:1, 103:6, 108:18, 110:5, 151:13, 152:15, 195:14  
**Turbine** - 211:1  
**Turn** - 6:9, 28:7,

37:1, 44:11, 46:23, 49:3, 64:24, 75:8, 80:20, 82:9, 82:22, 85:11, 88:6, 92:21, 98:22, 100:9, 112:17, 119:14, 130:25, 133:10, 154:14, 175:17, 177:16, 177:25, 178:24, 182:20, 182:22, 197:19, 206:7  
**Turner** - 10:9, 10:11  
**Turning** - 76:14  
**Two** - 30:20, 52:21, 72:23, 74:6, 91:25, 92:6, 93:9, 95:13, 109:23, 113:4, 122:5, 146:2, 146:22, 161:7, 164:9, 171:12, 172:8, 177:23, 182:16, 185:19, 202:15, 202:18, 206:24  
**Types** - 30:14, 76:16  
**Typically** - 24:14, 25:23, 27:21, 114:23, 127:9, 139:15, 200:8, 200:21, 203:8, 203:17

## U

**Unadjusted** - 198:5  
**Unattractive** - 52:16  
**Uncertainty** - 147:15  
**Underestimate** - 195:18  
**Understood** - 106:21, 154:21, 182:5  
**Undertake** - 74:14, 75:25, 131:24, 139:19  
**Undertaking** - 24:17, 76:5, 140:19, 155:14, 157:16  
**Undertakings** - 1:3, 1:7, 1:13  
**Underway** - 205:24  
**Unfamiliar** - 57:23  
**Unhedged** - 112:6  
**United** - 45:24, 46:3, 46:5, 52:5, 52:10, 52:13, 58:6,

58:9, 59:1, 62:2, 63:1, 65:8, 65:21, 66:6, 66:13, 77:25, 90:9, 90:17, 91:18, 93:5, 118:11, 119:16, 124:25, 128:7, 128:24, 129:14, 130:13, 133:5, 133:19, 134:6, 156:23, 157:4  
**Units** - 2:15  
**Universe** - 36:1, 36:6, 36:14, 42:5, 43:6, 44:19, 45:7, 78:16  
**University** - 195:25  
**Unless** - 40:24, 57:23, 58:10, 59:2, 59:9, 210:18  
**Unreasonably** - 179:12  
**Unregulated** - 2:9, 2:18  
**Unusual** - 50:3, 50:9, 50:11  
**Update** - 38:5, 73:12, 129:25, 130:21  
**Updated** - 38:11, 68:17, 69:25, 131:17, 131:22, 132:17, 180:22  
**Upgrades** - 208:17  
**Upper** - 209:2, 209:5  
**Used** - 11:15, 63:18, 64:8, 81:12, 83:20, 84:1, 92:22, 112:21, 113:15, 113:20, 113:23, 122:5, 122:21, 122:24, 124:22, 129:2, 132:19, 135:25, 136:19, 136:20, 139:20, 143:16, 144:16, 146:5, 149:1, 149:20, 154:19, 162:1, 170:5, 171:18, 173:8, 178:9, 178:18, 179:23, 181:23, 189:21, 190:9, 191:5, 191:14, 192:4, 196:3, 196:5, 201:1, 202:22, 202:23  
**Uses** - 90:1, 107:9  
**Using** - 21:2, 21:4, 25:18, 80:7,

100:17, 100:23, 101:1, 108:22, 110:3, 115:20, 115:24, 116:2, 116:23, 119:7, 119:9, 127:12, 129:13, 129:15, 140:15, 141:18, 141:22, 142:9, 142:16, 147:25, 156:24, 158:17, 158:18, 158:19, 159:6, 159:8, 159:9, 162:23, 165:19, 171:7, 172:25, 179:21, 181:1, 181:6, 181:8, 181:15, 181:17, 194:25, 195:25, 196:7, 200:16, 200:18  
**Utility** - 6:5, 6:21, 7:25, 10:9, 10:10, 10:11, 10:17, 11:2, 19:8, 19:14, 20:4, 21:10, 25:11, 25:17, 28:15, 29:9, 31:13, 33:20, 36:20, 36:23, 40:22, 50:4, 53:7, 55:16, 64:16, 68:24, 69:6, 72:5, 113:23, 118:23, 140:22, 149:8, 149:22, 150:1, 158:21, 159:1, 159:3, 177:20, 177:21, 183:22, 191:10  
**Utilize** - 186:6  
**Utilized** - 108:25

## V

**Validity** - 76:15  
**Valley** - 70:9  
**Valuation** - 84:3, 136:13  
**Value** - 17:9, 18:23, 19:11, 52:19, 70:7, 70:14, 85:8, 149:9, 149:13, 165:23, 177:22, 179:22, 197:7, 197:22  
**Values** - 186:4  
**Valuing** - 149:17  
**Variable** - 160:20, 168:13, 168:22, 169:1, 169:12, 169:22, 170:8, 170:15, 174:3, 174:14, 174:18, 174:20, 175:24

**Variables** - 168:19  
**Variation** - 164:25, 165:12  
**Variety** - 73:7, 93:4, 98:25, 204:3  
**Vary** - 136:4  
**Versa** - 164:11  
**Version** - 3:18, 17:6, 82:25, 140:10, 148:19, 148:22  
**Versus** - 4:2, 15:16, 15:21, 43:10, 46:6, 48:18, 49:5, 54:13, 55:8, 68:23, 89:2, 120:16, 140:22, 191:10, 193:20, 199:1  
**Vice** - 164:11  
**View** - 22:23, 23:6, 23:8, 23:18, 25:22, 71:14, 71:15, 83:2, 84:7, 84:23, 86:12, 105:5, 105:18, 108:21, 108:23, 135:15, 144:19, 144:23, 157:11, 157:20, 187:17  
**Views** - 46:5, 144:18, 187:7  
**Vis** - 143:19  
**Volatility** - 71:11, 89:24  
**Volume** - 99:20

## W

**Walmart** - 208:2  
**Warrant** - 133:23  
**Warrants** - 184:17  
**Wasn't** - 45:6, 131:22, 132:17  
**Water** - 10:21  
**Ways** - 4:14, 92:16, 171:18, 171:20  
**Weary** - 71:8  
**Week** - 206:16, 208:5  
**Weeks** - 155:6, 185:19, 198:16  
**Weight** - 184:17  
**Weighted** - 110:19  
**Weights** - 180:3  
**We'll** - 8:9, 30:4, 47:8, 61:5, 123:19, 126:12, 206:1, 206:7  
**We're** - 1:15, 4:10, 4:14, 5:1, 10:7, 13:8, 13:17, 73:9, 79:21, 93:8,

<p>123:17, 123:18, 127:14, 139:7, 161:20, 163:1, 165:17, 185:9, 196:20, 197:6, 202:12, 209:8, 212:4, 213:1 <b>Weren't</b> - 11:3 <b>Westar</b> - 15:20 <b>We've</b> - 13:7, 23:25, 24:8, 71:5, 71:10, 71:11, 107:4, 110:14, 138:19, 147:22, 147:24, 148:14, 171:18, 189:19, 199:7 <b>What's</b> - 28:25, 31:15, 32:24, 67:6, 73:23, 76:19, 88:15, 90:4, 91:20, 95:1, 109:6, 112:12, 137:4, 144:21, 150:19, 153:19, 158:25, 169:11, 176:5, 191:20, 208:7 <b>Whereabouts</b> - 165:4 <b>Whereas</b> - 186:2, 200:8 <b>Whole</b> - 98:25, 102:13, 179:17 <b>Wide</b> - 106:18 <b>Widely</b> - 11:15 <b>Will</b> - 6:13, 12:11, 12:16, 28:24, 30:17, 58:5, 61:3, 61:20, 77:9, 92:18, 92:19, 106:3, 115:8, 131:4, 133:16, 152:24, 173:20, 174:10, 175:9, 175:15, 182:24, 187:15, 188:23, 190:6, 190:18, 208:25 <b>Wind</b> - 211:1 <b>Windows</b> - 208:18, 208:19 <b>Winter</b> - 209:22 <b>Wishes</b> - 22:3, 22:25 <b>Withholding</b> - 56:9, 56:19 <b>Witness</b> - 7:12, 7:16, 23:12, 140:3 <b>Witnesses</b> - 73:12 <b>Word</b> - 31:25, 32:8 <b>Words</b> - 163:9, 179:15 <b>Work</b> - 11:15, 12:2,</p>	<p>12:4, 27:8, 27:9, 29:3, 29:11, 29:16, 33:9, 33:10, 34:3, 75:18, 75:21, 76:1, 76:2, 80:10, 146:6, 146:10, 147:8, 196:23 <b>Works</b> - 34:5 <b>World</b> - 105:5, 105:18 <b>Worldwide</b> - 63:9 <b>Worthy</b> - 2:13 <b>Wouldn't</b> - 40:8, 45:12, 45:20, 86:12, 87:3, 104:14, 104:22, 118:4, 118:7, 138:20, 149:18, 205:3 <b>Write</b> - 8:1 <b>Wyman</b> - 26:4, 27:5, 27:10, 27:13, 27:16, 29:15, 29:21, 30:15, 30:24 <b>Wyman's</b> - 32:1</p> <p><b>Y</b></p> <p><b>Years</b> - 5:4, 11:20, 11:22, 73:11, 74:7, 95:18, 103:11, 103:12, 103:24, 109:24, 110:9, 114:24, 124:6, 130:5, 130:23, 132:7, 132:9, 132:21, 168:12, 172:9, 182:16, 209:25, 210:24, 211:24 <b>Yesterday</b> - 8:18, 25:5, 33:15, 66:19, 66:25, 68:2, 72:24, 113:2, 189:23 <b>Yield</b> - 65:4, 69:20, 85:13, 85:19, 85:23, 86:1, 87:5, 87:14, 87:24, 108:24, 115:1, 115:8, 118:17, 127:20, 127:21, 128:10, 134:9, 134:19, 136:24, 137:16, 139:1, 139:9, 139:10, 139:14, 141:5, 142:4, 143:1, 143:15, 144:13, 145:22, 146:4, 157:14, 160:24, 161:11, 164:9, 167:15, 170:3,</p>	<p>193:21 <b>Yielded</b> - 100:6 <b>Yields</b> - 70:10, 86:13, 101:2, 101:9, 104:2, 104:19, 134:20, 134:24, 136:1, 136:5, 143:7, 146:9, 147:19, 158:4, 158:13, 159:16, 160:10, 160:16, 161:20, 162:19, 163:4, 163:13, 163:21, 165:14, 167:4, 167:24, 176:12, 177:7 <b>York</b> - 14:4, 51:7, 51:15, 75:21 <b>You'd</b> - 13:1, 93:7, 174:8, 207:19 <b>You'll</b> - 13:17, 66:3, 78:10, 93:18, 111:4, 126:20 <b>You've</b> - 11:19, 16:19, 30:1, 32:14, 33:5, 52:21, 117:12, 136:6, 136:22, 142:8, 144:7, 159:15, 173:22, 178:9, 187:23</p> <p><b>'</b></p> <p><b>'16</b> - 116:3 <b>'17</b> - 116:3 <b>'18</b> - 116:3 <b>'33</b> - 58:23, 59:16 <b>'76</b> - 160:10, 168:20</p> <p><b>#</b></p> <p><b>#25</b> - 173:20</p> <p><b>\$</b></p> <p><b>\$100.00</b> - 121:14 <b>\$105.00</b> - 121:16 <b>\$150.00</b> - 208:16 <b>\$200.00</b> - 208:17 <b>\$400.00</b> - 208:19 <b>\$5.00</b> - 121:15 <b>\$800.00</b> - 208:18</p> <p><b>/</b></p> <p><b>/Canadian</b> - 203:3</p> <p><b>0</b></p> <p><b>0.2</b> - 175:3 <b>0.9</b> - 145:22, 146:20</p>	<p><b>0000</b> - 168:19 <b>003</b> - 175:7, 175:11 <b>0034</b> - 174:4 <b>014</b> - 80:21, 80:25 <b>02</b> - 175:10 <b>08</b> - 189:5, 189:14 <b>094</b> - 193:6, 193:15</p> <p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>1.11</b> - 163:6, 163:10, 163:15, 163:23, 164:2 <b>1.49</b> - 167:4, 167:18 <b>1.96</b> - 166:5 <b>1/3rd</b> - 180:4, 180:12 <b>1/6</b> - 209:3 <b>1/8th</b> - 86:2 <b>1:15</b> - 123:18, 206:2 <b>1:20</b> - 206:3 <b>1:30</b> - 213:2 <b>10</b> - 28:7, 28:8, 74:11, 81:11, 83:18, 90:22, 99:7, 115:18, 115:22, 116:17, 121:17, 122:10, 145:23, 151:14, 152:1, 209:15, 211:8 <b>10.09</b> - 109:12 <b>10.17</b> - 16:1 <b>10.20</b> - 15:20 <b>10.64</b> - 14:11, 14:19 <b>10:00</b> - 71:21 <b>10:15</b> - 86:9 <b>10:30</b> - 98:20 <b>10:45</b> - 111:25 <b>10:57</b> - 123:14 <b>100</b> - 17:20, 154:13, 172:20, 209:18 <b>101</b> - 195:24 <b>103</b> - 132:5 <b>10s</b> - 73:14 <b>11</b> - 2:16, 15:14, 15:18, 15:24, 26:12, 26:22, 67:4, 67:9, 115:11, 119:4, 133:11 <b>11:41</b> - 123:15 <b>11:45</b> - 128:2 <b>12</b> - 17:22, 18:25, 177:18, 178:24 <b>12:00</b> - 140:1 <b>12:15</b> - 154:6 <b>12:30</b> - 173:18 <b>12:45</b> - 183:6 <b>1200</b> - 209:15</p>	<p><b>126</b> - 37:1, 37:17, 37:19 <b>13</b> - 15:18, 103:17, 104:13, 108:12, 110:6, 110:16, 119:15, 119:20, 125:1, 126:2, 134:25, 136:2, 141:24, 190:21 <b>13.45</b> - 110:14 <b>13.46</b> - 100:2, 101:18, 108:4, 148:10, 161:4 <b>13.5</b> - 103:9 <b>14</b> - 16:2, 16:3, 134:25 <b>15</b> - 154:21, 211:8 <b>152</b> - 182:21, 183:1, 183:3, 198:9 <b>154</b> - 3:16, 3:21, 190:12, 190:20, 191:1, 191:3 <b>159</b> - 3:4 <b>16</b> - 154:21 <b>17</b> - 89:25, 145:19, 145:20, 145:22, 178:25 <b>18</b> - 15:19, 35:15, 49:18 <b>18th</b> - 47:15, 70:2 <b>19</b> - 6:14, 35:10, 68:18, 77:4, 88:6, 89:11, 112:2, 145:11, 145:18, 145:20, 145:25, 165:6, 173:1 <b>1900s</b> - 107:6 <b>1914</b> - 123:2 <b>1919</b> - 125:8, 125:10, 129:18, 129:20 <b>1924</b> - 128:5, 128:9 <b>1926</b> - 125:5, 129:15, 131:12, 135:20 <b>1930</b> - 11:3 <b>1933</b> - 58:7, 58:11, 58:12 <b>1936</b> - 131:11 <b>1947</b> - 128:9 <b>1970</b> - 209:6 <b>1980</b> - 170:7, 170:11 <b>1981</b> - 170:13 <b>1990</b> - 129:16 <b>1's</b> - 181:1 <b>1st</b> - 6:11, 46:25</p> <p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>2.1</b> - 115:1, 115:22 <b>2.16</b> - 65:17</p>
--	---	--	--	---

<p><b>2.5</b> - 208:10, 209:8  <b>2.8</b> - 115:1  <b>2.82</b> - 115:22, 117:13  <b>2.97</b> - 116:15  <b>2/3rd</b> - 180:3, 180:12  <b>20</b> - 12:17, 19:23, 49:18, 53:23, 54:3, 90:2, 111:2, 128:5, 134:10, 136:24, 165:11, 209:12, 211:8  <b>20.54</b> - 150:17  <b>2000</b> - 5:5, 5:24, 48:6, 48:17  <b>2005</b> - 5:6, 193:18  <b>2006</b> - 83:1  <b>2007</b> - 11:24  <b>2008</b> - 160:19, 168:20, 169:2, 169:3, 169:23, 172:6, 176:6  <b>2009</b> - 5:6, 179:3, 181:2  <b>2010</b> - 5:6, 37:25, 48:20, 48:24, 49:4  <b>2011</b> - 5:24, 128:9, 128:10  <b>2012</b> - 67:16, 67:21, 69:13, 72:17, 77:4, 77:13, 78:13, 126:10  <b>2013</b> - 14:11, 131:11, 131:13, 131:20, 134:8, 183:17, 192:11, 192:13  <b>2014</b> - 28:16, 69:2, 125:5, 125:8, 125:10, 129:15, 129:16, 129:18, 129:20, 135:20, 160:10, 193:18, 210:7  <b>2015</b> - 16:9, 17:6, 27:13, 47:15, 49:4, 65:5, 65:13, 69:3, 70:24, 74:4, 76:3, 115:17, 124:5, 192:14  <b>2016</b> - 6:11, 66:2, 69:23, 87:6, 87:12, 114:15, 114:20, 114:25, 117:14, 118:14, 134:4  <b>2016/2017</b> - 65:4  <b>2017</b> - 66:3, 117:11  <b>2018</b> - 117:11, 118:14  <b>21</b> - 14:21, 15:13,</p>	<p>26:14, 26:18, 92:21, 150:15  <b>22</b> - 47:9  <b>22.75</b> - 150:16  <b>23</b> - 39:2, 48:14, 61:5, 156:18  <b>23.8</b> - 170:7  <b>24</b> - 14:13, 65:2, 126:12, 208:20  <b>240</b> - 198:10, 198:15  <b>247</b> - 183:8, 184:4, 198:10, 198:15  <b>25</b> - 49:18, 64:25, 95:18, 98:22  <b>26</b> - 112:17  <b>269</b> - 82:10, 82:22, 83:9, 145:18  <b>27</b> - 48:15, 115:12, 116:10, 124:5  <b>279</b> - 132:6, 135:3, 135:10  <b>28</b> - 82:18, 83:16, 177:17  <b>28th</b> - 134:8  <b>29</b> - 108:12, 121:25, 156:10</p>	<p><b>42.75</b> - 150:17  <b>43</b> - 150:9  <b>44</b> - 164:24, 164:25, 182:22, 184:3  <b>45.184734</b> - 176:1  <b>450</b> - 209:13  <b>48</b> - 34:5, 124:10  <b>49</b> - 183:8, 184:4</p>	<p><b>71</b> - 95:20, 115:14, 115:23, 116:4  <b>72</b> - 103:17  <b>75</b> - 191:15, 191:20  <b>76</b> - 177:20, 177:21, 180:11  <b>78</b> - 185:1  <b>7th</b> - 82:25</p>
		<div>5</div> <p><b>5.39</b> - 157:3  <b>5.4</b> - 128:8, 128:10, 130:6  <b>5.5</b> - 133:20, 134:3, 134:16, 141:8, 142:2  <b>5.6</b> - 80:6, 108:19, 120:3, 124:24, 128:16, 130:8, 132:20  <b>5.7</b> - 15:13  <b>5.75</b> - 81:17  <b>50</b> - 150:8  <b>500</b> - 95:19, 101:3, 102:23, 108:18, 152:15  <b>52</b> - 20:5  <b>52.31</b> - 150:9  <b>550</b> - 209:7  <b>57</b> - 76:13  <b>58</b> - 75:17, 76:11  <b>59</b> - 189:22, 190:3, 191:11, 192:4</p>	<div>8</div> <p><b>8.1</b> - 28:17, 81:19, 81:21, 82:3, 109:2, 141:9, 142:1, 142:17, 144:7, 145:5, 156:22  <b>8.3</b> - 72:18, 89:11, 89:15, 145:25, 146:20  <b>8.5</b> - 15:21  <b>8.75</b> - 72:16  <b>8.8</b> - 15:18  <b>80</b> - 10:19, 165:15, 166:21, 168:3  <b>825</b> - 209:11  <b>86</b> - 118:4</p>
	<div>3</div> <p><b>3.02</b> - 65:21  <b>3.5</b> - 81:20  <b>3.60</b> - 116:16  <b>3.68</b> - 116:5, 116:18, 137:8, 137:13, 199:8, 200:24  <b>3.94</b> - 152:1, 152:6  <b>3.96</b> - 141:10, 157:3  <b>30</b> - 65:13, 65:21, 83:25, 115:16, 115:18, 116:17  <b>31st</b> - 32:21, 134:4  <b>34</b> - 20:8  <b>34.1</b> - 19:17, 19:24, 20:5  <b>35</b> - 72:10, 72:12  <b>35.5</b> - 169:6  <b>38</b> - 42:9</p>	<div>6</div> <p><b>6.4</b> - 128:25  <b>6.6</b> - 90:23, 128:24  <b>6.8</b> - 112:6  <b>60</b> - 30:12, 81:13, 209:4  <b>600</b> - 61:22  <b>63</b> - 118:13  <b>64</b> - 126:14, 177:24, 185:4  <b>65</b> - 185:1  <b>67</b> - 209:22  <b>69</b> - 177:23, 180:11</p>	<div>9</div> <p><b>9.1</b> - 15:16, 16:4  <b>9.3</b> - 14:21  <b>9.32</b> - 16:3  <b>9.35</b> - 73:2  <b>9.5</b> - 108:6, 124:9  <b>9.57</b> - 15:12  <b>9.6</b> - 82:4, 82:18  <b>9.7</b> - 73:2  <b>9.8</b> - 109:2, 110:18, 156:22  <b>9.98</b> - 15:16  <b>9:05</b> - 1:1  <b>9:15</b> - 14:8  <b>9:30</b> - 35:13  <b>9:40</b> - 47:2  <b>9:45</b> - 54:18  <b>90</b> - 168:3  <b>91</b> - 99:3  <b>95</b> - 166:3, 166:20, 166:25</p>
	<div>4</div> <p><b>4.29</b> - 116:6, 116:18, 137:9, 137:11, 137:13, 141:13, 141:15, 201:2  <b>4.8</b> - 86:2  <b>40</b> - 72:7, 81:13  <b>40.9</b> - 150:7  <b>42</b> - 42:9, 43:9</p>	<div>7</div> <p><b>7.01</b> - 135:24  <b>7.1</b> - 89:9  <b>7.4</b> - 146:3, 147:12  <b>7.5</b> - 99:9  <b>7.6</b> - 109:3, 110:20, 141:18, 142:8, 142:16, 146:4, 156:20  <b>70</b> - 120:17, 177:23, 180:11</p>	