

NEW BRUNSWICK ENERGY AND UTILITIES BOARD

FILE SYSTEM

#2007-016-06-03

COPY TO: *Wao, G-70*

IN THE MATTER OF an application by Enbridge Gas New Brunswick Inc. to change its Contract Large General Service LFO distribution rate

Held at the New Brunswick Energy and Utilities Board premises, Saint John, N.B., on February 14th 2008.

INDEX

Mr. Gallant

- Direct by Mr. Lawson - page 474
- Cross by Mr. Hoyt - page 477
- By Mr. Toner - page 499
- By Mr. Radford - page 500
- Redirect - page 502

Dr. Gaske

- Direct by Mr. Lawson - page 504
- Cross by Mr. Stewart - page 510
- Cross by Mr. MacDougall - page 511
- Cross by Ms. Desmond - page 541
- By Mr. Toner - page 543
- By the Vice Chairman - page 547

A-12 - EGNB interrogatory number 6 for Flakeboard from the
2005 rate case - page 480

A-13 - Flakeboard Company Limited interrogatory number 1 in
the EGNB 2006 rate application - page 482

2 for identification - chart - page 487

3 for identification - EGNB's forecast of Flakeboard's savings
12 months' forecast January 2008 to December 2008
- page 491

Undertakings

page 497 - EGNB interrogatory number 3 to Flakeboard, the
first part of it, excluding the references to
calculations and so on -- the question is what
proportion of the total cost of using natural
gas, including commodity costs, do distribution
costs represent

1 NEW BRUNSWICK ENERGY AND UTILITIES BOARD
2 IN THE MATTER OF an application by Enbridge Gas New Brunswick
3 Inc. to change its Contract Large General Service LFO
4 distribution rate
5 Held at the New Brunswick Energy and Utilities Board premises,
6 Saint John, N.B., on February 14th 2008.

7 BEFORE: Raymond Gorman, Q.C. - Chairman
8 Cyril Johnston, Esq. - Vice-Chairman
9 Edward McLean - Member
10 Steve Toner - Member
11 Robert Radford - Member

12 NB Energy and Utilities Board - Counsel - Ms. Ellen Desmond
13 Staff - Doug Goss
14 - John Lawton
15 - Dave Young

16 Secretary Ms. Lorraine Légère
17 Assistant Secretary - Ms. Juliette Savoie

18

19 CHAIRMAN: Good morning, everyone. We seem to have a little
20 bit of noise in here. I will ask our court reporter, is
21 that going to be okay?

22 Are you going to be able to -- all right. We will
23 look for cues from you if we are not speaking loud enough
24 then.

25 All right. Well, I will take the appearances this
morning starting with the Applicant.

MR. HOYT: Len Hoyt and David MacDougall for Enbridge Gas
New Brunswick.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hoyt. Atlantic Wallboard/JD
Irving Limited?

1
2 MR. STEWART: Christopher Stewart and Sarah Price.

3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. CME. Flakeboard Company Limited?

4 MR. LAWSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. Gary
5 Lawson for Flakeboard.

6 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. NB Energy and Utilities Board.

7 MS. DESMOND: Ellen Desmond, Mr. Chair. And from Board
8 Staff, Dave Young, Doug Goss and John Lawton.

9 CHAIRMAN: And for the informal intervenors, Canadian
10 Restaurant and Food Services Association? Competitive
11 Energy Services? Department of Energy? Ganong Bros.
12 Limited?

13 MR. LEFEBVRE: Mark Lefebvre for Ganong Bros.

14 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lefebvre. Public Intervenor?

15 MR. THERIAULT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Daniel
16 Theriault.

17 CHAIRMAN: And Sucor Limited? With respect to the informal
18 intervenors, the Board's procedure policy entitles
19 informal intervenors to make a written or oral submission
20 to the Board at the conclusion of the evidentiary portion
21 of the hearing. And we would anticipate that the
22 evidentiary portion of the hearing will conclude today,
23 perhaps even this morning.

24 Would both of the informal intervenors be in a
25 position to address the Board this morning? Or would you

1

want to do it this afternoon? Mr. Theriault?

2

3

MR. THERIAULT: Whatever is convenient.

4

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lefebvre?

5

MR. LEFEBVRE: This morning would be fine.

6

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I guess that depends on how far we

7

get with respect to the evidence this morning. The other

8

preliminary matter of course is closing argument from the

9

Applicant and the formal intervenors.

10

And perhaps I could hear from the parties with respect

11

to what their preference would be in the event that we do

12

conclude the evidentiary portion of this hearing this

13

morning.

14

The Board, if at all possible, would very much like to

15

get into argument today. We are not sure how long

16

argument is going to take. And if we wait until tomorrow

17

there is going to be -- we certainly have a lot of

18

difficulty if we needed to get some time next week to

19

conclude this matter. I think it would put us in a very

20

difficult situation.

21

Mr. Hoyt, how would that work for you?

22

MR. HOYT: The Applicant's preference, and recognizing the

23

concern of the Board, would be to do it Friday morning,

24

but to start it as early as the Board was able.

25

CHAIRMAN: Well, if we were to finish -- again I don't know

1
2 what time we are going to finish this morning. We haven't
3 started yet. But if we were to get done this morning, say
4 mid morning, would 2:00 o'clock this afternoon be a
5 possibility?

6 MR. HOYT: It would be difficult.

7 CHAIRMAN: You feel you need the transcript in order to do
8 your closing argument?

9 MR. HOYT: Yes. We only received last night -- or
10 yesterday's transcript at midnight last night. So we
11 haven't really had a chance to go through that either.

12 CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, we will address that issue then
13 before we -- or at the end of the evidentiary portion as
14 to when we will start argument. And we will take that
15 into consideration.

16 What about the formal intervenors? Mr. Stewart, do
17 you have a preference?

18 MR. STEWART: We could go -- I mean, I would like a little
19 break, you know, in terms of just -- you know, after what
20 happens today, this morning and to that extent.

21 But I mean, we could be ready to go at 2:00 provided
22 we were done, as you said, mid morning, this morning.

23 CHAIRMAN: And Mr. Lawson?

24 MR. LAWSON: The sooner the better, Mr. Chairman. And while
25 it might be complicated for the Board to sit next week, it

1
2 is impossible for me to. I'm actually out of town
3 starting Saturday.

4 CHAIRMAN: Well, what about closing argument, Mr. Hoyt, in
5 terms of length? I don't really want to pin you down.
6 But can you give me -- do you have any idea as to perhaps
7 how long you might be?

8 MR. HOYT: It would be an hour at the most.

9 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart, are you able to give me an estimate?

10 MR. STEWART: It won't be more than an hour.

11 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lawson?

12 MR. LAWSON: Less than an hour.

13 CHAIRMAN: Well, that sounds like a half-day. All right.
14 Well, we will probably then deal with final argument
15 tomorrow morning.

16 So I suppose at this point in time the evidentiary
17 portion of the hearing won't get concluded unless we get
18 on with the matters this morning.

19 So Mr. Lawson?

20 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Barry Gallant is
21 on the stand. Perhaps we could have him sworn.

22 CHAIRMAN: I will ask Board Counsel to come forward and
23 swear Mr. Gallant.

24 BARRY GALLANT, sworn:

25 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LAWSON:

1
2 Q.1 - Mr. Gallant, you are the Manager of Finance and
3 Purchasing for Flakeboard Company Limited's St. Stephen
4 plant, is that correct?

5 A. Yes, I am.

6 Q.2 - And before I ask you if all of your evidence is true
7 that you have submitted in FCL-1 as a result of the
8 evidence having been prepared under your direction but by
9 my control, did I screw up in some fashion?

10 A. I believe Question 14 would need to be addressed.

11 Q.3 - And is it my understanding Question 14 is tied to
12 something that wasn't connected and should be removed from
13 your evidence?

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q.4 - And so for the Board, wishes to have Question 14 and
16 Answer 14 extracted. Because the answer to the preceding
17 question didn't get done. So when we deleted the answer
18 to the preceding one, I forget to delete the follow-up
19 question which is 14. So that should be deleted.

20 And Question 15 -- as a result the introductory words
21 of Question 15 should probably read instead "What comments
22 if any do you have" instead of "What does this analysis
23 tell you."

24 I don't think anything rides on it. But anybody
25 reading the evidence might wonder what three dates are

1
2 being referred to. And that work wasn't able to be
3 completed so it wasn't with the evidence.

4 So it wasn't -- so with that modification, was this
5 evidence prepared by you or under your direction?

6 A. Yes, it was.

7 Q.5 - And is the evidence true?

8 A. Yes, it is.

9 Q.6 - Perhaps if you could give us a brief summary of the
10 evidence for the Board. And then I will offer you up for
11 cross examination.

12 A. Good morning, Board or Chair and fellow Board members.
13 Flakeboard Company Limited manufactures composite panels
14 in St. Stephen, New Brunswick. In addition to that, we
15 have seven other manufacturing facilities through North
16 America.

17 It is our concern with this application that the costs
18 that we are currently paying for gas distribution to our
19 site in St. Stephen is significantly higher than, as we
20 understand the cost, to provide that service.

21 And it is further to our concern that the rate
22 application in front of the Board today is higher than the
23 cost to provide to the whole LFO class.

24 And thereby we would -- we object to the application
25 in front of the Board.

1
2 MR. LAWSON: Mr. Chairman, he is available for cross
3 examination.

4 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lawson. Mr. Stewart?

5 MR. STEWART: I have no questions for Mr. Gallant.

6 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hoyt?

7 MR. HOYT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HOYT:

9 Q.7 - Mr. Gallant, at Q. 10 of your evidence it asks "Has
10 Flakeboard's gas usage resulted in it having charges from
11 the LFO tier 2 and tier 3 rate classes 2005?" And the
12 response was "Yes".

13 Is that correct?

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q.8 - And at A-5 of your evidence you indicated that
16 Flakeboard uses approximately 650,000 GJ's of natural gas
17 annually, is that correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q.9 - And that would be an average of over 54,000 GJ's per
20 month, correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q.10 - So a significant amount of the gas Flakeboard uses is
23 in the second and/or third block, correct?

24 A. I think if you do the numbers out, 400' -- roughly
25 400,000 would be in the first tier. And then the

1
2 remaining would be in the other two tiers.

3 Q.11 - So the remaining would be 250,000?

4 A. That would be the calculation, correct.

5 Q.12 - And does Flakeboard use a similar amount of gas each
6 month? Or does it fluctuate?

7 A. Definitely there is some seasonality to our usage.
8 Heating load in the winter would probably drive more gas
9 usage in the winter period than in the summer.

10 Q.13 - Well, what typical usage would be in the winter?

11 A. Oh, probably in the neighborhood of maybe 60' to
12 70,000 GJ's.

13 Q.14 - Sorry?

14 A. In the neighborhood of 60' to 70,000 GJ's. I don't
15 have the exact calculation. And it does fluctuate, but --

16 Q.15 - That is fine. And you confirmed in your evidence that
17 EGNB is not requesting any increase for the second or
18 third blocks or the demand charge of the CLGS LFO rate,
19 correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q.16 - And yesterday there was discussion about the Board's
22 January 18th decision in relation to motions made by AWL
23 and Flakeboard in this proceeding.

24 Did you have a chance to review that decision?

25 A. Yes.

1
2 Q.17 - And if I tell you that in that the Board concluded that
3 it will proceed to set rates in this application using the
4 market-based method, would you agree with that?

5 A. I understand that that was the ruling in that case,
6 yes.

7 Q.18 - So let's look at EGNB's market-based method. And what
8 I would like to ask you to turn to is EGNB's evidence
9 which is A-3.

10 And I would like you to turn to page 2. So if you
11 look at the last paragraph on page 2 it indicates that
12 EGNB has adopted targeted annual savings for the market
13 categories that should provide sufficient incentive for
14 customers to switch to and continue to use natural gas for
15 the LFO sector, 10 percent light fuel oil has been
16 established as the annual savings target.

17 Do you see that, Mr. Gallant?

18 A. Yes, I do.

19 Q.19 - So would you agree that EGNB's market-based methodology
20 is to allow customers to see savings as against an
21 alternate fuel?

22 A. Based on what is stated there it would be, yes.

23 Q.20 - I would now like to refer you to Flakeboard's response
24 to EGNB IR number 6 from EGNB's 2005 rate application. I
25 have copies.

1
2 MR. HOYT: How many would the Board require?

3 CHAIRMAN: Well, I guess we will need five for the panel and
4 one at least for the Secretary. I guess we need eight, I
5 have been told.

6 MR. HOYT: I think that should be marked as an exhibit,
7 Mr. Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN: Any objections from any of the parties? I don't
9 see an up-to-date exhibit list. What was the last exhibit
10 number?

11 MR. HOYT: A-11.

12 MRS. LEGERE: A-11. It would be A-12.

13 CHAIRMAN: This will become exhibit A-12. It is EGNB
14 interrogatory number 6 for Flakeboard from the 2005 --
15 2004 hearing.

16 MR. HOYT: Well, it is dated 2004. But it is in respect to
17 the increase that was approved in March of 2005. So I
18 always refer to it as the 2005 rate case.

19 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

20 Q.21 - And have you had a chance to look at that, Mr. Gallant?

21 A. Just since I have -- just since I have sat here.

22 Q.22 - What I would like to ask you to confirm is that in

23 response to EGNB's questions in that interrogatory that

24 you provided Flakeboard's dollar savings from using

25 natural gas as compared to displaced oil and propane cost

1
2 for November and December 2004 and January of 2005.

3 And the two questions in particular to look at would
4 be (b) and (c).

5 A. What numbers again were those that we had --

6 Q.23 - (b) and (c)?

7 A. Page 3 and 4 of 5?

8 Q.24 - The responses would be the charts -- they are headed up
9 "interrogatory 6(b)" and then "interrogatory 6(c)".

10 A. Okay.

11 Q.25 - And so what I'm asking is whether those provided
12 Flakeboard's dollar savings from using gas as compared to
13 displaced oil and propane for November and December 2004
14 and January 2005?

15 A. Right off I don't remember. Providing the numbers?
16 It has been a couple of years. But I couldn't confirm
17 that I did or I didn't I guess at this point without going
18 back.

19 Q.26 - But in terms of -- if you go back just to the question.
20 If you go back to page 1 and look at Question (b) it asks
21 that you provide the percentage in absolute dollar savings
22 for each month using Flakeboard's actual propane and oil
23 displacement.

24 And if you go to (b) and work down through the page,
25 at the bottom there is a line called "Total Savings".

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

What would that indicate?

A. If you look -- if we start for January '05 --

Q.27 - Right.

A. -- \$81,726.94.

Q.28 - So would it be fair to say that that represented your calculation at that time of the total savings in January 2005 from using natural gas as opposed to oil and propane?

A. I would say that would be correct.

Q.29 - And similarly you provided similar savings information for December 2004 and November 2004, correct?

A. Correct.

Q.30 - So now I would like to show you Flakeboard's response to EGNB IR number 1 in EGNB's 2006 rate application.

Maybe I would ask Mr. MacDougall to do the honors.

MR. HOYT: And again, Mr. Chairman, I suggest it should be marked as an exhibit.

CHAIRMAN: Any objections to that? And that will become exhibit A-13. And that is Flakeboard Company Limited interrogatory number 1 in the EGNB 2006 rate application.

Q.31 - I would like you to look at Question 1(a). And if you turn to your response, you indicated that "The chart has been completed by Flakeboard. However, as it contains confidential information we have not provided the details."

1
2 And then you set out the monthly savings from using
3 natural gas rather than alternate fuels between October
4 2004 and October 2005, correct?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q.32 - And those were the -- those were Flakeboard's response
7 to the request as to what your savings had been from using
8 natural gas during that period of time, correct?

9 A. It would have been based on the formula that would
10 have been in place with regards to oil versus number 2
11 fuel.

12 Q.33 - And what formula is that, Mr. Gallant? Not the
13 specifics of the calculation. But just generally what
14 formula are you referring to?

15 A. The formula would be based on the current -- or the
16 price of number 2 fuel versus the relative price of
17 natural gas.

18 Q.34 - But did you and EGNB have a manner of calculating
19 savings?

20 A. There was -- there was a form, a form or a document
21 that laid out the manner to calculate that savings,
22 correct.

23 Q.35 - And that is a form that EGNB and Flakeboard had worked
24 out over some period of time and was used to determine
25 these savings?

1
2 A. It was used to determine -- it was used to determine
3 the savings as part of the -- yes, it was to determine the
4 savings with regards to the relationship between oil and
5 natural gas, the balance between the two of them -- or the
6 difference between the two of them.

7 Q.36 - And you wouldn't disagree if I told you that those
8 total monthly absolute savings totaled \$2,217,618, would
9 you?

10 A. I believe your math that that is --

11 Q.37 - Thank you. Now in A-8 of your evidence which is FCL-1
12 you have set out Flakeboard's annual increased
13 distribution costs for 2005, 2006 and 2007, correct?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q.38 - And in A-5 you indicated that Flakeboard's annualized
16 distribution charges with the new rate will be \$2.1
17 million, correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q.39 - And if I could ask you to turn to the end of A-15 of
20 your evidence.

21 Can you just read that last sentence?

22 A. Using data on a single date during the period of such
23 an extraordinary fuel price difference for the purpose of
24 this application does not give a fair reflection of the
25 true savings that a customer is likely to have during

2008.

Q.40 - Now in response to Flakeboard's -- or in Flakeboard's response to EGNB IR number 2(a) you were asked to complete a form for each of the months since October 2004 that Flakeboard has been using natural gas and provide Flakeboard's monthly savings from using natural gas rather than alternate fuels, as you did in 2006, correct?

A. Correct.

Q.41 - And in your response you indicated that you have achieved savings of at least 10 percent by burning natural gas over the cost of using light fuel oil, correct?

A. Correct.

Q.42 - And you did just confirm that EGNB and Flakeboard had a similar spreadsheet and methodology to determine Flakeboard's savings, correct?

A. Correct.

MR. HOYT: I have a document that I would like to put to Mr. Gallant that had been prepared by EGNB in terms of EGNB's calculation of Flakeboard's savings between October 2004 and December 2007. Mr. MacDougall can just hand them out.

CHAIRMAN: Are you asking that this be marked as an exhibit?

MR. HOYT: Please, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN: Again I will ask the parties, any objections to that?

1
2 MR. LAWSON: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps before it gets
3 marked there should be some foundation built for it.
4 Because there are no supporting calculations or anything.
5 I just -- I would really question its value.

6 MR. HOYT: The reason that there are no calculations was
7 because of the preference expressed by Flakeboard in
8 previous proceedings not to provide those calculations.

9 And we in posing the IR attempted to accommodate
10 Flakeboard's preference as demonstrated in some of these
11 previous proceedings in terms of determining what that
12 total calculation is without delving into the numbers such
13 as the commodity price and so on and putting that type of
14 information on the record.

15 So it has been done in an attempt to accommodate some
16 concerns that Flakeboard has expressed in the past.

17 MR. LAWSON: Again, I don't know what the numbers are. I
18 mean, these take calculations which I presume are founded
19 on some costs of Flakeboard.

20 I don't know. Does EGNB have Flakeboard's costs to be
21 able to have done this calculation? I just don't know.

22 CHAIRMAN: The difficulty with marking that as an exhibit is
23 that there has been no -- certainly it wasn't prefiled as
24 most of the exhibits are. There is no evidence to sort of
25 back up where this information came from. You are making

1
2 a statement as to where it came from. But there is no
3 evidence.

4 I can mark it for identification if you wish to use it
5 as an aid to cross examination. I think at this point in
6 time I wouldn't want to give an exhibit number. I will
7 mark it 1 for identification. Sorry. We will mark that
8 number 2 for identification.

9 Q.43 - So Mr. Gallant, have you had a chance to look at EGNB's
10 determination of Flakeboard's savings from November 2005 -
11 - well, from October 2004 to December 2007?

12 A. I have -- yes, I have looked at that.

13 Q.44 - So you received this earlier this week?

14 A. Yes, I have.

15 Q.45 - And when did you receive it?

16 A. I believe I received it Tuesday morning, if I'm not
17 mistaken.

18 Q.46 - So would you confirm that the savings numbers that are
19 shown in that chart from October 2004 to October 2005 are
20 the same numbers you provided in response to EGNB IR
21 number 1 in the 2006 rate application?

22 A. I would agree.

23 Q.47 - So those are the same numbers. So in terms of the
24 numbers set out there between November 2005 and December
25 2007, have you had a chance to consider those numbers

1
2 since Tuesday?

3 A. I would have had a chance to consider them, yes.

4 Q.48 - And would they be in the order of magnitude of the
5 savings that Flakeboard has realized from using natural
6 gas during that period of time?

7 A. I would have to say that in order of magnitude that it
8 would be in the ballpark of what we would do. But I would
9 also argue that our competitors would be able to cite the
10 same cost savings over number 2 fuel in that same time
11 period as well.

12 Q.49 - But you would indicate that \$9.6 million is in the
13 ballpark?

14 A. Without -- in the ballpark, correct.

15 Q.50 - And do you know what percentage level of savings that
16 would represent?

17 A. Right off, no, I would not.

18 Q.51 - But it is more than 10 percent?

19 A. We have already admitted that. We have definitely --
20 they saved more than 10 percent through that time period.

21 MR. HOYT: Mr. Chair, given the response, would it be
22 appropriate to have this document marked as an exhibit?

23 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lawson, any comments?

24 MR. LAWSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the document itself
25 -- the evidence is that the number represents a ballpark

1
2 figure, I believe the evidence was. But I don't think the
3 document itself has been established in any fashion. So I
4 don't think it is appropriate, Mr. Chairman.

5 In fact I'm looking at -- just comparing numbers. I
6 don't know. I'm looking at the numbers on A-12. And the
7 November and December numbers I can't reconcile. I don't
8 know.

9 MR. HOYT: Well, just in terms of that we better go back to
10 Mr. Gallant.

11 Q.52 - Let's look at A-12. So, Mr. Gallant, if you could turn
12 to A-12 -- sorry -- A-13 is the one you should be looking
13 at. If you go to A-13 and look at your responses under
14 total monthly absolute savings, what is the number for
15 October 2004? Sorry, Mr. Gallant, that's A-12.

16 A. Okay. A-13. \$25,160.

17 Q.53 - And what is the number for October 2004 on the item 2
18 marked for identification?

19 A. 25,160.

20 Q.54 - And if you look at November 2004 what is the number on
21 exhibit A-13?

22 A. 66,514.

23 Q.55 - And what is the number on item 2 for identification?

24 A. 66,514.

25 Q.56 - Could I ask you just to look at from December 2004 up

1
2 to October 2005 on both of those documents and confirm
3 that the numbers are identical?

4 A. What date was that again that you wanted me to --

5 Q.57 - If you go from December 2004 --

6 A. Okay.

7 Q.58 - -- up to October 2005.

8 A. I have checked.

9 Q.59 - And they are identical?

10 A. They are the same, yes.

11 Q.60 - Thank you. So, Mr. Gallant, if I could ask you again

12 to just turn to the end of A-15 of your evidence, and on

13 page 6 you indicate that -- and I quote -- "This

14 application does not give a fair reflection of the true

15 savings that a customer is likely to have during 2008."

16 End quote. Is that correct?

17 A. Could you just repeat that again.

18 Q.61 - Sure. Just at the end of A-15 --

19 A. Yes.

20 Q.62 - -- on page 6, it says, "This application does not give

21 a fair reflection of the true savings that a customer is

22 likely to have during 2008." Correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q.63 - So at this time I would like to circulate another

25 document that I will ask be marked for identification, and

1
2 it's EGNB's calculation of Flakeboard's forecast savings
3 for January 2008 to December 2008.

4 CHAIRMAN: EGNB's forecast of Flakeboard's savings 12
5 months' forecast January 2008 to December 2008 will become
6 number 3 for identification.

7 Q.64 - So, Mr. Gallant, when did you first see this document?

8 A. I think it accompanied the other document that you had
9 just passed out on Tuesday morning.

10 Q.65 - And have you had a chance to consider the numbers that
11 are presented in that document?

12 A. Generally consider them, yes.

13 Q.66 - And if I were to tell you that these forecasts of
14 Flakeboard's monthly savings for 2008 were calculated
15 using the same methodology and spreadsheet as were used to
16 determine the actual savings from 2004 to date, do you
17 have any reason to doubt EGNB's projection of Flakeboard's
18 savings of \$4.2 million for 2008?

19 A. I would take your word that if they were calculated
20 the same way, but I have no idea of proving that.

21 Q.67 - But again so they would seem -- appear to be in the
22 ballpark?

23 A. Like I say I would have -- they would appear to be in
24 the ballpark but I can't make an absolute determination
25 that that's what they would be.

1
2 Q.68 - Thank you, Mr. Gallant. Now, Mr. Gallant, I would ask
3 you to turn to A-12 of your evidence where you say, as
4 such like Flakeboard they pay for both product being
5 natural gas as well as the cost of distribution, correct?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q.69 - So you would agree that as a natural gas user,
8 Flakeboard pays EGNB's distribution charge and for the
9 natural gas itself, correct?

10 A. Flakeboard pays EGNB for distribution. It does not
11 pay -- it does not pay for the product itself to EGNB.

12 Q.70 - No. Correct. It pays EGNB for the distribution
13 charges and it pays somebody else for natural gas, the
14 commodity?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q.71 - And I would ask you to turn to A-13 which is the next
17 page of your evidence, where you indicated that energy
18 costs represent one of the most significant components of
19 operating costs for a number of businesses including
20 Flakeboard's, correct?

21 A. That is correct.

22 Q.72 - Now let's go to Flakeboard's response to EGNB IRs-3
23 (a), (b) and (c) which are in exhibit FCL-3.

24 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hoyt, what was the IR number?

25 MR. HOYT: It's IR number 3.

1
2 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

3 Q.73 - If we were to look at question (a), could you just read
4 the question and your response?

5 A. For each of 2007 -- is that the start of it?

6 Q.74 - No. 3(a), what proportion.

7 A. Sorry. I must have the wrong -- would you say that
8 again?

9 Q.75 - Yes. It's EGNB IR number 3.

10 A. Okay. Question (a)?

11 Q.76 - Yes, please.

12 A. Okay. What proportion of the total cost of using
13 natural gas including commodity costs do distribution
14 costs represent? Please provide all data, details and
15 calculations.

16 Q.77 - And would you read your response?

17 A. The cost of natural gas is not relevant to this
18 matter.

19 Q.78 - Now given that just a moment or two ago you indicated
20 that in addition to paying natural gas distribution
21 charges Flakeboard also pays commodity costs, would you be
22 prepared to provide us with a ballpark as to the
23 proportion of total cost of using natural gas -- or the
24 proportion of the total cost that distribution costs
25 represent?

1
2 MR. LAWSON: Mr. Chairman, again I would object on the basis
3 of relevance. What relevance does that have to this
4 hearing?

5 MR. HOYT: I think, Mr. Chair, it just goes to the
6 methodology. Mr. Gallant just confirmed that natural gas
7 costs are -- commodity costs are part of having natural
8 gas available. And again we are not looking for the
9 calculations. We don't want their price. We just want to
10 get a sense of the order of magnitude that the
11 distribution charges represent of their total gas cost.

12 CHAIRMAN: I take it you are not looking for precise figures
13 and I take it you are not looking for any confidential
14 information to be disclosed.

15 MR. HOYT: Not at all.

16 CHAIRMAN: You are simply looking for, as you say, an order
17 of magnitude. I think the question is reasonable.

18 MR. LAWSON: Mr. Chair, it may be reasonable but I don't
19 think it has any relevance except for the purposes of
20 establishing the market-based price formula, and there has
21 already been an agreement that there has been more than a
22 ten percent savings. That's the objective. And how much
23 it represents of the total cost is I submit completely
24 irrelevant to what the Board has to consider here today.
25 And I do submit that any disclosure will probably give

1
2 some relative cost advantage to competitors.

3 CHAIRMAN: Well if there is some issue here with respect to
4 confidentiality and perhaps some harm to your client's
5 business, that's a different issue and we can certainly
6 deal with this question on an in-camera basis, if that's
7 necessary. I took it that Mr. Hoyt's question was not
8 asking for specifics that would disclose that kind of
9 information.

10 MR. HOYT: Perhaps it may be of assistance. Given Mr.
11 Lawson's concern, I won't proceed with (b) which deals
12 with the percentage of distribution costs representative
13 of production costs, if that helps any, again because
14 that's where I was going next, but recognizing the concern
15 in terms of the production costs that his client has I
16 won't go there. But I do think it's highly relevant in
17 this proceeding to ask a question about what proportion
18 the distribution costs represent of the total gas costs of
19 Flakeboard.

20 CHAIRMAN: And, Mr. Lawson, again in terms of whether or not
21 you feel there is some confidential information there that
22 in some way might cause some harm to your client's
23 business, I --

24 MR. LAWSON: Without question, Mr. Chairman, even I, a not
25 very astute mathematician --

1
2 CHAIRMAN: So we have heard.

3 MR. LAWSON: -- witness evidence preparer -- managed to --
4 would manage to be able to figure out very quickly what
5 Flakeboard's costs are and energy costs in total, which
6 would be of great interest to the competitors of
7 Flakeboard. How much they in fact pay for gas or for
8 energy is obviously going to be relevant to competitors.
9 Business is competitive enough as it is.

10 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hoyt, I guess given Mr. Lawson's response,
11 and I don't want to put Flakeboard in a position where
12 they are going to disclose information of a confidential
13 nature that might be harmful to their business, but we do
14 have an option of treating this part in confidence and
15 sort of going in-camera. What I would ask is if you feel
16 that the response to that question is necessary for your
17 case we certainly can go in-camera and deal with it in
18 that fashion.

19 MR. HOYT: A couple of things. Again I think the discussion
20 has moved now more from relevance to confidentiality,
21 and --

22 MR. LAWSON: I'm not conceding on relevance, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN: I appreciate there is no -- that's right -- I
24 don't believe there is any concession on Mr. Lawson's
25 part. I'm really quite frankly pushing it on the

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

confidentiality side.

MR. HOYT: And I would like to confirm that EGNB has no objective of putting this confidential information on the record and understand the company's concern, and would be prepared to take it in confidence, either through an undertaking to just provide that percentage without having to turn the whole proceeding into an in camera proceeding, and could deal with it appropriately once we had that information.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lawson, are you prepared to handle it in that fashion, an undertaking that is responded to on a confidential basis?

MR. LAWSON: If, and only if, the Board rules that it is relevant.

CHAIRMAN: I believe it's relevant and that's our ruling. So you are prepared to do that by way of undertaking rather than have it --

MR. LAWSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Now just to be sure what that undertaking is, perhaps the question should be repeated. Sometimes we get undertakings we are not 100 percent sure precisely it is that has been asked for.

MR. HOYT: So the specific question is EGNB interrogatory number 3 to Flakeboard, the first part of it, excluding

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

the references to calculations and so on -- the question is what proportion of the total cost of using natural gas, including commodity costs, do distribution costs represent?

MR. LAWSON: And for what year?

MR. HOYT: Now.

MR. LAWSON: Today or 2007?

MR. HOYT: 2007 would be the actual, so that would be fine.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lawson, you are clear on what the undertaking is?

MR. LAWSON: I believe so, but I don't know the answer, so I think -- I know the question. Hopefully the undertaking can be answered by somebody that knows the answer.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you should ask Mr. Gallant so that you are clear as to what you are being asked to do.

A. Yes, I am.

Q.79 - Mr. Gallant, would you please turn to Flakeboard's response to EGNB IR number 2(b). And in that response you indicate that the approximate cost of Flakeboard's conversion from light fuel oil to natural gas was \$2.3 million, correct?

A. Correct.

Q.80 - And you confirmed earlier this morning that Flakeboard had savings of \$2,217,618 between October, 2004, the month

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

you started using natural gas, and October 2005, correct?

A. Correct.

Q.81 - So Flakeboard essentially recovered its full cost of conversion within one year, correct?

A. That would be the calculation, correct.

MR. HOYT: No more questions, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hoyt. Ms. Desmond?

MS. DESMOND: No questions from Board staff, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the Board?

BY MR. TONER:

MR. TONER: Yes, I have one question. And I'm not sure if the question is for you or Mr. Hoyt, but this document number 3 for identification, was this created using the budget after the rate increase number or before the rate increase, the 4.249 million?

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Chairman, if I might, I hate to interject, but that's part of the reason why this should not be as an exhibit or even considered is that there is no evidence as to what was used for this. That's part of my redirect.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lawson, your objection was noted and that document was not marked as an exhibit, simply marked for identification, and I think certain questions and answers were put to the witness where he agreed to certain propositions, if you will. I think this is really just a

clarification as to what was intended by those numbers.

But I appreciate it's not an exhibit.

MR. LAWSON: My concern is though that the questions might try to establish the credibility of a document that hasn't been established otherwise by the Applicant.

CHAIRMAN: That document has not been marked as an exhibit and unless there is some evidence to establish where those numbers came from, it won't be.

MR. HOYT: In answer to the question, those calculations do include the rate increase.

CHAIRMAN: Any redirect, Mr. Lawson?

MR. LAWSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. And I will start with -- oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Radford. I'm sorry.

BY MR. RADFORD:

Q.82 - Mr. Gallant, on your opening remarks you said the rates here in New Brunswick, as proposed, would be significantly higher. I think you used the word significant?

A. Yes, I did.

Q.83 - Yes. And so I flipped over to your chart which is -- it's a coloured chart --

A. Yes.

Q.84 - If I understand the chart correctly, the blue represents what the cost would be to your company for

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

using the services of Enbridge here in New Brunswick compared to what it is presently with the red, is that correct?

A. Yes. Actually mine is not in colour, so I guess maybe --

Q.85 - Okay. The first one is blue.

A. Okay. That's the 2,000,000. Okay. Sorry.

Q.86 - The second one is red.

A. Correct.

Q.87 - Then we drop down and everything looks a lot lower.

A. Correct.

Q.88 - But where are the volumes? Are your volumes -- are we comparing apples to apples here or apples to oranges?

A. If you -- there is a little box in the middle -- roughly in the middle to the right --

Q.89 - Yes.

A. -- where it says it's based on 50,000 gj's per month.

Q.90 - And are you using that --

A. That is the number that has been used to calculate.

Q.91 - That's constant through. So then I look at it, it's all --

A. That's correct.

Q.92 - Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Anything further, Mr. Radford?

1
2 MR. RADFORD: No. That's it.

3 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lawson, redirect.

4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LAWSON:

5 Q.93 - Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to look at IR number 3,
6 which Mr. Toner just asked a question of EGNB, have you
7 seen any of the figures used to support this calculation?

8 A. I have not seen any of the figures, no.

9 Q.94 - Did you know before the question was asked by Mr. Toner
10 today whether or not it was with or without the rate
11 increase requested?

12 A. No, I did not.

13 Q.95 - So could you in fact address the question accurately of
14 whether or not that is a fair reflection of the savings
15 anticipated in 2008?

16 A. No, I could not.

17 Q.96 - I'm going to refer you also back to I number 2, and at
18 the same time A-12. A-12 identified on page 3 of 5 what
19 the savings were that were calculated in the 2004/2005
20 rate increase application

21 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lawson, that may be A-13.

22 MR. LAWSON: A-13. Looking at A-12 which is actually the
23 2004 - 053? I thought that was marked as A-12.

24 CHAIRMAN: Yes. It is A-12. Okay.

25 Q.97 - So as I look at the number on page 3 of 5, the numbers

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

for each of the three months there for savings, and my confusion is that for example in the November '04 calculation the number comes up at \$65,923, correct?

A. Correct.

Q.98 - When I look at the chart that was marked I-2 it's identified as \$66,514, correct?

A. Correct.

Q.99 - When I look for example at January of '05, the figure shown on A-12 is \$81,700 and the figure shown on I-2 is is \$88,900, correct?

A. Correct.

Q.100 - So they aren't consistent, although I will admit they were consistent with A-13.

A. Correct.

Q.101 - You don't recall why there would be some discrepancy in those calculations?

A. No, I don't.

Q.102 - Now there was also a question with respect to the cost of conversion of \$2.3 million. That would be described by an accountant as the direct costs -- maybe not by an accountant -- by me as the direct costs as opposed to other costs, is that right?

A. Correct.

Q.103 - What other costs might the company have incurred as a

1
2 result of doing the conversion?

3 A. We would have incurred down time which would have
4 meant lost production time, which wouldn't have been
5 captured in that 2.3 million dollars for example.

6 MR. LAWSON: Those are all the questions I have on redirect.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lawson. Thank you, Mr. Gallant.

9 MR. HOYT: Mr. Chair, if I could just ask to get a sense

10 from Mr. Lawson in terms of timing on that undertaking?

11 MR. LAWSON: I have no idea.

12 MR. GALLANT: Probably before the morning.

13 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Is it something that with a break -

14 -

15 MR. GALLANT: Probably in a break I can probably make it --

16 MR. HOYT: I don't know what the wishes of the Board would

17 be or the Applicant. We could break now and obtain the

18 information.

19 MR. LAWSON: No, I don't think we need it for Dr. Gaske. We

20 may as well --

21 MR. HOYT: You don't anticipate recalling the witness.

22 Okay. That was the reason. That's fine.

23 DR. STEVEN GASKE, sworn:

24 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LAWSON:

25 CHAIRMAN: The witness has been sworn.

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

Q.1 - Dr. Steven Gaske, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q.2 - And the evidence that has been marked as FLC number 2 is a report or written testimony that you have provided in this matter, is that right?

A. That is correct.

Q.3 - And that was prepared by you?

A. Yes.

Q.4 - And is the evidence true?

A. Yes, it is.

Q.5 - On the back of your document is a curriculum vitae. Have you worked in matters of economic -- regulatory economics in the past?

A. Yes. I have approximately 30 years of experience.

MR. LAWSON: I would ask that Dr. Gaske be identified as an expert in regulatory economics.

CHAIRMAN: Any objection? All right. He will be so declared as an expert witness in regulatory economics.

Q.6 - Dr. Gaske, could you provide the Board a brief summary of your evidence and also any comments you might have with respect to any of the other evidence you have heard at the hearings this week?

A. Yes. Good morning, Board. My evidence has two fundamental recommendations. One is that you all use your

1
2 discretion and authority to reject this rate increase and
3 that you order EGNB to set up an accounting system so that
4 it can track over charges and amounts provided as
5 incentives to various customers, so that they would be
6 kept for smaller customers on a class basis and for larger
7 customers on an individual customer basis.

8 The reason I am proposing that you reject the rate
9 increase is that the proposed LFO rate is not just and
10 reasonable under any economic or regulatory standard that
11 I am aware of.

12 The stand-alone cost for Flakeboard to construct its
13 own line is on the order of about 300 to \$350,000 a year.
14 Currently they are paying \$1.2 million for the service and
15 if the rate increase goes through they will be asked to
16 pay more than \$2,000,000 for a service that shouldn't cost
17 more than \$350,000.

18 EGNB is a franchise monopoly. It has been granted a
19 monopoly to provide gas distribution service. And the
20 reason typically that you would grant the franchise
21 monopoly is that one company serving the entire market
22 will have huge economies of scale. You could do it
23 cheaper than any individual customer could do it for
24 themselves.

25 So grant them the monopoly, use the Board though stand

1
2 in place of competitors you ensure that the rates that
3 they charge to companies are not excessive, that indeed
4 the public and the customers get the benefits of these
5 economies of scale. And in fact in data responses
6 provided by EGNB they have indicated that the St. Stephen
7 lateral where Flakeboard takes service costs approximately
8 \$250,000 a year. You can throw on some overheads on that,
9 maybe say \$350,000 a year for them to run that lateral.

10 Well they are using that lateral to serve Flakeboard
11 and the rest of St. Stephen. So you break it up and
12 perhaps -- perhaps it costs \$200,000 a year to provide
13 service to Flakeboard. They want to charge \$2,000,000 for
14 that service.

15 So as a Board you are in a position to look at the
16 rates and determine whether or not they are just and
17 reasonable. There is a formula in place based on the cost
18 of oil and the cost of natural gas, and that margin, and
19 the rate stays ten percent under the cost of oil. That's
20 fine in some circumstances. In the current circumstances
21 it's not good and it's not appropriate.

22 I would submit to you that given a franchise monopoly,
23 if this Board did not exist, if there were no regulation
24 whatsoever on the rates, that EGNB most likely would be
25 charging the rates that they are asking to charge today to

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

Flakeboard and American Wallboard and the LFO customers. They would try to charge as much as they possibly could to just barely get under the cost of using oil.

Now in my testimony I say that the market-based rate tied to oil is not an appropriate measure for this company, that the appropriate market-based rate is the cost of an alternative transportation provider. In fact the evidence is that the company trying to build its own line would have a cost of 300, \$350,000 a year for the distribution cost. That's the alternative market-based price for distribution.

When you incorrectly think of it in terms of what is the cost -- alternative cost of oil, you are missing the real economic point, which is when you measure it against oil, EGNB comes in and it will provide a ten percent savings over oil. With EGNB you get that ten percent savings. Without EGNB, if EGNB did not exist, Flakeboard would not be using oil. They would be using natural gas. They would have built their own line for 300, \$350,000 a year and they would be using natural gas. So the appropriate market-based measure would say, all right, with EGNB they are using gas, without EGNB they are using gas. There is no savings in the cost of gas. With EGNB they are paying \$2,000,000 a year for distribution.

1
2 Without EGNB they are paying \$350,000 by building the line
3 themselves or having somebody else build it for them. So
4 it is fundamentally flawed to even think of it in terms of
5 their saving money on the price of oil. They wouldn't be
6 using oil if EGNB were not there.

7 So rather than think of it in terms of all the money
8 they have been saving, it's only appropriate to look at it
9 in terms of how much excess cost are they actually paying,
10 because that's the real economic alternative if EGNB were
11 not here.

12 Now my second recommendation in terms of keeping track
13 of the deferrals has to do with the fact that EGNB is
14 being charged far more than cost right now. And it has
15 been suggested that the reason to charge them more than
16 cost is to keep the deferral account down.

17 So for example, if they are overpaying by a million
18 dollars this year, a million dollars more than their
19 stand-alone cost, EGNB will have deferrals of 18,000,000.
20 If they charge \$300,000 to Flakeboard, they will have
21 \$19,000,000 in deferred costs. So this overcharge is the
22 equivalent of asking Flakeboard to currently pay down the
23 account, the deferred cost account.

24 So I am recommending that they be -- that an account
25 be set up to keep track of how much of the deferred costs

1
2 that otherwise would occur are being charged to Flakeboard
3 now so that they can get credit for that later when it's
4 time to collect the deferred costs.

5 So in a nutshell that's my testimony.

6 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The witness is available for cross
7 examination.

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Stewart, any questions.

9 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. STEWART:

10 Q.7 - Dr. Gaske, to your knowledge does Flakeboard buy its
11 natural gas from Enbridge Gas New Brunswick?

12 A. It's my understanding that they do not.

13 Q.8 - And so to the extent that they save money by buying
14 natural gas, that's a saving brought to them by whomever
15 they buy the gas from and not from Enbridge Gas New
16 Brunswick, isn't that correct?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q.9 - And in fact Enbridge Gas New Brunswick is trying to
19 significantly increase its charges to Flakeboard and not
20 to hand them additional savings in this proceeding,
21 correct?

22 A. That's correct.

23 MR. STEWART: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think we will take a 15 minute
25 break at this point in time. So we will be back at about

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

25 to 11:00.

(Recess - 10:20 a.m. - 10:40 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN: Are you ready to proceed with cross examination, Mr. MacDougall?

CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. MACDOUGALL:

MR. MACDOUGALL: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chair, Panel Members. Good morning, Dr. Gaske. I am going to be referring primarily to FCL-2, which is your evidence, and to FCL-3, which are your IR responses.

Now, Dr. Gaske, if we could refer in your evidence, FCL-2, at page 3, question 4. In here you indicate that the rate described on page 3 of Mr. Charleson's testimony has been referred to as a market-based rate, but then you state that you will explain that it is based on the relationship between the markets for oil and gas, when in your view a true market-based rate for pipeline transportation services would be based on -- some way on costs and/or prices in the pipeline transportation market, correct?

A. That's correct.

Q.10 - Now whatever the nomenclature of the derivation of the CLGS LFO rate being proposed, would you acknowledge that the derivation of the distribution rate that is set out in Mr. Charleson's evidence is generally the method of

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

derivation of this rate that has been used for a number of years in New Brunswick, the methodology?

A. Yes.

Q.11 - And this derivation of the LFO rate is consistent with the derivation of all of EGNB's general rates, correct?

The same methodology is used?

A. Yes.

Q.12 - And it's based on providing a discount to an alternate fuel, correct?

A. Depends on your definition of alternate fuel. As I explained earlier, for Flakeboard the alternate fuel would be natural gas delivered by their own system. So it is not really based on their alternate fuel, it's based on the cost of oil which is not an alternate for them. It might as well be coal from England, to the extent that you are using a hypothetical alternate fuel.

Q.13 - Is Flakeboard a dual fuel customer?

A. That's my understanding.

Q.14 - And the other fuel is light fuel oil, at least in part?

A. They could switch to light fuel oil, yes.

Q.15 - And prior to using natural gas do you know what Flakeboard used?

A. I understand that they used some combination of propane and oil.

1
2 Q.16 - And the approach in the LFO class -- the use of the
3 methodology in the LFO class -- has always used the
4 comparison to LFO, correct? That has been the alternate
5 fuel that has been used for that methodology as long as it
6 has been used in New Brunswick, correct?

7 A. Yes, that has been the assumed alternate.

8 Q.17 - And that approach has been referred to as the market-
9 based rate approach, right?

10 A. That's my understanding, yes.

11 Q.18 - Okay. Now if I could show you an extract -- Mr. Hoyt
12 can hand the document out. This is going to be an extract
13 from the initial decision of this Board dated June 23rd
14 2000, dealing with EGNB's rates and tariffs. And, Dr.
15 Gaske, you see on the front here, you see In the Matter of
16 an Application by Enbridge Gas New Brunswick Inc. for
17 Approval of its Rates and Tariffs, June 23rd 2000?

18 A. Yes, I see that.

19 Q.19 - And if you could turn -- and I have just given you an
20 extract because it's just the relevant pages of the
21 decision dealing with rates -- if you go to page 10 and
22 you will see a heading "Rates", followed by a heading
23 "Target Rates", correct?

24 A. Yes.

1
2 Q.20 - Now directly under the heading "Target Rates" you will
3 see that it says, EGNB proposed that a market-based
4 approach be used for setting target rates during the
5 development period, correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q.21 - And then if we go to the next paragraph, in the first
8 sentence, it says, the market-based approach starts with
9 the premise that the total delivered price of natural gas
10 to the customer must be below the equivalent price for
11 fuel oil, correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q.22 - And then if we can continue on with the paragraph at
14 the bottom of the page, the starting point, therefore, is
15 to estimate the burner tip prices by rate class for the
16 competing fuel and to apply the appropriate discount.
17 This provides the estimated total delivered price for
18 natural gas to the customer, correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q.23 - And then you turn the page, the next step is to back
21 out from this total delivered price, by rate class, the
22 forecast costs of the commodity, transportation tolls,
23 load balancing costs and gas marketers' profit margin.
24 The residual amount is the target price, by class, for
25 distribution, that EGNB proposed to charge, correct?

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

A. That's correct.

Q.24 - And this is generally what EGNB has done in all of its rate cases up to this one and what it is doing in this rate case, correct?

A. That's my understanding.

Q.25 - Okay. And then if we can go over to page 12, and in the last paragraph, first sentence, it says, the Board will approve the market-based methodology of setting target rates as proposed by the Applicant, correct?

A. Yes.

Q.26 - So for the purposes of EGNB's applications from the very outset of its development of a gas distribution system in New Brunswick through to and including today, EGNB and the Board have always understood market-based rates to be as per the methodology first put forward by EGNB back in 2000 and as it is being put forward today, correct?

A. That is the definition of market-based they have used and that is the point of my testimony, that the definition is inappropriate.

Q.27 - That's what has been used since the outset, continues to be used and has been consistently approved by the Board, correct?

A. That's the method. If your question goes to

1
2 market-based that's a different question.

3 Q.28 - No. That the rate has been called by the Board a
4 market-based rate, correct? We just went through it. The
5 Board will approve the market-based methodology. So what
6 they approved they considered and have always considered a
7 market-based methodology, correct?

8 A. For some customers that's probably correct. For
9 others it's not correct.

10 Q.29 - Well let me go back. I just want you to -- let's talk
11 about what the Board has approved.

12 A. Yes. No, I'm agreeing with you that the terminology,
13 market-based rate, is what they have called this, and the
14 point of my testimony is it's a misnomer in some cases.

15 Q.30 - But the methodology Enbridge Gas New Brunswick has put
16 forward -- and I said right at the beginning, regardless
17 of the nomenclature -- has been the methodology that this
18 Board has always approved.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q.31 - And the Board has always approved it as a market-based
21 rate, their terminology.

22 A. They have always used that terminology, yes.

23 Q.32 - Thank you. Now if we can go back to page 10. And
24 again the market-based rate is what EGNB has proposed,
25 correct?

1
2 A. Yes.

3 Q.33 - Now we can tell from your testimony from the discussion
4 that we just had that you are disputing the terminology
5 market-based. But also my understanding, if we flip back
6 to your evidence at question 9, page 7, here you are also
7 stating, if I understand it correctly, that in your view
8 the development period for LFO service is over and there
9 is no longer a need for a commodity price market-based
10 rate to induce conversion, correct?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q.34 - Now did you read the Board's January 18, 2008, decision
13 in the motion for this proceeding?

14 A. Yes, I did.

15 Q.35 - And I would just like to hand you a copy of that.

16 Yesterday the Board said it had -- and probably other
17 parties -- and if we could go to page 2 of the decision.
18 Here you will see in the second paragraph that the Board
19 quotes back to its original June 23, 2000, decision that
20 we were just discussing, correct?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q.36 - And in the first two paragraphs they say as follows,

23 the development period is a term used to describe the
24 amount of time required to move from a greenfield

25 situation to a more established natural gas industry. The

1
2 Board considers that a development period during which a
3 non-traditional regulatory framework would be used is
4 appropriate, do you see that?

5 A. Yes, I do.

6 Q.37 - And the reference was to a non-traditional regulatory
7 framework, correct?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q.38 - And that's what the Board approved at the outset on
10 June 23, 2000?

11 A. Under the circumstances then, yes.

12 Q.39 - And then you will see that the Board goes on to state
13 in the second last paragraph that it has dealt with the
14 appropriate length of development period in two previous
15 decisions, the June 23rd, 2000, decision, which we were
16 just talking about, which was modified by a decision dated
17 January 1, 2005, where the Board -- January 21, 2005 --
18 where the Board stated -- and if we flip to page 3 -- that
19 it finds it appropriate to extend the development period
20 to December 31, 2010, correct?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q.40 - And then if we can go to the first full paragraph on
23 page 3, the Board then concluded on January 18 of this
24 year, that during the development period rates have been
25 set using the market base method. This method establishes

1
2 rates that provide an incentive to convert and to continue
3 to use natural gas. The rates are not based on costs.
4 The difference between the actual costs of providing
5 service and the revenues received from the market-based
6 rates are recorded in a deferral account, correct?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q.41 - Okay. And from what we have recently just gone through
9 there, it is clear that the market-based method that the
10 Board is referring to in this decision is the same
11 approach that EGNB has used since 2000 and is putting
12 forward in this case, correct?

13 A. It's the same method. The circumstances have changed.
14

15 Q.42 - And the Board has as recently as January of this year
16 ruled that those rates are not cost-based, correct?

17 A. That the rates that were in effect in January this
18 year were not cost-based, that's correct.

19 Q.43 - It was during the development period.

20 A. Right. And those are the rates that I have
21 recommended that they keep in place.

22 Q.44 - No. They said that the market-based method -- and then
23 we can just go back to the quote on page 3 -- this method
24 establishes rates that provide an incentive to convert and
25 to continue to use natural gas. The rates are not based

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

on costs. So the rates that derive out of the method the Board has confirmed are not based on costs, correct?

A. That's correct.

Q.45 - And in fact from the quote there we can see that the Board found that in its view not only does this market base rates methodology provide an incentive to convert but an incentive to continue to use natural gas, correct?

A. That is correct.

Q.46 - And now if we could go to the last paragraph on page 3, starting with the second sentence --

A. If I could stop you for just a moment, I should clarify my last response.

Q.47 - Certainly.

A. It does provide an incentive to convert. It provides less of an incentive than if a cost-based rate were in place. So when this was first adopted in 2000 it -- my understanding is that the rate was considerably less than a cost-based rate, and therefore provided a large incentive. Now as opposed to a cost-based rate it provides a disincentive, if your comparison is to a cost-based rate. So --

Q.48 - What evidence on a cost-based rate was provided in the initial hearing?

A. Well earlier Mr. Charleson said that the reason for

1
2 a -- an important reason for adopting this rate which is
3 tied to the cost of oil, was the fact that in the start-up
4 period you initially put a lot of costs in the ground, you
5 know, millions of dollars. And if I remember his
6 testimony correctly, the first person who comes along, if
7 you charge that person the cost-based rate, it would be
8 enormous.

9 Q.49 - Correct.

10 A. And they would never convert. So you used this rate
11 tied to oil. Now I would submit that the circumstances
12 you are under right now are just what he was talking
13 about, that you are using a rate tied to oil, you are
14 paying a distribution rate that is absolutely enormous
15 compared to costs, and that the rationale for providing an
16 incentive to switch is that this is better than a cost-
17 based rate, and I think that was his testimony, that --
18 and so the circumstances then as opposed to now are
19 enormously different.

20 Q.50 - If we can go -- let's follow-up -- if we can go to the
21 last paragraph on page 3, okay, starting with the second
22 sentence. And the Board stated there that market-based
23 rates were necessary to develop the natural gas system in
24 New Brunswick, and the Board believes that they are an
25 essential element of the development period. All

1
2 customers have and continue to benefit from the existence
3 of the natural gas system. It is important to remember
4 that the market-based method of setting rates is designed
5 to provide customers with savings when compared to an
6 alternate source of energy, correct?

7 A. Yes. And that's what I am taking issue with.

8 Q.51 - And the Board stated that on January 18, 2008, correct?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q.52 - Okay. And now we will come to the Board's more
11 specific recent commentary on the issue that we are
12 talking about here that you raised in your evidence,
13 whether in your view the development period for LFO
14 services is over. And in the first full paragraph on page
15 4, the last sentence, the Board states, the Board does not
16 believe that it would be appropriate for the development
17 period to end for one customer class but not for the other
18 customer classes, correct?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q.53 - And then the Board goes on in the next paragraph to say
21 that this means that it must decide if it is appropriate
22 for the purposes of setting rates at this time, less than
23 a month ago, to change from the market-based method,
24 correct?

25 A. That's correct.

1
2 Q.54 - And then if we can just flip down to the last paragraph
3 on this page you will see, and again I quote, "The Board
4 does not consider it appropriate to make a change to the
5 rate setting method that may turn out to have been
6 premature. The consequences of such action could be very
7 significant. The Board believes that any such change
8 should be linked to the end of the development period.
9 The Board, based on the evidence, is convinced that the
10 development period has not yet ended nor will it in the
11 near future. The Board will therefore proceed to set
12 rates on this application using the market-based method",
13 correct?

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q.55 - And the market-based method again being referred to
16 here is the market-based method as always understood in
17 New Brunswick from the onset of EGNB's greenfield natural
18 gas distribution development, correct?

19 A. That is correct.

20 Q.56 - Now in response to -- and I don't think you have to
21 turn this up, it's very quick. In response to EGNB IR-
22 7(b) you confirm that EGNB's rate application is with
23 respect to the CLGS LFO class as a whole, correct?

24 A. That is correct.

25 Q.57 - And if we could turn again to the Board's January 18

1
2 decision at page 4, in the first full paragraph, and here
3 the Board stated, "The Board believes that the most
4 appropriate way to set rates is by grouping customers into
5 various classes and to set rates for each separate class.
6 It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to set
7 rates on an individual customer basis. The Board
8 continues to believe that it is appropriate to use the
9 same method for setting rates for all classes. Further,
10 the Board does not believe that it would be appropriate
11 for the development period to end for one customer class
12 but not for the other customer classes", correct?

13 A. That's what the Board says here and I have some
14 clarifications of that.

15 Q.58 - But that's what the Board found a month ago?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q.59 - And now if we can go to your evidence at question 3,
18 page 2, in the fourth line of your response you make the
19 statement that the existing rates for service to
20 Flakeboard are excessive, correct?

21 A. That is correct.

22 Q.60 - And you are talking about the current Board approved
23 rates for Flakeboard there, right?

24 A. That is correct.

25 Q.61 - And the current rates were approved by the Board in its

1
2 decision of December 15, 2005?

3 A. That is correct.

4 Q.62 - And they were approved consistent with the market-based
5 approach that have been used throughout by EGNB?

6 A. That is correct.

7 Q.63 - Now if the Board approves market-based rates during the
8 development period then those rates are the rates to be
9 chargeable and collectible from the customers during that
10 period, correct?

11 A. The Board sets rates, yes.

12 Q.64 - And that's what EGNB charges?

13 A. And EGNB charges that, yes.

14 Q.65 - And they can't charge any more than the maximum rate
15 approved by this Board?

16 A. That's correct. And the Board holds hearings to
17 determine what are just and reasonable rates, what are
18 excessive rates.

19 Q.66 - And the Board found the rates that are currently being
20 charged to be just and reasonable in its December 15,
21 2005, decision, correct, or they approved those rates?

22 A. They approved those rates.

23 Q.67 - And as we have previously discussed, the Board recently
24 reiterated in its January 18 decision that the market-
25 based rates are specifically not based on costs, correct?

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

A. That is correct.

Q.68 - Now, Mr. Gaske, using the CLGS LFO methodology to date, the methodology that has created the rates to date, would you concur that there has been significant take up by LFO customers of natural gas in the Province of New Brunswick?

A. I'm not sure that I can answer that.

Q.69 - Okay. Well let's go to an IR then, Flakeboard IR 2(c).

This is EGNB's response to Flakeboard IR 2(c).

VICE CHAIRMAN: What volume is that in, Mr. MacDougall? I get these confused sometimes.

MR. MACDOUGALL: Let me just check my exhibit list here.

MR. LAWSON: A-4.

VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Q.70 - It wasn't the second copy, it was the first.

A. I may have the wrong item.

Q.71 - This would be EGNB's response to Flakeboard IR number 2. You may not have that. Maybe Mr. Hoyt could show you his copy. That's it.

A. Yes, I have it.

Q.72 - So here my question was whether you could concur there has been significant take up by LFO customers of natural gas in the province, okay.

So maybe if we could just go to the second page of this response, item (c), and here we are talking about LFO

1
2 total market potential, correct?

3 A. Yes. The problem I had with your initial question was
4 the Province of New Brunswick, the province is large
5 geographically. I believe this is probably confined to
6 those portions that are -- I just don't know whether we
7 could in the far western part of the province there is
8 significant --

9 Q.73 - Sure.

10 A. -- potential -- that's where my problem lies.

11 Q.74 - Okay. Well in the area in which Enbridge Gas
12 distribution system is available, or close to that area,
13 would you say there has been significant take up where
14 natural gas has been available?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q.75 - And that take up has occurred based on the rates that
17 have been provided for those customers based on the
18 approved methodology from the beginning of EGNB's gas
19 distribution system up to today, right?

20 A. That is correct.

21 Q.76 - Thank you. So the market-based approach used to date
22 has been successful in the LFO class, correct, in
23 achieving its goal?

24 A. I would have to ask you what the goal is.

25 Q.77 - The goal of getting customers to convert to natural

1
2 gas.

3 A. If that's the goal, yes.

4 Q.78 - And to continue to use natural gas.

5 A. For the most part, yes.

6 Q.79 - Thank you. And consistent with that EGNB's approach,
7 and you would have heard this from Mr. Charleson
8 yesterday, has been to try to maximize conversions
9 consistent with keeping the deferral account as low as
10 possible, correct? There is a balance, maximize
11 conversions but keep the deferral account?

12 A. Yes. That's the part of my testimony that addresses
13 the rates that are being asked of Flakeboard to keep the
14 deferral account down.

15 Q.80 - Now if we could flip back to the January 18, 2000,
16 decision. And if we could go to the third full paragraph,
17 the last sentence.

18 A. Is that January 18, 2008, or --

19 Q.81 - Yes.

20 A. Okay.

21 MR. TONER: What page?

22 MR. MACDOUGALL: Page 4.

23 Q.82 - And again if we can go to the third full paragraph, and
24 in the last sentence on page 4, third full paragraph, it
25 states that the Board also has a responsibility to EGNB to

1
2 ensure that it has a reasonable opportunity to recover its
3 prudently incurred investment which includes the deferral
4 account and to earn a return on that investment, correct?

5 A. That's what it says, yes.

6 Q.83 - And it's generally understood, is it not, in regulatory
7 theory that utilities are entitled to earn a reasonable
8 opportunity -- or entitled to a reasonable opportunity to
9 recover their costs and earn a fair return on their
10 capital?

11 A. Yes. And so there is no misunderstanding, I'm not --
12 nothing in my recommendation would challenge that or in my
13 view even endanger that. So to the extent there is some
14 misinterpretation that my testimony suggests such a thing,
15 it absolutely does not.

16 Q.84 - There is no misinterpretation. I just wanted to
17 confirm to the Board that that's generally understood.
18 Now, Dr. Gaske, if we could go to your response to EGNB
19 IR-7(c). That would be FCL-3.

20 Q.85 - EGNB -- Flakeboard response to EGNB 7(c). Here you
21 were asked to identify all other jurisdictions in which
22 you had worked which had a rate setting methodology
23 substantially the same as that currently used in New
24 Brunswick. And you stated that you do not recall any
25 jurisdictions that set regulated rates in the same manner

1
2 as the CLGS LFO rate, correct?

3 A. That is correct.

4 Q.86 - And you were not involved in any of the processes
5 leading to the development of the initial rates approach
6 taken in New Brunswick, were you?

7 A. No.

8 Q.87 - Now at the bottom of your response to 7(c) you state
9 that in contrast EGNB's customers do not voluntarily pay
10 the LFO rate in the short run because no cost-based rate
11 is available to them, and it may be the case that no
12 competitive transportation service is available to them
13 either, correct?

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q.88 - What I am just struggling with here is the first part
16 of that. You say EGNB's customers do not voluntarily pay
17 the LFO rate, but EGNB's customers do voluntarily pay the
18 LFO rate that is currently in place, do they not? No one
19 has forced them to pay that rate?

20 A. As I understand it, Flakeboard tried to build its own
21 line and was involuntarily prevented from doing so, which
22 means that involuntarily they -- the only -- or the best --
23 - next best alternative available to them was the EGNB
24 rate, and through EGNB's strong and aggressive
25 intervention and their attempt to build their own line,

1
2 they ultimately concluded that they would not get approval
3 for it, so involuntarily they chose the next best
4 alternative. So --

5 Q.89 - But they do voluntarily pay that rate, don't they?

6 They could use what they were using. They could have
7 stayed on what they were using. They were in business
8 previously, correct?

9 A. That's part of the point of my testimony, is that they
10 would not have continued doing what they were doing. They
11 were going to build their own line.

12 Q.90 - You are not a lawyer? You are not qualified to be a
13 lawyer? You are not putting any legal testimony forward
14 here?

15 A. No, no. This is economic testimony.

16 Q.91 - But you are not making any comment on the regulatory
17 regime in New Brunswick as to the rights or not rights of
18 any party to build a gas distribution system?

19 A. No. This is an economic and ratemaking question.

20 Q.92 - Here you say in contrast, EGNB's customers do not
21 voluntarily pay the LFO rate. What other customers were
22 you talking about?

23 A. Well I believe American Wallboard --

24 Q.93 - Atlantic Wallboard.

25 A. -- I'm sorry -- Atlantic Wallboard has basically been

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

through the same process. They -- if they had their preferred voluntary option, they would have built their own line and taken their own service.

Q.94 - But you can't legally state whether they have that preferred option?

A. It's not -- it's not a legal opinion. It's a factual opinion or a factual statement that these are companies that wanted to build their own, they were denied or perceived that they would be denied that opportunity, and so they involuntarily went to their next best option.

Q.95 - They both freely of their own volition signed up as customers with Enbridge Gas New Brunswick, correct?

A. Well --

Q.96 - I think that's a yes or no question.

A. I guess in the context of my prior answer the answer is no. That was not -- that was not their preferred option.

Q.97 - It was not their preferred option but they voluntarily chose to go with EGNB. No one forced them to do that.

A. They took -- they involuntarily took their second best option, yes.

Q.98 - And I think we had testimony yesterday from various parties, the parties were aware of the existing regulatory regime in New Brunswick and the rate setting methodology

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

when they entered into their contract.

A. That is correct.

Q.99 - Now if we could go to EGNB IR-8, your response to EGNB IR-8. And here we refer to your evidence that EGNB had already achieved 100 percent conversion of all accessible LFO customers, correct?

A. Yes.

Q.100 - And then we asked, would Flakeboard have been considered an accessible customer prior to the construction of the St. Stephen lateral, and you said that it would because accessible means a location that can be easily reached, correct?

A. Easily reached and economical.

Q.101 - And yesterday do you remember Mr. Charleson stating that the distance from the main line to Flakeboard was approximately 13 kilometres?

A. Yes.

Q.102 - Do you also remember the testimony from Mr. Charleson either yesterday or the day before talking about the other five customers who remain potential LFO customers?

A. Yes.

Q.103 - And that at least four of those customers were closer than 13 kilometres?

A. I recall that and it didn't seem to provide enough

1
2 information to determine whether they were in fact
3 accessible.

4 Q.104 - Well you base your decision here for Flakeboard -- you
5 said they would be accessible means a location that can be
6 easily reached. What analysis had you done to determine
7 how easily reachable St. Stephen was compared to any other
8 customer?

9 A. The point of easily reached on an economical basis,
10 and some of the missing data, have to do with the size of
11 the customer. In pipelines there are enormous economies
12 of scale. So for example, if you double the size of the
13 pipe you probably won't even double the cost, but you will
14 get four times the volume.

15 If you have a pipe that is five times as large you
16 might have three times the cost and 25 times the volume.
17 So on a per unit basis the costs become quite low and
18 certain customers become highly economical. Flakeboard
19 was economical. They had a price of around \$300,000 to do
20 it themselves. As I understand it they offered to build
21 the line and also throw in enough capacity and give the
22 line to EGNB, so that EGNB could serve Saint John with
23 zero cost investment.

24 Now in contrast you would have the five other
25 customers. I don't know the volumes for those customers,

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

whether you are talking about customers who are nearby but would be served by an extremely small diameter pipe with huge costs per unit, or per unit kilometre. But what is very clear from Mr. Charleson's testimony is that, if I remember correctly, a few of these customers you are not even negotiating with, that one customer you have been talking to for four or five years and haven't been able to sign up.

So -- and I believe there was some testimony that they have gone out and they have signed up -- the low hanging fruit was the term used. So you have got five customers listed here that, for whatever reason, haven't been signed up and there could be any number of reasons why they are not signed up, but I would assume if it's economical to do so it would have happened.

Q.105 - But you are assuming that all customers -- so when do all customers make a decision to sign up? There is never any potential? Like if it's economical to do so you will get all the customers? Where in the greenfield situation?

A. In my experience one of the first things that you do is you could go out and you sign up the big customers because they make a great anchor. And when it's economical to do so, they will sign up pretty quickly because the big customers tend to be businesses. So you

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

will probably get switching faster out of most businesses and large customers than you will for residences.

Q.106 - You will acknowledge that there is five remaining customers shown in the potentiality column for Enbridge Gas New Brunswick?

A. Yes. And they are listed as not signed up regardless of their location as opposed to on the natural gas main or as opposed to in close proximity. So they are not listed as in close proximity, they are not signed up. I -- the testimony of Mr. Charleson really didn't suggest that you were on the verge of actually signing any of them.

Q.107 - No. I'm just saying they are in the potentiality column.

A. That's correct.

Q.108 - So now if we could go to EGNB IR-9(c). You were asked if the delivered cost of natural gas is less than that of light fuel oil, would you agree that this would give the customer an advantage by switching from light fuel oil to natural gas?

And in your response you gave a series of qualifiers before you concluded that the company would achieve a partial advantage by switching from light fuel oil to natural gas, and because of your response I just want to revisit it. Maybe we have to clarify the question.

1
2 The question really is, all else being equal, the
3 manufacturing facility has access only to light fuel oil
4 but then -- or any fuel oil product -- but then has access
5 to natural gas at a cheaper price than the fuel oil
6 product, is it not in a better position than before the
7 natural gas became available to them, all other things
8 being equal?

9 A. Not necessarily.

10 Q.109 - Okay. So all things being equal, you have to pay for
11 an alternative fuel say \$10 a gigajoule, and nothing else
12 changes, but you have a new fuel at \$9 a gigajoule, that
13 is -- you are not better off, all other things being
14 equal?

15 A. Flakeboard is in a position where --

16 Q.110 - That's not my question, if I just could, Dr. Gaske --
17 that's not my position. I'm not talking about Flakeboard.
18 I'm just giving a hypothetical.

19 A. And I said not necessarily and I was going to explain
20 why I said not necessarily.

21 Q.111 - Okay.

22 A. Flakeboard is in a position where it competes with
23 other companies in North America, primarily companies who
24 are on natural gas. Those companies buy natural gas, they
25 pay a distribution charge, and they produce.

1
2 Now in theory if Flakeboard goes to natural gas and
3 it's cheaper, they can compete with those customers. They
4 pay for natural gas and then they pay a reasonable
5 distribution charge on top of it. Now the competitors in
6 North America, their cost of gas have gone up some, but
7 their distribution charge didn't go up. What -- in
8 Flakeboard's case, the price that it's being charged is
9 tied to the price of oil.

10 Q.112 - I think, Dr. Gaske, you are way past my question.

11 A. I am explaining why not necessarily.

12 Q.113 - No.

13 A. There has been a huge divergence between gas and oil
14 costs, so that EGNB is soaking up the difference. So --

15 Q.114 - That's not my question, Dr. Gaske.

16 A. -- having switched to natural gas in order to match
17 its competitors, it's at a disadvantage because it's --
18 the price that it pays for its fuel is still tied to the
19 price of oil. And so for them making the switch and
20 seeing the competitors have a constant -- well for your
21 hypothetical purposes -- a constant price of gas, and them
22 being in the position where they pay for gas and then
23 their distribution charge, keeps them tied to the oil
24 price which is diverged by in essence being on EGNB's
25 current rate structure they might as well be on oil, they

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

get a small advantage but they are highly disadvantaged against the other -- the people they compete against.

Q.115 - Dr. Gaske, turn to your evidence at A-9. And also in response -- and you don't have to pull it up -- in response to EGNB IR-11(a) you appeared to be insinuating that EGNB is no longer trying to build the business by attracting new customers, correct?

A. That's what this pricing would suggest, yes.

Q.116 - If we could turn to EGNB's response to Flakeboard IR-1. Again, that is in A-4.

A. I'm sorry. I'm going to have to look for it here.

Q.117 - Counsel may have it. It is EGNB's response to Flakeboard IR number 1.

A. I do have it.

Q.118 - It doesn't matter if you are using table 1.

MR. LAWSON: A-6 is correct, I believe. A-6 I think is the one.

A. That was my problem. I had A-6.

Q.119 - Now if we could see here, and just to start out, you will see in the SGS --

A. Which -- where was it?

Q.120 - IR number 1. The CGSGS class runs out to 2006. And I just wanted to make sure that we are all on the same page here.

1
2 But then you will see there is three SGS or four SGS
3 numbers that follow below that for 2007?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q.121 - Do you see that? And is it your understanding that
6 the class was broken up between '06 and '07 so that those
7 numbers would be reflective of the SGS class?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q.122 - So with that in mind, could you confirm that this
10 chart shows that clearly from the beginning till now there
11 has been an increasing number of conversions in the
12 various classes?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q.123 - And you will see in LFO tier 1 in 2006 there were 18
15 customers. And by 2007, following the most recent rate
16 decision, we have 20 customers, correct?

17 A. That is correct.

18 Q.124 - Okay. And you understand, don't you, Dr. Gaske, that
19 EGNB's development period did not propose to exist in
20 perpetuity, but eventually it is anticipated that EGNB
21 will be more like a mature gas utility, correct?

22 A. That is correct.

23 Q.125 - And to get to that period EGNB needed to develop a
24 base of customers. It is that discussion you were relying
25 on, about Mr. Charleson's discussion yesterday, correct?

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

A. That is correct.

MR. MACDOUGALL: Those are all my questions, Mr. Chair.

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Dr. Gaske.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacDougall. Ms. Desmond?

MS. DESMOND: Mr. Chair, we have just one question for

Dr. Gaske.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY MS. DESMOND:

Q.126 - Sir, given that the Board has decided that the method for setting rates is to be the same for all classes -- at least it has made that decision in previous Board rulings -- what would be the market-based comparison for the other rate classes other than the LFO class?

A. I want to make it clear that I'm not proposing to change the method. The rates that are currently in place are based on this method.

However, the Board can choose to keep these rates in place and continue them and take notice of the fact that the divergence between gas and oil costs has become enormous compared to its historical relationship, and simply say the rates will be based on this methodology, but the rates that are currently in place based on this methodology will continue.

And so I hope that answers your question. I'm not really saying change the method for them at this point in

1
2 time. I'm saying simply keep the current rate in place,
3 which is based on the current method.

4 Q.127 - I had understood from your evidence that for the
5 purpose of determining a market-based rate the Board would
6 look at competitive cost?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q.128 - How would that proxy be determined for other rate
9 classes?

10 A. For large customers you could -- if you were to do a
11 stand-alone cost -- normally you wouldn't -- you wouldn't
12 necessarily do a stand-alone cost, but that would give you
13 the upper limit on what you should be charging. You would
14 do an analysis of the specific cost to serve that
15 customer.

16 And I think the testimony of the EGNB witnesses was
17 that they go out and they do something like net present
18 value analysis to determine the cost of serving a
19 particular customer.

20 And so they are doing a calculation already for large
21 customers. And so you can use that calculation to figure
22 an upper limit on what that customer should be charged,
23 for the large customers.

24 Normally when you go to a cost-based method you do a
25 cost allocation. Because there are a lot of customers who

1
2 serve jointly on a common basis, using a lot of the same
3 facilities. And you can't attribute those facilities
4 solely to any one of them.

5 Q.129 - Proxy for the residential class then would be a cost-
6 based method, is that --

7 A. At some point I understand it is anticipated that you
8 will move to a cost-based rate. Yet you wouldn't take
9 them off of the market-based proxy.

10 However it is probably just as true for them that this
11 huge differential in oil and gas prices that has developed
12 recently is something that didn't exist before.

13 And the Board for them could take the same option and
14 say, we are not changing the method, we are just using our
15 authority to deny a rate change at this time, and continue
16 in place with what were perfectly satisfactory rates four
17 months ago or even today.

18 MS. DESMOND: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Desmond. Any questions from the
20 Board? Mr. Toner?

21 BY MR. TONER:

22 Q.130 - Good morning. A few things that you said struck me
23 during your testimony. And I just want you to clear them
24 up. Because I do understand your position as an expert.
25 So at one point in your testimony you interrupted him.

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

And you wanted to clear up yourself. And you stated that the market-based method to calculate would create a disincentive for LFO customers. Is that --

A. The context of the question was that going back to an earlier Board decision where it was stated that using the market-based approach instead of a cost-based approach would give an incentive for customers to switch over.

So my clarification was that in fact you are probably in a position now where this market-based approach is a disincentive if you were to compare it to a cost-based approach.

Q.131 - For the distribution rate or for the burner tip?

A. For the distribution rate then, that if -- I will use Flakeboard as an example. If six years ago a company like Flakeboard had come along and then offered a \$2 million rate, that would have been a disincentive, if it was a cost-based rate. That would have been a disincentive.

So there was a decision that let's tie it to the price of oil. And maybe the rate would have been 500,000. So that gave them a big incentive to switch instead of having a cost-based rate.

Q.132 - Compared to?

A. Compared to a cost-based rate.

Q.133 - For using?

1
2 A. For using gas versus oil. You wouldn't use a cost-
3 based rate because nobody would switch. So you used a
4 market-based to get people to switch.

5 Q.134 - Now when you are using -- when you are saying cost-
6 based you are taking into account their distance of 13
7 miles from the line?

8 A. I am taking that into account.

9 Q.135 - So if another customer was 100 feet from the line he
10 should pay nothing for the distribution system across the
11 province?

12 A. Now initially back then they had a lot of costs sunk
13 in the ground but very few customers. So I think the
14 testimony was if you have \$2 million then the first
15 customer comes along. If you take that customer you will
16 have to charge that customer \$2 million, the whole cost.
17 So that customer will never come along.

18 So to start out, to get things going and attract
19 customers, we will charge just a little bit less than the
20 oil price in total, maybe \$500,000 for those big customers
21 and we will sign a bunch of them up.

22 And after you get a bunch of them signed up you have
23 got millions of dollars. You divide 20 customers into
24 these millions of dollars. And maybe your cost-based rate
25 now is \$300,000 apiece. Your market-based rate started at

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

500,000 because you didn't have customers. And you would have charged them 2,000,000.

It is all these years later there is this huge gap in oil and gas prices that just developed recently. And suddenly you are asking them to pay \$2 million. You could have asked them to do that in the beginning when they were the only customer hypothetically.

So \$2 million does give you a key incentive to switch, but --

Q.136 - Well, 10 percent?

A. Yes, 10 percent. But if you were to go to a cost-based rate I'm convinced it would be much, much lower. So the crux of my testimony was eight years ago the cost-based rate would have been way too high. And so they went to this method.

Now I think circumstances probably flipped considerably. And the cost-based rate would be the lower one. And if you are talking about incentives to switch, the cost-based rate is a much better incentive now than the rate that's tied to oil.

Q.137 - Do you believe that your customer -- and I'm saying Flakeboard because you are basically representing them --

A. Sure.

Q.138 - -- right. And so you are familiar with their

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

operation somewhat?

A. Somewhat.

Q.139 - All else being equal, if they were to open for business today, would they not locate where they are located now, just strictly because of the market-based? And I'm pushing you all the way to the burner tip.

Would they go to another jurisdiction because there is a significant savings? Or is it still a just and reasonable burner tip rate --

A. I don't --

Q.140 - -- everything else being equal?

A. Everything else being equal, I think what they would do is locate along the Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline and tap directly into it and get that rate.

Q.141 - So not necessarily in this jurisdiction?

A. It would be -- yes. It would be in this province.

Q.142 - Still in New Brunswick?

A. It would be in the province of New Brunswick. But it would be under NEB jurisdiction. And they would tap right into that. And they would get a cost-based rate.

MR. TONER: Thank you. That is all the questions.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Johnston?

VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

BY THE VICE CHAIRMAN:

1
2 Q.143 - Dr. Gaske, I have a couple of topics I want to talk to
3 you about.

4 You make two recommendations to the Board. The first
5 is to keep rates where they are now. And the second, if I
6 understand correctly, is to set up and to order a cost
7 allocation study which would then be used, among other
8 things, to deal with the existing deferral account, among
9 other purposes.

10 You have seen our decision from last month. And it
11 has been reviewed with Mr. MacDougall here quite a bit
12 this morning.

13 And you are aware that the Board has ordered that we
14 will be holding a generic hearing into the material
15 dealing with the -- to the matters dealing with the end of
16 the development period, what the criteria will be and what
17 the transition will be.

18 Given that, I'm just wondering why you believe it will
19 be appropriate in this proceeding to order the cost
20 allocation study?

21 A. Simply for accounting purposes to keep track of those
22 dollars. I think as I indicated, a lot of the testimony
23 here is that Wallboard and Flakeboard need to pay very,
24 very high prices, much higher than they could do it
25 themselves, because it will hold down the size of the

1
2 deferral account.

3 So the cost study at this point would be fairly
4 simple. But it would be based on stand-alone costs.
5 EGNB probably has a calculation of the cost that it took
6 to connect these customers.

7 And you simply account for and keep track of how much
8 excessive costs are they paying now in order to hold down
9 the deferral account. Because later on that deferral
10 account is going to be collected from customers.

11 But you have some customers that are paying less than
12 cost. And that is why it is building up. But you have a
13 few large, very large customers who are paying far more
14 than cost. And it would almost be adding insult to
15 injury.

16 First charge them \$1 1/2 million more than cost now to
17 hold down the size of the deferral account, and then turn
18 around in a couple of years and start charging them for
19 the deferral account along with everyone else.

20 Q.144 - I understand what you are saying, Dr. Gaske. But I
21 guess my point is that the Board has put in place a
22 process for ending the development period, which
23 presumably is going to have some directions with respect
24 to cost allocation throughout the whole system.

25 And your suggestion, if I understand you correctly, is

1
2 that we order cost allocation for the LFO class only, is
3 that right?

4 A. Yes, just for purposes of accounting.

5 Q.145 - But wouldn't the same argument be equally true with
6 respect to every other class requiring cost allocation
7 study, the same purposes, who should pay and who should
8 not?

9 A. Right. And let me clarify one thing. With the large
10 customers it should be a relatively simple exercise.
11 Because -- and it should be done on an individual company-
12 by-company basis.

13 As EGNB indicated, when they build a line out to a
14 large customer they usually will do the analysis in-house.
15 They know what the cost of the lines are to connect those
16 customers.

17 Within the LFO class you have -- in fact you got into
18 this discussion the other day -- you have got 20
19 customers. But in a lot of the data EGNB pulls out the
20 two really big ones because they are 20 times the size of
21 the average of the other 18. And so a lot of data they
22 actually pulled them out and treated them separately.

23 Later when you move to cost-based rates you probably
24 won't define a class as LFO. The LFO is based on the fact
25 that all these customers have one thing in common,

1
2 alternate fuel oil. If you -- so that's their alternative
3 market. It has nothing to do with their costs.

4 When you go to the cost-based rates you will probably
5 redefine. There won't be an LFO class. It will be some
6 class that is grouped together based on similar cost
7 characteristics.

8 And so by keeping track of how much these large
9 customers are overpaying now to hold down the deferral
10 account, when you split the LFO class say into really
11 large customers who have a low per unit cost and much
12 smaller LFO customers who might have a higher unit cost,
13 you would like credit for the deferrals to follow whoever
14 is going to what class, so you can make those allocations.

15
16 Q.146 - Mr. Reed testified yesterday -- and I think I had some
17 questions with him -- he suggested that there should be a
18 separate class for the two formal intervenors in this
19 case.

20 Is that what you would foresee as well? Because you
21 seem to be going one step further and talking about
22 individual rates for the individual customers.

23 A. Right. Now I would see that the basic rate would be a
24 class rate, say the two customers would be lumped
25 together.

1
2 And then some decision would have to be made on the
3 amount of deferrals that have been paid down in advance by
4 these customers, the amount of incentives that were given
5 to these customers.

6 Those would be recovered as a surcharge. And the
7 Board would have to make a decision on how to levy the
8 surcharges to get the deferral costs and whatever
9 incentive costs there are in the class.

10 Q.147 - I may be getting off the topic of this hearing. But
11 it is in the evidence.

12 Are you opposed in general to the idea of the postage
13 stamp rates for distribution of gas to large customers?
14 Is that what I take from your evidence?

15 A. Not -- not as an absolute principle, no.

16 Q.148 - Let me ask you this question, Doctor, and soon. If we
17 have another customer -- there has been another customer
18 discussed in these proceedings, customer X, which -- let
19 us hypothetically say that they would be similar in usage
20 to the two Formal Intervenors in this case.

21 We know that they are approximately double the
22 distance away from the line, as slightly more than
23 Flakeboard.

24 Would you see their cost as being doubled? Should
25 they be brought on as a customer as compared to

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

Flakeboard's costs?

A. The real question, the additional variable in that, would be the size of the customer and the diameter of the pipe.

Q.149 - Well, I'm hypothetically suggesting that they are a similar --

A. Similar size.

Q.150 - -- size customer to Flakeboard?

A. If the allocated cost -- if you lump them all together and you have an allocated cost, you often will test it to make sure that there is no customer in the group that is paying more than their stand-alone cost.

So for example if Flakeboard's stand-alone cost is \$350,000, you lump these people together, and Flakeboard is paying an average price of \$320,000, then they call belong in the same class.

The big test is whether or not you have some customers you are charging really excessive rates relative to their cost. And when you have that then you need to separate them out.

So to answer your question, you would probably do an analysis where you lump them together, see what the answer is and then test it for reasonableness for each of the big customers.

1
2 Q.151 - I'm going to summarize. There would be a
3 substantially different rate, correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Radford?

7 BY MR. RADFORD:

8 Q.152 - Over the last three days I have been listening very
9 closely to the evidence presented. Because I'm getting
10 myself an education out of this. And obviously you have a
11 tremendous background.

12 I believe I understand the economics of it. But then
13 when Mr. MacDougall took you through step by step through
14 the decisions of this Board, long before I was ever
15 involved, and he took you carefully through it -- and if
16 this Board is consistent with what it has been doing for
17 the last eight years, what choices do we have?

18 Would you just outline what choices you think we have?

19 A. Well, I believe the Board has already ruled that this
20 hearing will not involve a change in the methodology. But
21 I also believe that the Board has the ability to, even
22 within that context, to give thumbs up or thumbs down on
23 this rate change, to continue using the market-based
24 method but continue in place the existing market-based
25 rates, and in essence to say no to the application.

1
2 I think that would be consistent with what you have
3 done in the past. But at the same time I would guess that
4 you probably never said no to one of these applications
5 before. But the circumstances are pretty unusual right
6 now, where the spread between gas and oil prices has
7 become enormous.

8 So a company like Flakeboard is currently paying about
9 \$1.2 million a year, which is a big rate for this service.
10 You can say no to the increase and they will continue to
11 pay \$1.2 million a year. Or you can give it thumbs up and
12 say that they should pay \$2 million a year and that is
13 reasonable.

14 So I think you are consistent with past decisions if
15 you exercise your authority to say no. I think that has
16 always been one of -- every time it has come up before the
17 Board that has always been an option.

18 MR. RADFORD: Thank you.

19 BY MR. TONER:

20 Q.153 - I would like your thoughts on the 21-day average that
21 they have used to come up with this rate versus 365 or 90
22 or 60, like two months, three months of past to
23 extrapolate what the future is going to give.

24 What are your thoughts on that?

25 A. I think a fairly long period of time is appropriate.

1
2 This -- I believe one of the EGNB explained the other day,
3 the idea to use the margin between oil and gas was adopted
4 because the two tend to correlate with each other. They
5 will move together.

6 Q.154 - But you know that it has been higher then? Natural
7 gas has been higher then?

8 A. Yes, yes. And so --

9 Q.155 - In the recent past?

10 A. Right. And so what you really want is some kind of a
11 margin that will stay fair constant, so that -- you know,
12 gas prices go up and oil prices go up, they are still 50
13 cents apart. Or they go down, they are still 50 cents
14 apart, something fairly close to that.

15 And I think -- so you would want a much longer term
16 average to look at. And when people go out and make their
17 investments to buy equipment to switch to gas, they do it
18 based -- not based on what the last 21 days were, but they
19 do it based on a longer term average. So if the last 21
20 days it slips or what not, that doesn't have a big impact
21 on their decision.

22 So I think a much longer term average is appropriate
23 for setting this rate. It would certainly give EGNB a
24 little more certainty as to what the rate is going to be.
25 And it would very much give the customers a little more

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

certainty as to what the rate is going to be.

Q.156 - But if you were to take a 365 day average of the U. S. exchange rate --

A. Yes.

Q.157 - -- would that give you a realistic future right now?

And I don't think -- I don't know if you are an expert on the U. S. exchange rate, but you must be familiar with it. A 365 day average of the U. S. exchange rate would not give you a precise future?

A. No.

Q.158 - But a 21 day it would?

A. The thing here though is that you are not trying to get an accurate estimate of say the exchange rate or even an accurate estimate of the oil price. You are trying to get an accurate estimate of the spread between the two.

And so you can take a long-term average and you can come up with a number like 50 cents and say, we don't need to know absolutely where oil and gas prices are going but we will keep the spread at 50 cents.

This proceeding now is about the fact that you have got an existing spread in place. Are you going to change that spread or continue with the existing spread?

And I would submit that a 21-day average to increase the spread as much as they are asking to increase it isn't

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

a very good indicator of what the market for the distribution service ought to be.

Nor do I think it has a huge impact on people switching in the long term -- that the 21-day average isn't driving people's decisions to switch.

I don't -- to the extent they want to attract any more customers, I don't think those customers are looking at the 21-day average and saying yes, we will spend \$3 million to convert our equipment because of this average.

They probably look at the last two or three years and say would that kind of average justify switching over.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lawson, any redirect?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LAWSON:

Q.159 - Just for clarification, in reference to providing service free to St. Stephen, you indicated in your testimony that the offer was made to Flakeboard to provide the lines so that they could provide free service to Saint John.

I'm assuming you meant St. Stephen, for clarification?

A. Yes. Yes, I did.

Q.160 - It would be along the extra line?

A. New Brunswick has a lot of saints.

Q.161 - In cross examination by Mr. MacDougall reference was made to IR number 9 on this question of the switch to

1
2 competitive advantage. I'm just going to refer you to
3 that if I could please.

4 And the question that is in that interrogatory -- and
5 it is FCL-3 if you want to turn to it, number 9 -- the
6 question was "If the delivered cost of natural gas is less
7 than light fuel oil, do you agree that this would give the
8 customer an advantage by switching?"

9 Now am I correct that your answers are an advantage
10 with respect to competitors?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q.162 - Okay. What would your answer be with respect to an
13 advantage of one fuel over the other, bearing in mind that
14 this doesn't address the issue of distribution rates?

15 A. I'm not sure I totally understand your question the
16 way you qualify it.

17 Q.163 - All right. I just wanted to make sure it was clear.
18 Because when I read this question I read it differently
19 than you answered it. And that is the reason why I was
20 phrasing it.

21 And I'm going to have stand beside you for the next
22 question because we have to share the book, the
23 interrogatories in.

24 There was a reference in A-6 again to the level of
25 customers. I'm not sure if Mr. MacDougall referred to the

number of customers. Or was it --

MR. MACDOUGALL: Chart I.

MR. LAWSON: Chart I?

MR. MACDOUGALL: Correct. Yes.

Q.164 - With the actual number of customers. So there has been a substantial growth in the number of customers, wouldn't you agree?

A. Yes.

Q.165 - Can you comment about that growth is and how it relates to the distribution -- I'm sorry, the growth and incentives?

And just for your reference, the incentives sheet details -- I would have had this sooner but I didn't have the book -- is in Flakeboard interrogatory number 5, the answer there.

A. Mmmm. That is where it says the financial incentives provided by EGNB to the customers who are identified in the table below. And the dollar amount of incentives has increased considerably from one year to the next.

So I presume that they are providing larger and larger incentives to continue to grow. So they were --

Q.166 - And how does that correlate to the numbers in the number of customers in the growth as you see it?

A. Well --

1
2 Q.167 - Just generally, not --

3 A. Yes.

4 Q.168 - -- specifics.

5 A. Yes. From 2006 to 2007 the incentives almost doubled,
6 a little less than doubled. And the number of customers
7 went up somewhat less than that. So the incentives seem
8 to be growing faster than the customers.

9 MR. LAWSON: Those are all the questions I have. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lawson. Thank you, Dr. Gaske for
11 your attendance here today and your evidence.

12 WITNESS: Thank you.

13 (The witness stepped down)

14 CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn until I think 2:00 o'clock. We
15 have a motion at 1:00 o'clock. And I don't really know
16 how long that is going to take. The Public Intervenor and
17 Mr. Hoyt are both involved in that.

18 So we will adjourn until 2:00 o'clock at which time we
19 will hear the comments from the informal intervenors and
20 then argument from the applicant. And the intervenors
21 will be heard tomorrow morning commencing at 9:00 o'clock.

22 So for now we will adjourn this hearing till 2:00
23 o'clock this afternoon.

24 (Recess - 12:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.)

25 CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. This afternoon we have set aside

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

to allow the informal intervenors an opportunity to address the Board with respect to this application.

And I understand that we have two informal intervenors present, at least this morning we did. Mr. Lefebvre and Mr. Theriault. Are there any other informal intervenors present?

I will ask Mr. Lefebvre to come forward them, please.

MR. LEFEBVRE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board for the opportunity for to make our presentation.

My name is Marc Lefebvre. I am Vice-President of Supply Chain for Ganong Bros. I have held that position for the last five years. Prior to that I was Vice-President of Finance for 14 years. And I am also a corporate secretary for the company.

The presentation that I have here was prepared by Mr. David Ganong. And the intent was to have Mr. Ganong present to present it himself, however, yesterday's weather prevented his return from Ontario. So here I am.

To the extent that this was written in the first person from Mr. Ganong, I will present it in that way. For those of you that know David will understand that I am not David Ganong. And for those that don't, then you will have to bear with me.

I will now proceed. My name is David Ganong. I am

1
2 President and C.E.O. of Ganong Bros. Limited in St.
3 Stephen, New Brunswick, a position, which I've held since
4 1977. In addition to Ganongs, I am currently a member of
5 the Board of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, Sun
6 Life of Canada, a member -- sorry, the University of New
7 Brunswick and a Member of the North American
8 Competitiveness Council that provides direct advice to
9 Prime Minister Harper, Presidents of the United States and
10 Mexico on competitive matters. I am the founding Chairman
11 and currently a Member of the New Brunswick Business
12 Council that also deals with the issue of competitiveness
13 and improving the economic prospects for our province. A
14 complete c.v. with further details on my background is
15 attached to the presentation.

16 Ganong Bros., is a confectionery manufacturing company
17 established in St. Stephen in 1873 and manufacturing
18 continuously since that time. The company currently
19 employs 307 New Brunswickers, most of which are employed
20 in the St. Stephen manufacturing facility and is currently
21 recruiting for additional employees. The company must
22 compete globally and since Free Trade has invested in a
23 new plant, equipment and systems in order to service major
24 companies, such as Wal-Mart, Loblaws, Shoppers Drug Mart
25 and major customers in the United States. The competitive

1
2 environment for confectionery manufacturing in Canada has
3 become much more difficult due to the appreciation of the
4 Canadian dollar and this has resulted in the closure of
5 four major confectionery plants in Canada, in the course
6 of the last 15 months. At the moment, the majority of the
7 manufacturing of confectionery takes place in the greater
8 Toronto area, with some operations in Quebec and British
9 Columbia, in addition to Ganongs in St. Stephen. There
10 are no other significant manufacturers of confectionery
11 products in Atlantic Canada.

12 Ganong converted to Natural Gas in 2005 when Enbridge
13 came to St. Stephen. At that time, our delivery charge
14 was 79 cents. In 2006 the delivery charge increased by
15 149 percent followed by a further 21 percent in 2007 and
16 the now proposed increase of 90 percent in 2008. IF the
17 current proposal is accepted, the cumulative change for
18 four years since Ganongs began using natural gas would
19 have a 475 percent increase in the delivery charge rate.

20 During the period in which we could experience a 475
21 percent increase in the delivery charge for gas, the
22 consumer price increase in New Brunswick has been
23 approximately 6.4 percent. Our ability to pass on pricing
24 increases to our customers generally is restricted to the
25 CPI unless they are very unusual circumstances. The

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

dramatic increase in price of natural gas distribution there is almost completely absorbed by Ganongs as reduced profitability and therefore reduced competitiveness.

Flakeboard has already laid out a compelling case for the extremely high distribution charges for natural gas in New Brunswick even prior to the 2008 proposal and has indicated the competitive disadvantage in which it leaves their plant in St. Stephen. Ganong would be no different, with virtually all of our major competition being in Ontario or the United States, where natural gas distribution charges are much less. In addition to other competitive challenges, such as the exchange rate, Ganong is faced with an uncompetitive distribution charge on natural gas; the proposed increase will result in our cost increasing by \$78,000 in this year along.

The increase in oil prices is seen on the impact on our freight charges as well, which since 2005 have increased by 63 percent, which pales in significance to the proposed increase in natural gas distribution charges.

New Brunswick is embarking upon an aggressive goal of self-sufficiency by 2025. Underlying the self-sufficiency goals is an increase in employment, increasing industry and improved immigration. I would submit that the dramatic increase in the distribution cost of gas will

1
2 directly and negatively impact current business in New
3 Brunswick that requires natural gas in its processing,
4 while at the same time discouraging new industry from
5 coming to New Brunswick, as they would have the
6 opportunity to locate new plants in jurisdictions with
7 much lower costs, including the distribution costs for
8 natural gas as already submitted to this panel.

9 The cost of laying the pipe from the main pipeline to
10 Ganongs in St. Stephen has not changed since it was put in
11 the ground in 2005 and the maintenance cost would not have
12 changed significantly in that period of time. The
13 resulting increase of 475 percent since Ganong's
14 conversion to LNG is an unreasonable burden to place on
15 the large users in New Brunswick including Ganongs.

16 The competitiveness of industry is critical to the
17 future of New Brunswick and the available competitive
18 sources of energy are critical to our industrial
19 development as well as prosperity and viability of those
20 industries currently here. The distribution rate increase
21 to \$4.54 requested by EGNB, currently being considered by
22 the Board, is contrary to the self-sufficiency agenda of
23 the Province of New Brunswick and will be detrimental to
24 the long term growth of businesses such as Ganongs in St.
25 Stephen.

1
2 I respectively submit the increase should not be
3 allowed. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lefebvre. I guess this being
5 Valentine's Day, I must say that we all certainly
6 appreciate the product that you manufacture. Perhaps it
7 has gotten some of us out of trouble today.

8 Any of the Panel Members have any questions for Mr.
9 Lefebvre? Mr. Toner?

10 MR. TONER: I wasn't sure I was going to be allowed to ask
11 questions. But not right now, no.

12 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Johnston?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN: I just have a couple of questions.

14 BY VICE CHAIRMAN:

15 Q.169 - What type of fuel was Ganong using before natural gas.

16 MR. LEFEBVRE: Light oil.

17 Q.170 - It was using light oil?

18 MR. LEFEBVRE: Yes.

19 Q.171 - For all applications?

20 MR. LEFEBVRE: We were using propane as well.

21 Q.172 - What kind of a -- I am just curious as to what their
22 mix was between propane and light oil?

23 MR. LEFEBVRE: Very small amount of propane. We had a few
24 kettles that required propane versus light oil. So a
25 majority would have been oil.

1
2 VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That's all the questions I have.

3 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Radford or Mr McLean? Just one question, Mr.
4 Lefebvre. Your final -- I guess in final analysis you
5 respect that the increase should not be allowed. And I am
6 just wondering are you suggesting the magnitude of the
7 increase should not be allowed, or is your suggestion that
8 there be no increase allowed?

9 MR. LEFEBVRE: Well in deference to a comment made earlier,
10 I am not familiar with the law terms of the latitude you
11 made have as to -- obviously no increase is -- would be a
12 nice start, but probably unreasonable to expect. But
13 something less than 4.54 certainly would be something that
14 we would be looking for.

15 CHAIRMAN: Thank you for taking --

16 MR. RADFORD: Sorry, I didn't hear his last four words.
17 Could you say that again?

18 MR. LEFEBVRE: Well our expectation would be to have no
19 increase, which would be a continuation of the current
20 mode. However, I feel that something between the current
21 rate around the 4.54 is likely to be in the range.

22 MR. RADFORD: Well, I would like to thank you for taking the
23 time to participate as an informal intervenor and
24 attending today's session. So thank you.

25 MR. LEFEBVRE: Thank you. I have copies for you.

1
2 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Theriault.

3 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. THERIAULT:

4 Q.173 - Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Board members. As
5 Public Intervenor I was appointed as an informal
6 intervenor in the matter of an application by Enbridge Gas
7 New Brunswick for approval to change its Contract Large
8 General Service-Light Fuel Oil distribution rates.

9 My role in this proceeding is limited to providing a
10 brief to the Energy and Utilities Board with respect to
11 the evidence presented by the Applicant and the
12 intervenors and to comment on any rulings that may have
13 been made during the course of the hearing.

14 While the application to change LFO distribution rates
15 is being dealt with separately from an application by EGNB
16 to change distribution rates for their other customer
17 classes, many of the rulings made in this application
18 could have an impact on both the process and the outcome
19 of the second proceeding in which I am a formal
20 intervenor.

21 By letter to the energy and Utilities Board dated
22 November 5, 2007, EGNB filed an application and supporting
23 evidence to change its LFO distribution rate. What the
24 Applicant is proposing is a 90 percent increase in the
25 first block delivery charge, while leaving the demand

1
2 charge and the remaining delivery blocks unchanged.

3 The application, and the evidence that accompanies it,
4 is a minimal one since there appears to be limited burden
5 of proof required to change market based rates.

6 Nevertheless, several points about the Applicant and this
7 application and the evidence adduced by the Applicant that
8 should be examined in light of the potential impact of the
9 proposed increase on the Large Contract General Service-
10 Light Fuel Oil customers should be made. And first off I
11 would like to point out that the Gas Distribution Act,
12 which was passed in 1999, separates the distribution of
13 natural gas from the sale of natural gas. a gas
14 distribution company is responsible for transporting
15 natural gas to consumers. EGNB is a gas distribution
16 company and its charges are for the delivery of natural
17 gas.

18 Secondly, the Applicant is a monopoly service provider
19 with a General Franchise Agreement awarded by the Province
20 of New Brunswick. The General Franchise Agreement is a
21 privilege, not a right, and it can be revoked if the
22 Applicant fails to meet its responsibilities under the
23 agreement.

24 Thirdly, the Applicant has based its case on three
25 maintained hypotheses. First, it is still operating in a

1
2 Greenfield marketplace insofar as the LFO customer class
3 is concerned. Two, market based, rather than cost based,
4 rate making is appropriate. And, three, the spread
5 between the two fuel types, light fuel and natural gas, is
6 the appropriate mechanism for the determination of a rate
7 increase for a delivery service.

8 The advantage, I submit, of arguing from a maintained
9 hypothesis is that one never has to prove it. It is
10 accepted as fact and the debate proceeds from there. this
11 is, in essence, what the Applicant has done in this case.

12 EGNB I submit has offered no evidence to support the
13 Greenfield designation. In fact it has merely asserted
14 that the development phase continues for the LFO class, in
15 contradiction to the evidence that suggests that all of
16 the potential customers have been completely captured by
17 the Applicant. the Board should not accept this assertion
18 by EGNB merely because it asserted it.

19 The position of the Applicant on market-based rate
20 making proceeds from the first hypothesis. If the market
21 is still in the development phase, then market based
22 ratesetting mechanisms are appropriate. Again there is no
23 evidence offered by the Applicant to support this position
24 other than an assertion that market based rates meet the
25 Applicant's objectives.

1
2 The use of a commodity-spread mechanism to justify a
3 rate increase for a transportation service is merely
4 squaring the circle in the Applicant's case. The
5 Applicant's entire proposition can be restated as, we are
6 still in a development phase, and because we are in a
7 development phase we need to use market based rates, and
8 because we need to use market based rates we have to go to
9 the futures market for commodity energy spreads to develop
10 a rate increase.

11 There is nothing in the Applicant's case that elevates
12 it above a series of assertions, assumptions and
13 maintained hypotheses. The Applicant's case is not about
14 evidence. rather it is about opinion, and opinion I
15 submit is not a basis on which this Board can rely when
16 rendering a decision in this matter.

17 There are two formal intervenors in this application,
18 Flakeboard and AWL.

19 With respect to AWL, Witness Power gave an overview of
20 the economics of the AWL plant, the need to access export
21 markets, the impact of the rate increase on the ability to
22 compete in distant markets, the predication of the
23 application on the basis of spreads between oil and
24 natural gas, and the fact that AWL was never structured to
25 use any other fuel type other than natural gas.

1
2 Witness Reed challenged the time interval used for the
3 averaging calculations. Additionally, the witness focused
4 on the lack of cost data and the need for any market based
5 rates to be positioned in the interval between marginal
6 costs as a floor and fully allocated costs as a ceiling.

7 With respect to Flakeboard, Witness Gallant discussed
8 the impact of the rate increase on company production
9 costs and traced the history of rate increases for gas
10 distribution services over the years in which EGNB
11 provided services to Flakeboard.

12 Witness Gaske discussed in his written evidence the
13 standards for reasonable rates and noted that the gas
14 distribution rates were greater than market based rates.
15 He argued that using energy commodity spreads for rate
16 increases for a distribution service was not a valid
17 approach. A significant point raised by this witness was
18 that of inter-class equity and the role to be played by
19 the deferral account, as well as the proper accounting for
20 costs between customer classes.

21 In summary, Mr. Chairman, Board members, the
22 intervenors' case rests on two interconnected issues.
23 First, the negative impact on operations and the ability
24 to compete that such a large rate increase will have, and,
25 secondly, the apparent disconnect between the price for

1
2 the service provided and the cost of providing that
3 service. I submit the Board needs to address both of
4 these issues when rendering its decision in this
5 application.

6 In its decision of January 18th, 2008, the Board made
7 several rulings with respect to a motion brought before it
8 by the intervenor Atlantic Wallboard. And the motion was
9 as follows, and I will quote from Mr. Stewart's letter,
10 The within matter be adjourned and the Board conduct a
11 hearing into the appropriate rate making methodology to be
12 utilized to establish distribution rates for EGNB's
13 Contract Large General Service-Light Fuel Oil class.

14 I submit the opinions and the rulings of the Board
15 that were articulated in its decision on the motion
16 require both evaluation and comment.

17 In its decision on the motion, and in apparent
18 agreement with the Applicant, the Board has asserted that
19 a market based rate setting methodology is appropriate for
20 this application.

21 However, in its application and evidence, the Applicant
22 has advanced a case for only one type of market based rate
23 methodology - that being a commodity spread methodology
24 that uses the differentials between future prices for
25 light fuel oil and natural gas as the basis for setting

1
2 rate increases. This reduces the debate at the bearing to
3 one of focusing on the length of the averaging period to
4 be used to calculate the spread.

5 This debate I submit is a sterile one, because the
6 assumption underlying the market based rate methodology is
7 incorrect. EGNB is providing a delivery service, nothing
8 more. If a market base rate setting mechanism is to be
9 used it must focus on the delivery service, not on the
10 spreads between two energy commodities. The Board must
11 not allow EGNB to define, without challenge, what is an
12 appropriate market based rate setting mechanism. It is
13 the Board's duty I submit and responsibility to determine
14 the appropriate rate setting methodology -- rate making
15 methodology -- and not to restrict itself to adjudication
16 over calculations on an averaging process associated with
17 a rate setting mechanism that I submit is not appropriate.

18
19 I submit with the utmost respect, Mr. Chairman, there
20 is an underlying theme that comes through the decision of
21 the Board on the motion. This theme is one of reverse
22 onus. It appears that the Applicant can state that it is
23 still in a Greenfield situation with respect to the
24 development of the natural gas marketplace in New
25 Brunswick, and the onus is then placed on the intervenors

1
2 to demonstrate otherwise.

3 The Greenfield designation is not a right that belongs
4 to the Applicant. It is a privilege extended by the
5 legislation and the General Franchise Agreement and it is
6 administered by this Board. At any time the Board has the
7 right and the responsibility to evaluate this designation
8 and to remove it from any customer class market for which
9 it is no longer appropriate.

10 The burden of proof of this Greenfield assumption
11 belongs to the Applicant, and for each rate application
12 made. EGNB must make the case for the continued
13 application of the rate setting methodology based on this
14 assumption. Mere assertions that the designation is
15 appropriate are not evidence and do not constitute a basis
16 for the Board to render a decision affirming the
17 designation.

18 In the motion the Board ruled that it was appropriate
19 to use the same method for setting rates for all classes.
20 A review of the rate case filing indicates that there is
21 nothing on the record to support this position. In point
22 of fact the position may be in contradiction to regulatory
23 practice elsewhere. There are decisions made by other
24 regulators that allowed different rate setting
25 methodologies for various customer classes served by gas

1
2 distribution companies, particularly where the degree of
3 market penetration differed by customer class.

4 In its motion the Board ruled that it was not
5 appropriate for the development period to end for one
6 customer class but not for other customer classes. This I
7 suggest is a corollary of the first ruling. Again there is
8 nothing on the record to support this position. If the
9 market for one customer class has been completely
10 penetrated by the gas distribution company, then it cannot
11 be said that that particular customer class market is
12 still in the development phase. In the literature there
13 are a number of cases where regulatory Boards have
14 terminated the development period for one customer class,
15 while maintaining it for other classes. This practice is
16 nothing more than recognition that each customer class
17 market may develop and mature at a different pace, and
18 this requires regulatory oversight and judgment as to the
19 timing of the termination of the development phase.

20 MR. THERIAULT: In this motion, the development has not yet
21 ended nor will it end in the near future. This position
22 can only be appropriate if one ignores the differences
23 between the various markets served by EGNB.

24 It is clear from the evidence on the record that the
25 LFO customer class has been completely penetrated by EGNB,

1
2 that all of the customers in the class that could be --
3 that reasonably could be served are being served, and that
4 all of the customers have made the necessary investments
5 to take natural gas from the monopoly supplier.

6 I submit it is not appropriate for the Board to ignore
7 this market reality when considering whether a development
8 period has come to an end.

9 The Board stated on page 4 of its decision on the
10 motion that -- and I will quote, "...where it appears that
11 the development period will end before 2010, it is the
12 obligation of EGNB to apply to the Board to end the
13 development sooner."

14 This creates, I suggest three problems as it relates
15 to EGNB.

16 First, there is absolutely no incentive for EGNB to
17 apply to the Board for removal of the "Greenfield"
18 designation. This designation allows EGNB to continue to
19 propose market-based, rather than cost-based rate setting
20 mechanisms, not only to the year 2010, but also beyond
21 2010, provided it can make a case for the same. In other
22 words, EGNB has, and continues to have the freedom to
23 continue its monopoly-pricing practices.

24 Second, given the Board's position it is not
25 appropriate for the development period to end for one

1
2 customer class, but not for the other customer classes,
3 the probable outcome is that EGNB will propose that one
4 class is still in the development phase and, therefore,
5 the "Greenfield" designation must apply to all.

6 Third, and without utmost respect, I submit the Board
7 is abdicating its responsibility in this matter. It is
8 the Board that has the duty to determine when the
9 "Greenfield" must come to an end. This position is
10 consistent with earlier rulings by the predecessor board
11 on the establishment of the timelines for the development
12 period. Unless this Board is prepared to repudiate these
13 earlier rulings, the responsibility for managing all
14 aspects of the "Greenfield" designation, from timelines to
15 customer class distinctions, belongs with the regulator,
16 not EGNB.

17 Insofar as the Applicants case is concerned, I would
18 argue that its case is nothing more than the opportunistic
19 application of monopoly-pricing strategy. There is no
20 evidence to support the hypotheses advanced by the
21 Applicant to justify either the magnitude or timing of
22 this rate increase. The application should be rejected by
23 the Board on the basis of a lack of any substantive
24 evidence to support it.

25 The intervenors have made a case for rejecting the

1
2 application in its entirety, although neither has advanced
3 this particular position. Both intervenors have
4 demonstrated that a rate increase cannot, and should not,
5 be evaluated in isolation from the impact that the rate
6 increase would have on operations and competitive
7 position. The costs of providing gas distribution
8 services are largely fixed in nature. Distribution rates
9 should be stable and predictable over time, given the
10 fixed nature of distribution services. The market-based
11 methodology put forth by EGNB introduced undue volatility
12 into the distribution rate, making it difficult for LFO
13 customers to operate in New Brunswick and maintain their
14 competitive position. If the application has been based
15 on cost considerations, then the Board might be guided by
16 the regulatory principle that those who incur the costs
17 must pay. However, this is not a cost-based rate
18 application. It is a market-based one. Therefore, the
19 Board is entitled to consider the impact on the
20 intervenors of the application of a market-based
21 methodology.

22 With the utmost respect the Boards opinions and
23 rulings in this application give rise to considerable
24 concern. These concerns have been articulated earlier and
25 I do not intend to repeat them again. However, I wish to

1
2 advise the Board that, with respect to the second
3 application by EGNB, I have taken note of these positions
4 and reserve the right to challenge any or all of them in
5 the function of my responsibilities as Public Intervenor.
6 I will vigorously challenge any fettering of my role as
7 representing the public interest in this second
8 application. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Theriault. Any questions, Mr.

10 Toner? Mr. Johnston? Mr. McLean? Mr Radford?

11 BY MR. RADFORD:

12 Q.174 - Following through with this morning, my comments, I am
13 trying to gain an education here of just what we can do
14 and what we can't do. But as a Public Intervenor, you are
15 speaking for all the other customers including the 18 that
16 are not represented here today?

17 MR. THERIAULT: My role as Public Intervenor, sir, is I see
18 it as representing the public interest. The public
19 interest represents all the other classes, as well as, the
20 LFO class.

21 Q.175 - Right.

22 MR. THERIAULT: And what I try to do in my position is to
23 strike a balance.

24 Q.176 - And as I said this morning, I believe I understand the
25 economics of it, both the economics of the Applicant and

1
2 the economics of those formal intervenors. But where I am
3 wrestling with is the previous decisions made by this
4 Board and you seem to have gone further in your comments
5 that I heard up until now what we can do.

6 First of all, I would like a copy of your --

7 MR. THERIAULT: I will be e-mailing to the Board and to all
8 the parties copies of it.

9 Q.177 - Yes. But again it is for an educational purpose, I am
10 trying to understand what we can do here. And you seem to
11 say in a nutshell say we can do basically whatever we
12 think is --

13 MR. THERIAULT: Just and reasonable.

14 Q.178 - Just and reasonable.

15 MR. THERIAULT: And in approving the rates. And I think Mr.
16 Stewart -- and I had the opportunity to sit in on the
17 motion, and I think Mr. Stewart put it best when -- and I
18 will paraphrase his argument. I am sure I won't say it as
19 well, but in determining what is a just and reasonable
20 rate, the Board I submit should be reviewing -- I am not
21 saying changing the ratemaking methodology every time, but
22 should be reviewing the circumstances surrounding the
23 ratemaking methodology in every application for increase
24 to keep current with it, to keep current on the deferral
25 account.

1
2 I mean there has been lots of discussions over the
3 week with respect to the deferral account in broad
4 strokes, but I certainly haven't seen anything as to
5 what's gone into the deferral account. I can guarantee
6 that will come in the next one. But I think the Board has
7 the latitude to do what it wants. I think the Board could
8 even revisit its January 18th motion if it so chose, but I
9 don't think -- and I will be making that argument at a
10 later time that that application or that motion doesn't
11 apply to any further proceedings, because it was part of
12 the LFO application. And that application was brought by
13 EGNB. Why they split the various classes, rather than
14 dealing with one, I don't know. But that was their
15 choice. But I do believe the Board has very wide latitude
16 and can revisit previous rulings of the Board, from the
17 predecessor Board with respect to the ratemaking. But I
18 am not even going that far. I am just saying a review of
19 the ratemaking methodology should be conducted. I believe
20 that was the -- and that's why I specifically quoted from
21 Mr. Stewart's motion. That's what he was asking for. He
22 wasn't saying we think it should be -- or at least I
23 didn't read it that way, it should be cost-based or it
24 should be market-based. He said let's review it to see
25 what form there is.

1
2 All I am suggesting is there may be -- and you know
3 obviously there is no evidence, but there may be other
4 forms of ratemaking methodology that are available. Even
5 other forms of market-based methodology that I heard from
6 the experts over the last couple of days.

7 Q.179 - What about changing the tier system?

8 MR. THERIAULT: That's always -- if the Board feels that
9 that is something that should be done, then obviously I
10 suggest that the Board has the power to do that. I
11 brought you the legislation, the Gas Distribution Act and
12 the Energy and Utilities Board Act.

13 Q.180 - And I will just ask you this, because I perhaps should
14 have asked you before, have you seen contracts been
15 customers and Enbridge?

16 MR. THERIAULT: I have seen very little here in my role as
17 an informal intervenor. I am hoping that -- if you want
18 to ask me that questions towards the end of March, I would
19 be pleased to answer it. But I haven't at this point.

20 MR. RADFORD: And Mr. Chairman is the original franchise
21 agreement somewhere filed here with this office?

22 CHAIRMAN: Yes.

23 MR. RADFORD: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Theriault for taking the time to
25 address us today.

1 MR. THERIAULT: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hoyt, is there anything further that we need
3 to -- I guess from your perspective that we need to do
4 prior to final argument?

5 MR. HOYT: No, I don't believe so.

6 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart, anything?

7 MR. STEWART: I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lawson?

9 MR. LAWSON: No, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN: Ms. Desmond? All right. Then we will adjourn
11 until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning at which time we will
12 commence final argument.

13 (Adjourned)

14 Certified to be a true transcript of
15 the proceedings of this hearing, as
16 recorded by me, to the best of my
17 ability.

18 
19 Reporter
20
21
22
23
24
25

A				
abdicated 579:7	acknowledge 511:23 536:4	539:11 559:24	537:23 538:6	Applicant's 472:22
ability 554:21	across 545:10	568:17 571:22	American 508:2	571:25 572:4,5,11
564:23 572:21	Act 570:11 584:11	577:7 580:25	531:23 563:7	572:13
573:23 585:9	584:12	582:9	among 548:7,8	application 470:2
able 470:17 472:24	action 523:6	against 479:20	amount 477:22	476:17,22,24
474:9 476:2	actual 481:22	508:15 539:3,3	478:5 514:24	479:3,24 482:14
486:21 488:9	491:16 498:9	agenda 566:22	517:24 552:3,4	482:20 484:24
496:4 535:8	519:4 560:6	aggressive 530:24	560:19 567:23	487:21 490:14,20
about 473:16 474:4	actually 474:2	565:21	amounts 506:4	502:20 513:16
478:21 495:17	501:5 502:22	ago 493:19 522:23	analysis 475:22	523:12,22 554:25
506:13 510:25	509:9 536:12	524:15 543:17	534:6 542:14,18	562:3 569:6,14,15
516:11 518:16	550:22	544:15 546:14	550:14 553:23	569:17,22 570:3,7
521:13 522:12	adding 549:14	agree 479:4,19	568:4	572:17,23 574:5
524:22 526:25	addition 476:14	487:22 492:7	anchor 535:23	574:20,21 576:11
531:22 533:20	493:20 563:4	536:18 559:7	and/or 477:23	576:13 579:19,22
535:2 537:17	564:9 565:12	560:8	511:19	580:2,14,18,20,23
540:25 546:19	additional 510:20	agreed 499:24	annual 479:12,16	581:3,8 582:23
548:3 551:21	553:3 563:21	agreeing 516:12	484:12	583:10,12,12
555:8 557:21	Additionally 573:3	agreement 494:21	annualized 484:15	applications 515:12
560:10 570:6	address 471:25	570:19,20,23	annually 477:17	555:4 567:19
572:13,14 584:7	473:12 502:13	574:18 576:5	another 490:24	apply 514:16
above 572:12	559:14 562:3	584:21	545:9 547:8	578:12,17 579:5
absolute 481:21	574:3 584:25	aid 487:5	552:17,17	583:11
484:8 489:14	addressed 475:10	allocated 553:10,11	answer 475:16,16	appointed 569:5
491:24 552:15	addresses 528:12	573:6	475:17 498:12,14	appreciate 496:23
absolutely 521:14	addresses 528:12	allocation 542:25	500:10 526:7	500:3 567:6
529:15 557:19	adduced 570:7	548:7,20 549:24	532:16,16 553:22	appreciation 564:3
578:16	adjourn 561:14,18	550:2,6	553:23 559:12	approach 513:2,8,9
absorbed 565:3	561:22 585:6	allocations 551:14	560:16 584:19	514:4,8 519:11
accept 571:17	adjourned 574:10	allow 479:20 562:2	answered 498:14	525:5 527:21
accepted 564:17	585:7	575:11	559:19	528:6 530:5 544:7
571:10	adjudication 575:15	allowed 567:3,10	answers 499:23	544:7,10,12
access 537:3,4	administered 576:6	568:5,7,8 576:24	541:24 559:9	573:17
572:20	admit 503:13	allows 578:18	anticipate 471:21	appropriate 488:22
accessible 533:6,10	admitted 488:19	almost 549:14 561:5	504:21	489:4 507:21
533:12 534:3,5	adopted 479:12	565:3	anticipated 502:15	508:6,7,22 509:8
accommodate 486:9	520:17 556:3	along 521:6 544:16	540:20 543:7	514:16 518:4,14
486:15	adopting 521:2	545:15,17 547:14	anybody 475:24	518:19 522:16,21
accompanied 491:8	advance 552:3	549:19 558:22	anything 475:24	523:4 524:4,8,10
accompanies 570:3	advanced 574:22	565:16	486:4 501:25	548:19 555:25
account 509:16,23	579:20 580:2	already 488:19	583:4 585:2,4	556:22 571:4,6,22
509:23,24 519:6	advantage 495:2	494:21 533:6	apart 556:13,14	574:11,19 575:12
528:9,11,14 529:4	536:19,23 539:2	542:20 554:19	apiece 545:25	575:14,17 576:9
545:6,8 548:8	559:2,8,9,13	565:5 566:8	apparent 573:25	576:15,18 577:5
549:2,7,9,10,17	571:8	alternate 479:21	574:17	577:22 578:6,25
549:19 551:10	advice 563:8	483:3 485:8 512:9	appear 491:21,23	appropriately 497:9
573:19 582:25	advise 581:2	512:11,12,14,15	appearances 470:20	approval 513:17
583:3,5	affirming 576:16	512:17 513:4,7	appeared 539:6	531:2 569:7
accountant 503:21	after 473:19 499:15	522:6 551:2	appears 570:4	approve 515:9
503:22	545:22	alternative 508:8,11	575:22 578:10	516:5
accounting 506:3	afternoon 472:2	508:14 509:10	apples 501:14,14,14	approved 480:17
548:21 550:4	473:4 561:23,25	530:23 531:4	applicant 470:21	515:23 516:6,11
573:19	561:25 569:4	537:11 551:2	472:9 500:6	516:18,20 518:9
accurate 557:14,15	again 472:25 481:5	although 503:13	504:17 515:10	524:22,25 525:4
557:16	482:16 485:24	580:2	561:20 569:11,24	525:15,21,22
accurately 502:13	486:17 490:4,11	always 480:18	570:6,7,18,22,24	527:18
achieve 536:22	490:17 491:21	513:3 515:15	571:11,17,19,23	approves 525:7
achieved 485:11	493:8 494:2,8	516:6,18,20,22	574:18,21 575:22	approving 582:15
533:6	495:13,20 496:19	523:16 555:16,17	576:4,11 579:21	approximate 498:20
achieving 527:23	516:24 523:3,15	584:8	581:25	approximately
	523:25 528:23	America 476:16	Applicants 579:17	477:16 505:15

- 507:7 533:17
552:21 564:23
area 527:11,12
564:8
argue 488:9 579:18
argued 573:15
arguing 571:8
argument 472:8,15
472:16 473:8,14
474:4,14 550:5
561:20 582:18
583:9 585:3,7
around 534:19
549:18 568:21
articulated 574:15
580:24
aside 561:25
asked 485:4 497:23
498:16 502:6,9
506:15 528:13
529:21 533:9
536:16 546:7
584:14
asking 481:11
485:22 495:8
507:25 509:22
546:6 557:25
583:21
asks 477:9 481:20
aspects 579:14
asserted 571:13,18
574:18
assertion 571:17,24
assertions 572:12
576:14
assistance 495:10
Assistant 470:11
associated 575:16
Association 471:10
assume 535:15
assumed 513:7
assuming 535:17
558:20
assumption 575:6
576:10,14
assumptions 572:12
astute 495:25
Atlantic 470:24
531:24,25 564:11
574:8
attached 563:15
attempt 486:15
530:25
attempted 486:9
attendance 561:11
attending 568:24
attract 545:18
558:7
attracting 539:8
attribute 543:3
authority 506:2
- 543:15 555:15
available 477:2
494:8 510:6
527:12,14 530:11
530:12,23 537:7
566:17 584:4
average 477:19
550:21 553:16
555:20 556:16,19
556:22 557:3,9,17
557:24 558:5,9,10
558:12
averaging 573:3
575:3,16
awarded 570:19
aware 506:11
532:24 548:13
away 552:22
AWL 478:22
572:18,19,20,24
A-11 480:11,12
A-12 480:12,13
489:6,11,12,15
492:3 502:18,18
502:22,23,24
503:10
A-13 482:19 489:12
489:13,16,21
492:16 502:21,22
503:14
A-15 484:19 490:12
490:18
A-3 479:9
A-4 526:13 539:11
A-5 477:15 484:15
A-6 539:17,17,19
559:24
A-8 484:11
A-9 539:4
a.m 511:3,3 585:6
-
- B**
- b** 481:4,6,20,24
492:23 495:11
back 481:18,19,20
486:25 489:9
502:17 505:12
510:25 514:20
515:17 516:10,23
517:5,19 519:23
528:15 544:5
545:12
background 554:11
563:14
balance 484:5
528:10 581:23
balancing 514:23
ballpark 488:8,13
488:14,25 491:22
491:24 493:22
barely 508:4
- barry** 474:20,24
base 518:25 520:7
534:4 540:24
575:8
basic 551:23
basically 531:25
546:23 582:11
basis 494:2 495:6
497:13 506:6,7
524:7 534:9,17
543:2 550:12
572:15,23 574:25
576:15 579:23
bear 562:24
bearing 559:13
575:2
became 537:7
become 480:13
482:18 491:5
534:17,18 541:19
555:7 564:3
before 470:5 473:13
475:6 486:2
499:15 502:9
504:12 533:20
536:22 537:6
543:12 554:14
555:5,16 567:15
574:7 578:11
584:14
began 564:18
beginning 516:16
527:18 540:10
546:7
being 476:2 492:4
498:16 509:14
510:2 511:23
515:17 523:15
525:19 528:13
537:2,8,10,13
538:8,22,24 547:4
547:12,13 552:24
565:10 566:21
567:4 569:15
574:23 578:3
believe 475:10
484:10 487:16
489:2 496:24
497:16 498:12
522:16 524:8,10
527:5 531:23
535:10 539:17
546:22 548:18
554:12,19,21
556:2 581:24
583:15,19 585:3,4
believes 521:24
523:7 524:3
belong 553:17
belongs 576:3,11
579:15
- below** 514:10 540:3
560:19
benefit 522:2
benefits 507:4
beside 559:21
best 530:22,23
531:3 532:11,21
582:17 585:9
better 473:24 489:9
521:16 537:6,13
546:20
between 483:3
484:4,5,6 485:20
487:24 498:25
511:16 519:4
538:13 540:6
541:19 555:6
556:3 557:16
567:22 568:20
571:5 572:23
573:5,20,25
574:24 575:10
577:23
beyond 578:20
big 535:22,25
544:21 545:20
550:20 553:18,24
555:9 556:20
bit 470:15 545:19
548:11
block 477:23 569:25
blocks 478:18 570:2
blue 500:24 501:7
Boards 577:13
580:22
Board's 471:18
478:21 517:12
522:10 523:25
575:13 578:24
book 559:22 560:15
both 471:24 490:2
492:4 532:12
561:17 569:18
574:3,16 580:3
581:25
bottom 481:25
514:14 530:8
box 501:15
break 473:19
504:13,15,17
507:11 510:25
brief 476:9 505:20
569:10
British 564:8
broad 583:3
broken 540:6
Bros 471:11,13
562:12 563:2,16
brought 510:14
552:25 574:7
583:12 584:11
- brunswick** 470:1,2
470:4,23 476:14
500:18 501:2
510:11,16,18
512:3 513:6,16
515:14 516:15
521:24 523:17
526:6 527:4
529:24 530:6
531:17 532:13,25
536:6 547:18,19
558:23 563:3,7,11
564:22 565:7,21
566:3,5,15,17,23
569:7 570:20
575:25 580:13
- Brunswickers**
563:19
budget 499:15
build 508:9 509:3
530:20,25 531:11
531:18 532:9
534:20 539:7
550:13
building 509:2
549:12
built 486:3 508:20
532:3
bunch 545:21,22
burden 566:14
570:4 576:10
burner 514:15
544:13 547:7,10
burning 485:11
business 495:5,23
496:9,13 531:7
539:7 547:5
563:11 566:2
businesses 492:19
535:25 536:2
566:24
buy 510:10,15
537:24 556:17
buying 510:13
by-company 550:12
-
- C**
- c** 481:4,6 492:23
526:25
calculate 483:21
501:20 544:3
575:4
calculated 491:14
491:19 502:19
calculating 483:18
calculation 478:4
478:15 482:7
483:13 485:20
486:12,21 491:2
499:6 502:7 503:4
542:20,21 549:5

- calculations** 486:4,6
 486:8,18 493:15
 494:9 498:2
 500:10 503:17
 573:3 575:16
call 553:16
called 481:25 516:3
 516:13
came 486:25 487:2
 500:9 564:13
camera 497:8
Canada 563:6 564:2
 564:5,11
Canadian 471:9
 563:5 564:4
capacity 534:21
capital 529:10
captured 504:5
 571:16
carefully 554:15
case 479:5 480:18
 496:17 515:5
 519:12 530:11
 538:8 551:19
 552:20 565:5
 570:24 571:11
 572:4,11,13
 573:22 574:22
 576:12,20 578:21
 579:17,18,25
cases 515:4 516:14
 577:13
categories 479:13
cause 495:22
ceiling 573:6
cents 556:13,13
 557:18,20 564:14
certain 499:23,24
 534:18
certainly 472:17
 486:23 495:5
 496:17 520:14
 556:23 567:5
 568:13 583:4
certainty 556:24
 557:2
Certified 585:8
CGSGS 539:23
Chain 562:12
Chair 471:7 476:12
 477:7 480:7
 485:23 488:21
 494:5,18 499:7,9
 504:9 511:7,8
 541:3,6
challenge 529:12
 575:11 581:4,6
challenged 573:2
challenges 565:13
chance 473:11
 478:24 480:20
- 487:9,25 488:3
 491:10
change 470:2
 522:23 523:4,7
 541:15,25 543:15
 554:20,23 557:22
 564:17 569:7,14
 569:16,23 570:5
changed 519:13
 566:10,12
changes 537:12
changing 543:14
 582:21 584:7
characteristics
 551:7
charge 478:18
 492:8 507:3,13,25
 508:3 509:15,20
 514:25 521:7
 525:14 537:25
 538:5,7,23 545:16
 545:19 549:16
 564:13,14,19,21
 565:14 569:25
 570:2
chargeable 525:9
charged 509:14
 510:2 525:20
 538:8 542:22
 546:3
charges 477:10
 484:16 492:13
 493:21 494:11
 506:4 510:19
 525:12,13 565:6
 565:12,18,20
 570:16
charging 507:25
 542:13 549:18
 553:19
Charleson 520:25
 528:7 533:15,19
 536:11
Charleson's 511:13
 511:25 535:5
 540:25
chart 482:22 487:19
 500:21,22,24
 503:6 540:10
 560:3,4
charts 481:8
cheaper 506:23
 537:5 538:3
check 526:12
checked 490:8
Chief 563:5
choice 583:15
choices 554:17,18
choose 541:17
chose 531:3 532:20
 583:8
- Christopher** 471:2
circle 572:4
circulate 490:24
circumstances
 507:20,20 518:11
 519:13 521:11,18
 546:17 555:5
 564:25 582:22
cite 488:9
clarification 500:2
 544:9 558:15,20
clarifications
 524:14
clarify 520:13
 536:25 550:9
class 476:23 506:6
 513:2,3 514:15,21
 514:24 522:17
 523:23 524:5,11
 527:22 539:23
 540:6,7 541:13
 543:5 550:2,6,17
 550:24 551:5,6,10
 551:14,18,24
 552:9 553:17
 571:2,14 574:13
 576:8 577:3,6,9
 577:11,14,16,25
 578:2 579:2,4,15
 581:20
classes 477:11
 522:18 524:5,9,12
 540:12 541:10,13
 542:9 569:17
 573:20 576:19,25
 577:6,15 579:2
 581:19 583:13
clear 498:10,16
 519:9 535:5
 541:14 543:23
 544:2 559:17
 577:24
clearly 540:10
CLGS 478:18
 511:23 523:23
 526:3 530:2
client 495:15
client's 495:4,22
close 527:12 536:9
 536:10 556:14
closely 554:9
closer 533:23
closing 472:8 473:8
 474:4
closure 564:4
CME 471:3
coal 512:16
collect 510:4
collected 549:10
collectible 525:9
colour 501:5
- coloured** 500:22
Columbia 564:9
column 536:5,14
combination 512:24
come 474:22 522:10
 544:16 545:17
 555:16,21 557:18
 562:8 578:8 579:9
 583:6
comes 503:4 508:16
 521:6 545:15
 575:20
coming 566:5
commence 585:7
commencing 561:21
comment 531:16
 560:10 568:9
 569:12 574:16
commentary 522:11
comments 475:21
 488:23 505:21
 561:19 581:12
 582:4
commodities 575:10
commodity 486:13
 492:14 493:13,21
 494:7 498:4
 514:22 517:9
 572:9 573:15
 574:23
commodity-spread
 572:2
common 543:2
 550:25
companies 507:3
 532:8 537:23,23
 537:24 563:24
 577:2
company 471:3
 475:3 476:13
 482:19 500:25
 503:25 506:21
 508:7,9 536:22
 544:15 550:11
 555:8 562:15
 563:16,18,21
 570:14,16 573:8
 577:10
company's 497:5
compare 544:11
compared 480:25
 481:12 501:3
 521:15 522:5
 534:7 541:20
 544:23,24 552:25
comparing 489:5
 501:14
comparison 513:4
 520:21 541:12
compelling 565:5
compete 538:3
- 539:3 563:22
 572:22 573:24
competes 537:22
competing 514:16
competition 565:10
competitive 471:10
 496:9 530:12
 542:6 559:2
 563:10,25 565:8
 565:13 566:17
 580:6,14
competitiveness
 563:8,12 565:4
 566:16
competitors 488:9
 495:2 496:6,8
 507:2 538:5,17,20
 559:10
complete 485:4
 563:14
completed 476:3
 482:23
completely 494:23
 565:3 571:16
 577:9,25
complicated 473:25
components 492:18
composite 476:13
conceding 496:22
concern 472:23
 476:17,21 495:11
 495:14 497:5
 500:4 580:24
concerned 571:3
 579:17
concerns 486:16
 580:24
concession 496:24
conclude 471:22
 472:12,19
concluded 474:17
 479:2 518:23
 531:2 536:22
conclusion 471:20
concur 526:5,21
conduct 574:10
conducted 583:19
confectionery
 563:16 564:2,5,7
 564:10
confidence 496:14
 497:6
confidential 482:24
 494:13 495:21
 496:12 497:4,13
confidentiality
 495:4 496:20
 497:2
confined 527:5
confirm 480:22
 481:16 485:14

- 487:18 490:2
497:3 523:22
529:17 540:9
confirmed 478:16
494:6 498:24
520:3
confused 526:11
confusion 503:3
connect 549:6
550:15
connected 475:12
consequences 523:6
consider 487:25
488:3 491:10,12
494:24 523:4
580:19
considerable 580:23
considerably
520:18 546:18
560:20
consideration
473:15
considerations
580:15
considered 499:19
516:6,6 533:10
566:21
considering 578:7
considers 518:2
consistent 503:13
503:14 512:5
525:4 528:6,9
554:16 555:2,14
579:10
consistently 515:23
constant 501:21
538:20,21 556:11
constitute 576:15
construct 506:12
construction 533:11
consumer 564:22
consumers 570:15
contains 482:23
context 532:16
544:5 554:22
continuation 568:19
continue 479:14
514:13 519:2,25
520:8 522:2 528:4
541:18,23 543:15
554:23,24 555:10
557:23 560:22
578:18,23
continued 531:10
576:12
continues 515:22
524:8 571:14
578:22
continuously
563:18
contract 470:2
533:2 569:7 570:9
574:13
contracts 584:14
contradiction
571:15 576:22
contrary 566:22
contrast 530:9
531:20 534:24
control 475:9
convenient 472:3
conversion 498:21
499:5 503:20
504:2 517:10
533:6 566:14
conversions 528:8
528:11 540:11
convert 519:2,24
520:7,15 521:10
527:25 558:10
converted 564:12
convinced 523:9
546:13
copies 479:25
568:25 582:8
copy 517:15 526:15
526:19 582:6
corollary 577:7
corporate 562:15
correctly 500:24
517:7 521:6 535:6
548:6 549:25
correlate 556:4
560:23
cost-based 519:16
519:18 520:16,19
520:20,23 521:7
530:10 542:24
543:8 544:7,11,18
544:22,24 545:24
546:18,20 547:21
550:23 551:4
578:19 580:17
583:23
Council 563:5,8,12
Counsel 470:8
474:22 539:13
couple 481:16
496:19 548:2
549:18 567:13
584:6
course 472:8 564:5
569:13
court 470:15
CPI 564:25
create 544:3
created 499:14
526:4
creates 578:14
credibility 500:5
credit 510:3 551:13
criteria 548:16
critical 566:16,18
cross 476:11 477:2
477:8 487:5 510:6
510:9 511:4,6
541:8 558:24
569:3
crux 546:14
cues 470:18
cumulative 564:17
curious 567:21
current 483:15
507:20 524:22,25
538:25 542:2,3
564:17 566:2
568:19,20 582:24
582:24
currently 476:18
506:14 509:22
525:19 529:23
530:18 541:15,22
555:8 563:4,11,18
563:20 566:20,21
curriculum 505:12
Cyril 470:6
C.E.O 563:2
c.v 563:14
-
- D**
- Daniel** 471:15
data 484:22 493:14
507:5 534:10
550:19,21 573:4
date 484:22 490:4
491:16 526:3,4
527:21
dated 480:16
513:13 518:16
569:21
dates 475:25
Dave 470:10 471:8
David 470:22
562:17,22,23,25
day 533:20 550:18
556:2 557:3,9,12
567:5
days 554:8 556:18
556:20 584:6
deal 474:14 495:6
496:17 497:9
548:8
dealing 513:14,21
548:15,15 583:14
deals 495:11 563:12
dealt 518:13 569:15
debate 571:10 575:2
575:5
December 481:2,13
482:11 485:21
487:11,24 489:7
489:25 490:5
491:3,5 518:20
525:2,20
decide 522:21
decided 541:9
decision 478:22,24
513:13,21 517:12
517:17,19 518:15
518:16 519:10
524:2 525:2,21,24
528:16 534:4
535:18 540:16
541:11 544:6,19
548:10 552:2,7
556:21 572:16
574:4,6,15,17
575:20 576:16
578:9
decisions 518:15
554:14 555:14
558:6 576:23
582:3
declared 505:19
deference 568:9
deferral 509:16
519:6 528:9,11,14
529:3 548:8 549:2
549:9,9,17,19
551:9 552:8
573:19 582:24
583:3,5
deferrals 509:13,19
551:13 552:3
deferred 509:21,23
509:25 510:4
define 550:24
575:11
definitely 478:7
488:19
definition 512:11
515:19,20
degree 577:2
delete 475:18
deleted 475:17,19
delivered 512:13
514:9,17,21
536:17 559:6
delivery 564:13,14
564:19,21 569:25
570:2,16 571:7
575:7,9
delving 486:12
demand 478:18
569:25
demonstrate 576:2
demonstrated
486:10 580:4
denied 532:9,10
deny 543:15
Department 471:11
depends 472:6
512:11
derivation 511:22
511:24 512:2,5,6
derive 520:2
describe 517:23
described 503:20
511:13
designation 571:13
576:3,7,14,17
578:18,18 579:5
579:14
designed 522:4
desmond 470:8
471:7,7 499:8,9
541:5,6,8 543:18
543:19 585:6
details 482:25
493:14 560:14
563:14
determination
487:10 491:24
571:6
determine 483:24
484:2,2,3 485:15
491:16 507:16
525:17 534:2,6
542:18 575:13
579:8
determined 542:8
determining 486:11
542:5 582:19
detrimental 566:23
develop 521:23
540:23 572:9
577:17
developed 543:11
546:5
development 514:5
515:13 517:8,23
518:2,14,19,24
519:19 521:25
522:13,16 523:8
523:10,18 524:11
525:8 530:5
540:19 548:16
549:22 566:19
571:14,21 572:6,7
575:24 577:5,12
577:14,19,20
578:7,11,13,25
579:4,11
diameter 535:3
553:4
differed 577:3
difference 484:6,23
519:4 538:14
differences 577:22
different 495:5
516:2 521:19
554:3 565:9
576:24 577:17
differential 543:11
differentials 574:24

- differently** 559:18
difficult 472:20
 473:6 524:6 564:3
 580:12
difficulty 472:18
 486:22
direct 474:25
 503:21,22 504:24
 563:8
direction 475:8
 476:5
directions 549:23
directly 514:2
 547:15 566:2
disadvantage
 538:17 565:8
disadvantaged
 539:2
disagree 484:7
disclose 495:8
 496:12
disclosed 494:14
disclosure 494:25
disconnect 573:25
discount 512:9
 514:16
discouraging 566:4
discrepancy 503:16
discretion 506:2
discussed 525:23
 552:18 573:7,12
discussing 517:20
discussion 478:21
 496:19 517:3
 540:24,25 550:18
discussions 583:2
disincentive 520:21
 544:4,11,17,18
displaced 480:25
 481:13
displacement
 481:23
disputing 517:4
distance 533:16
 545:6 552:22
distant 572:22
distinctions 579:15
diverged 538:24
divergence 538:13
 541:19
divide 545:23
Doctor 552:16
document 483:20
 485:18 488:22,24
 489:3 490:25
 491:7,8,11 499:13
 499:22 500:5,7
 505:12 513:12
documents 490:2
doing 504:2 515:4
 530:21 531:10,10
- 542:20 554:16
dollar 480:24
 481:12,21 560:19
 564:4
dollars 504:5
 509:18,18 521:5
 545:23,24 548:22
done 473:3,22
 475:17 486:15,21
 515:3 534:6
 550:11 555:3
 571:11 584:9
double 534:12,13
 552:21
doubled 552:24
 561:5,6
doubt 491:17
Doug 470:9 471:8
down 474:5 481:24
 501:11 504:3
 509:16,22 523:2
 528:14 548:25
 549:8,17 551:9
 552:3 554:22
 556:13 561:13
dr 504:19,23 505:2
 505:16,20 510:10
 511:8,11 513:14
 529:18 537:16
 538:10,15 539:4
 540:18 541:4,7
 548:2 549:20
 561:10
dramatic 565:2,25
drive 478:8
driving 558:6
drop 501:11
Drug 563:24
dual 512:18
due 564:3
during 483:8
 484:22,25 488:6
 490:15,22 514:4
 518:2,24 519:19
 525:7,9 543:23
 564:20 569:13
duty 575:13 579:8
- E**
- each** 478:5 481:22
 485:5 493:5 503:2
 524:5 553:24
 556:4 576:11
 577:16
earlier 487:13
 498:24 512:12
 520:25 544:6
 568:9 579:10,13
 580:24
early 472:24
earn 529:4,7,9
- easily** 533:13,14
 534:6,7,9
economic 505:13
 506:10 508:15
 509:10 531:15,19
 563:13
economical 533:14
 534:9,18,19
 535:15,19,24
economics 505:14
 505:17,19 554:12
 572:20 581:25,25
 582:2
economies 506:22
 507:5 534:11
education 554:10
 581:13
educational 582:9
Edward 470:6
effect 519:17
EGNB's 479:7,8,19
 479:24 480:23
 482:14 485:19
 487:9 491:2,4,17
 492:8 512:6
 513:14 515:12
 523:17,22 526:9
 526:17 527:18
 528:6 530:9,16,17
 530:24 531:20
 538:24 539:10,13
 540:19 574:12
eight 480:4 546:14
 554:17
either 473:11 497:6
 530:13 533:20
 579:21
element 521:25
elevates 572:11
Ellen 470:8 471:7
elsewhere 576:23
embarking 565:21
employed 563:19
employees 563:21
employment 565:23
employs 563:19
Enbridge 470:2,22
 501:2 510:11,15
 510:18 513:16
 516:15 527:11
 532:13 536:5
 564:12 569:6
 584:15
end 473:13 484:19
 490:12,16,18
 522:17 523:8
 524:11 548:15
 577:5,21 578:8,11
 578:12,25 579:9
 584:18
endanger 529:13
- ended** 523:10
 577:21
ending 549:22
energy 470:1,4,8
 471:6,11,11
 492:17 496:5,8
 522:6 566:18
 569:10,21 572:9
 573:15 575:10
 584:12
England 512:16
enormous 521:8,14
 534:11 541:20
 555:7
enormously 521:19
enough 470:18
 496:9 533:25
 534:21
ensure 507:2 529:2
entered 533:2
entire 506:21 572:5
entirety 580:2
entitled 529:7,8
 580:19
entitles 471:18
environment 564:2
equal 537:2,8,10,14
 547:4,12,13
equally 550:5
equipment 556:17
 558:10 563:23
equity 573:18
equivalent 509:22
 514:10
Esq 470:6
essence 538:24
 554:25
essence,what
 571:11
essential 521:25
essentially 499:4
establish 500:5,8
 574:12
established 479:16
 489:3 500:6
 517:25 563:17
establishes 518:25
 519:24
establishing 494:20
establishment
 579:11
estimate 474:9
 514:15 557:14,15
 557:16
estimated 514:17
evaluate 576:7
evaluated 580:5
evaluation 574:16
even 471:23 495:24
 499:19 509:4
 529:13 534:13
- 535:7 543:17
 554:21 557:14
 565:7 583:8,18
 584:4
event 472:11
eventually 540:20
ever 554:14
every 550:6 555:16
 582:21,23
everyone 470:14
 549:19
everything 501:11
 547:12,13
evidence,the 574:21
evidentiary 471:20
 471:22 472:12
 473:13 474:16
exact 478:15
examination 474:25
 476:11 477:3,8
 487:5 502:4
 504:24 510:7,9
 511:4,6 541:8
 558:14,24 569:3
examined 570:8
example 503:3,9
 504:5 509:17
 534:12 544:15
 553:14
except 494:19
excess 509:9
excessive 507:3
 524:20 525:18
 549:8 553:19
exchange 557:4,8,9
 557:14 565:13
excluding 497:25
Executives 563:5
exercise 550:10
 555:15
exhibit 480:6,9,9,13
 482:17,19 485:22
 486:22 487:6
 488:22 489:21
 492:23 499:19,22
 500:3,7 526:12
exhibits 486:24
exist 507:23 508:18
 540:19 543:12
existence 522:2
existing 524:19
 532:24 548:8
 554:24 557:22,23
expect 568:12
expectation 568:18
experience 505:15
 535:21 564:20
expert 505:17,19
 543:24 557:7
experts 584:6
explain 511:15

537:19
explained 512:12
 556:2
explaining 538:11
export 572:20
expressed 486:7,16
extend 518:19
extended 576:4
extent 473:20
 510:13 512:16
 529:13 558:7
 562:20
extra 558:22
extract 513:11,12
 513:20
extracted 475:16
extraordinary
 484:23
extrapolate 555:23
extremely 524:6
 535:3 565:6
e-mailing 582:7

F

faced 565:14
facilities 476:15
 543:3,3
facility 537:3
 563:20
fact 489:5 496:7
 502:13 507:5
 508:8 509:13
 510:18 520:5
 521:3 534:2
 541:18 544:9
 550:17,24 557:21
 571:10,13 572:24
 576:22
factual 532:7,8
fails 570:22
fair 482:6 484:24
 490:14,21 502:14
 529:9 556:11
fairly 549:3 555:25
 556:14
familiar 546:25
 557:8 568:10
far 472:6 509:14
 527:7 549:13
 583:18
fashion 475:9 489:3
 496:18 497:12
faster 536:2 561:8
FCL-1 475:7 484:11
FCL-2 511:9,12
FCL-3 492:23
 511:10 529:19
 559:5
February 470:4
feel 473:7 495:21
 496:15 568:20

feels 584:8
feet 545:9
fellow 476:12
fettering 581:6
few 535:6 543:22
 545:13 549:13
 567:23
figure 489:2 496:4
 503:9,10 542:21
figures 494:12
 502:7,8
filed 569:22 584:21
filing 576:20
final 474:14 568:4,4
 585:3,7
Finance 475:2
 562:14
financial 560:17
finds 518:19
fine 472:5 478:16
 498:9 504:22
 507:20
finish 472:25 473:2
first 477:25 491:7
 497:25 501:7
 514:7 515:8,16
 517:22 518:22
 520:17 521:6
 522:14 524:2
 526:15 530:15
 535:21 545:14
 548:4 549:16
 562:20 569:25
 570:10,25 571:20
 573:23 577:7
 578:16 582:6
five 480:3 533:21
 534:15,24 535:8
 535:12 536:4
 562:13
fixed 580:8,10
Flakeboard's
 477:10 479:23
 480:24 481:12,22
 482:13 483:6
 484:12,15 485:3,3
 485:7,16,20
 486:10,20 487:10
 491:2,4,14,17
 492:20,22 496:5
 498:18,20 538:8
 553:2,14
flawed 509:4
FLC 505:4
flip 517:5 518:18
 523:2 528:15
flipped 500:21
 546:17
floor 573:6
fluctuate 478:6,15
focus 575:9

focused 573:3
focusing 575:3
follow 540:3 551:13
followed 513:22
 564:15
following 540:15
 581:12
follows 517:22
 574:9
follow-up 475:18
 521:20
Food 471:10
forced 530:19
 532:20
forecast 491:2,4,5
 514:22
forecasts 491:13
foresee 551:20
forget 475:18
form 483:20,20,23
 485:5 583:25
formal 472:9 473:16
 551:18 552:20
 569:19 572:17
 582:2
forms 584:4,5
formula 483:9,12
 483:14,15 494:20
 507:17
forth 580:11
forward 474:22
 515:16,17 516:16
 519:12 531:13
 562:8
found 520:6 524:15
 525:19
foundation 486:3
founded 486:18
founding 563:10
four 533:23 534:14
 535:8 540:2
 543:16 564:5,18
 568:16
fourth 524:18
framework 518:3,7
franchise 506:18,20
 507:22 570:19,20
 576:5 584:20
frankly 496:25
free 558:16,18
 563:22
freedom 578:22
freely 532:12
freight 565:18
Friday 472:23
front 476:22,25
 513:15
fruit 535:12
fuel 479:15,21
 483:11,16 484:23
 485:12 488:10

498:21 512:10,11
 512:12,14,17,18
 512:20,20,21
 513:5 514:11,16
 536:18,19,23
 537:3,4,5,11,12
 538:18 551:2
 559:7,13 567:15
 569:8 570:10
 571:5,5 572:25
 574:13,25
fuels 483:3 485:8
full 499:4 518:22
 522:14 524:2
 528:16,23,24
fully 573:6
function 581:5
fundamental 505:25
fundamentally
 509:4
further 476:21
 501:25 524:9
 551:21 563:14
 564:15 582:4
 583:11 585:2
future 523:11
 555:23 557:6,10
 566:17 574:24
 577:21
futures 572:9

G

gain 581:13
gallant 474:20,23
 474:24 475:2
 477:5,9 479:17
 480:20 483:12
 485:19 487:9
 489:10,11,15
 490:11 491:7
 492:2,2 494:6
 498:15,18 500:17
 504:8,12,15 573:7
Ganong 471:11,13
 562:12,17,17,21
 562:23,25 563:2
 563:16 564:12
 565:9,13 567:15
Ganongs 563:4
 564:9,18 565:3
 566:10,15,24
Ganong's 566:13
gap 546:4
Gary 471:4
gaske 504:19,23
 505:2,16,20
 510:10 511:8,11
 513:15 526:3
 529:18 537:16
 538:10,15 539:4
 540:18 541:4,7
 548:2 549:20
 561:10 573:12
gave 536:21 544:21
 572:19
general 470:2 512:6
 552:12 569:8
 570:9,19,20
 574:13 576:5
generally 483:13
 491:12 511:25
 515:3 529:6,17
 561:2 564:24
generic 548:14
geographically
 527:5
gets 486:2
getting 527:25
 552:10 554:9
gigajoule 537:11,12
give 474:6,9 476:9
 484:24 487:6
 490:14,20 494:25
 534:21 536:18
 542:12 544:8
 546:9 554:22
 555:11,23 556:23
 556:25 557:6,10
 559:7 580:23
given 488:21 493:19
 495:10 496:10
 507:22 513:19
 541:9 548:18
 552:4 578:24
 580:9
giving 537:18
gj's 477:16,19
 478:12,14 501:18
globally 563:22
go 473:11,18,21
 481:19,20,24
 489:9,13 490:5
 492:22 495:16
 496:17 513:21
 514:7 515:7
 516:10,23 517:17
 518:22 519:23
 520:10 521:20,20
 524:17 526:8,24
 528:16,23 529:18
 532:20 533:4
 535:22 536:16
 538:7 542:17,24
 546:12 547:8
 551:4 556:12,12
 556:13,16 572:8
goal 527:23,24,25
 528:3 565:21
goals 565:23
goes 494:5 506:15
 515:25 518:12
 522:20 538:2

- going** 470:16,17
472:16,17 473:2
481:17 495:14
496:8,12,15
502:17 511:9
513:12 531:11
537:19 539:12
544:5 545:18
549:10,23 551:14
551:21 554:2
555:23 556:24
557:2,19,22 559:2
559:21 561:16
567:10 583:18
gone 519:8 535:11
538:6 582:4 583:5
good 470:14 471:15
476:12 505:24
507:21 511:7,8
543:22 558:2
561:25 569:4
Gorman 470:5
Goss 470:9 471:8
gotten 567:7
grant 506:20,25
granted 506:18
great 496:6 535:23
greater 564:7
573:14
greenfield 517:24
523:17 535:20
571:2,13 575:23
576:3,10 578:17
579:5,9,14
ground 521:4
545:13 566:11
group 553:12
grouped 551:6
grouping 524:4
grow 560:22
growing 561:8
growth 560:7,10,11
560:24 566:24
guarantee 583:5
guess 472:6 480:3,4
481:17 496:10
501:5 532:16
549:21 555:3
567:4 568:4 585:2
guided 580:15
-
- H**
- half-day** 474:13
hand 485:21 510:20
513:12 517:15
handle 497:11
hanging 535:11
happened 535:16
happens 473:20
harm 495:4,22
harmful 496:13
- Harper** 563:9
hate 499:17
having 475:8
477:10 494:7
497:7 509:3
538:16 544:22
headed 481:8
heading 513:22,22
514:2
hear 472:10 561:19
568:16
heard 496:2 505:22
528:7 561:21
582:5 584:5
hearing 471:21,22
472:12 474:17
480:15 494:4
520:24 548:14
552:10 554:20
561:22 569:13
574:11 585:8
hearings 505:23
525:16
Heating 478:8
held 470:4 562:12
563:3
helps 495:13
high 546:15 548:24
565:6
higher 476:19,22
500:19 548:24
551:12 556:6,7
highly 495:16
534:18 539:2
him 474:21 543:25
551:17
himself 562:18
historical 541:20
history 573:9
hold 548:25 549:8
549:17 551:9
holding 548:14
holds 525:16
honors 482:15
hope 541:24
Hopefully 498:13
hoping 584:17
hour 474:8,10,12
hojt 470:22,22,24
472:21,22 473:6,9
474:4,8 477:6,7,8
480:2,6,11,16
482:16 485:18,23
486:6 488:21
489:9 492:24,25
494:5,15 495:10
496:10,19 497:3
497:24 498:7,9
499:7,8,13 500:10
504:9,16,21
513:11 526:18
- 561:17 585:2,3
Hoyt's 495:7
huge 506:22 535:4
538:13 543:11
546:4 558:4
hypotheses 570:25
572:13 579:20
hypothesis 571:9,20
hypothetical 512:17
537:18 538:21
hypothetically
546:8 552:19
553:6
-
- I**
- idea** 474:6 491:20
504:11 552:12
556:3
identical 490:3,9
identification 487:4
487:7,8 489:18,23
490:25 491:6
499:14,23
identified 502:18
503:7 505:16
560:18
identify 529:21
ignore 578:6
ignores 577:22
immigration 565:24
impact 556:20
558:4 565:17
566:2 569:18
570:8 572:21
573:8,23 580:5,19
important 521:2
522:3
impossible 474:2
524:6
improved 565:24
improving 563:13
inappropriate
515:21
Inc 470:2 513:16
incentive 479:13
519:2,24 520:7,8
520:15,16,20
521:16 544:8,21
546:9,20 552:9
578:16
incentives 506:5
546:19 552:4
560:12,13,17,19
560:22 561:5,7
include 500:11
includes 529:3
including 492:19
493:13 498:4
515:14 566:7,15
581:15
incorrect 575:7
- incorrectly** 508:13
increase 478:17
480:17 499:15,16
500:11 502:11,20
506:2,9,15 510:19
555:10 557:24,25
564:16,19,21,22
565:2,15,17,20,23
565:25 566:13,20
567:2 568:5,7,8
568:11,19 569:24
570:9 571:7 572:3
572:10,21 573:8
573:24 579:22
580:4,6 582:23
increased 484:12
560:20 564:14
565:19
increases 564:24
573:9,16 575:2
increasing 540:11
565:16,23
incur 580:16
incurred 503:25
504:3 529:3
indeed 507:3
indicate 482:2
488:12 490:13
498:20 511:12
indicated 477:15
482:22 484:15
485:10 492:17
493:19 507:6
548:22 550:13
558:16 565:8
indicates 479:11
576:20
indicator 558:2
individual 506:7,23
524:7 550:11
551:22,22
induce 517:10
industrial 566:18
industries 566:20
industry 517:25
565:23 566:4,16
informal 471:9,17
471:19,24 561:19
562:2,4,6 568:23
569:5 584:17
information 482:10
482:24 486:14,25
494:14 495:9,21
496:12 497:4,10
504:18 534:2
initial 513:13
520:24 527:3
530:5
initially 521:4
545:12
injury 549:15
- insinuating** 539:6
insofar 571:2
579:17
instead 475:21,22
544:7,21
insult 549:14
intend 580:25
intended 500:2
intent 562:17
interconnected
573:22
interest 496:6 581:7
581:18,19
interject 499:17
interrogatories
559:23
interrogatory
480:14,23 481:9,9
482:20 497:24
559:4 560:15
interrupted 543:25
interval 573:2,5
intervenor 471:14
561:16 568:23
569:5,6,20 574:8
581:5,14,17
584:17
intervenors 471:9
471:18,19,24
472:9 473:16
551:18 552:20
561:19,20 562:2,4
562:6 569:12
572:17 573:22
575:25 579:25
580:3,20 582:2
intervention 530:25
inter-class 573:18
introduced 580:11
introductory
475:20
invested 563:22
investment 529:3,4
534:23
investments 556:17
578:4
involutarily
530:21,22 531:3
532:11,21
involve 554:20
involved 530:4
554:15 561:17
in-camera 495:6
496:15,17
in-house 550:14
IR 479:24 482:14
485:4 486:9
487:20 492:24,25
493:9 498:19
502:5 511:10
523:21 526:8,8,9

526:17 539:10,14
539:23 558:25
irrelevant 494:24
IRs-3 492:22
Irving 470:25
IR-11(a) 539:6
IR-7(c) 529:19
IR-8 533:4,5
IR-9(c) 536:16
isolation 580:5
issue 473:12 495:3,5
522:7,11 559:14
563:12
issues 573:22 574:4
item 489:17,23
526:16,25
I-2 503:6,10

J

January 478:22
481:2,14 482:3,7
491:3,5 503:9
517:12 518:17,17
518:23 519:15,17
522:8 523:25
525:24 528:15,18
574:6 583:8
John 470:4,9 471:8
534:22 558:19
Johnston 470:6
547:23 567:12
581:10
jointly 543:2
judgment 577:18
Juliette 470:11
June 513:13,17
517:19 518:10,15
jurisdiction 547:8
547:16,20
jurisdictions 529:21
529:25 566:6
justify 558:12 572:2
579:21

K

keep 509:16,25
519:21 528:11,13
541:17 542:2
548:5,21 549:7
557:20 582:24,24
keeping 509:12
528:9 551:8
keeps 538:23
kept 506:6
kettles 567:24
key 546:9
kilometre 535:4
kilometres 533:17
533:24
kind 495:8 556:10
558:12 567:21

know 472:25 473:19
473:19 486:17,20
486:21 488:15
489:6,8 498:12,13
502:9 504:16
512:22 521:5
527:6 534:25
550:15 552:21
556:6,11 557:7,19
561:15 562:22
583:14 584:2
knowledge 510:10
knows 498:14

L

lack 573:4 579:23
laid 483:21 565:5
large 470:2 520:19
527:4 534:15
536:3 542:10,20
542:23 549:13,13
550:9,14 551:8,11
552:13 566:15
569:7 570:9
573:24 574:13
largely 580:8
larger 506:6 560:21
560:21
last 473:9,10 479:11
480:9 484:21
515:8 518:13
520:10,13 521:21
522:15 523:2
528:17,24 548:10
554:8,17 556:18
556:19 558:11
562:13 564:6
568:16 584:6
later 510:3 546:4
549:9 550:23
583:10
lateral 507:7,9,10
533:11
latitude 568:10
583:7,15
law 568:10
Lawson's 495:11
496:10,24
Lawton 470:9 471:8
lawyer 531:12,13
laying 566:9
leading 530:5
least 480:4 485:11
512:20 533:23
541:11 562:5
583:22
leaves 565:8
leaving 569:25
lefebvre 471:13,13
471:14 472:4,5
562:5,8,9,11

567:4,9,16,18,20
567:23 568:4,9,18
568:25
legal 531:13 532:7
legally 532:5
LEGERE 480:12
legislation 576:5
584:11
Len 470:22
length 474:5 518:14
575:3
less 474:12 520:16
520:18 522:22
536:17 545:19
549:11 559:6
561:6,7 565:12
568:13
let 516:10 526:12
550:9 552:16,18
letter 569:21 574:9
let's 479:7 489:11
492:22 516:10
521:20 526:8
544:19 583:24
level 488:15 559:24
levy 552:7
LFO 470:2 476:23
477:11 478:18
479:15 506:9
508:2 511:23
512:5 513:2,3,4
517:8 522:13
523:23 526:3,5,22
526:25 527:22
530:2,10,17,18
531:21 533:7,21
540:14 541:13
544:4 550:2,17,24
550:24 551:5,10
551:12 569:14,23
571:2,14 577:25
580:12 581:20
583:12
lies 527:10
Life 563:6
light 479:15 485:12
498:21 512:20,21
536:18,19,23
537:3 559:7
567:16,17,22,24
570:8,10 571:5
574:25
like 472:14 473:18
474:13 479:8,10
479:23 480:22
482:13,21 485:18
490:24 491:23
492:4 497:3
517:15 535:19
540:21 542:17
544:15 551:13

555:8,20,22
557:18 568:22
570:11 582:6
likely 484:25 490:15
490:22 507:24
568:21
limit 542:13,22
limited 470:25
471:3,12,17
476:13 482:19
563:2 569:9 570:4
Limited's 475:3
line 481:25 506:13
508:10,20 509:2
524:18 530:21,25
531:11 532:4
533:16 534:21,22
545:7,9 550:13
552:22 558:22
lines 550:15 558:18
linked 523:8
list 480:9 526:12
listed 535:13 536:7
536:9
listening 554:8
literature 577:12
little 470:14 473:18
501:15 545:19
556:24,25 561:6
584:16
LNG 566:14
load 478:8 514:23
Loblaws 563:24
locate 547:5,14
566:6
located 547:6
location 533:12
534:5 536:8
long 472:15 474:7
513:5 554:14
555:25 558:5
561:16 566:24
longer 517:9 539:7
556:15,19,22
576:9
long-term 557:17
look 470:18 479:7
479:11 480:20
481:3,20 482:3,21
487:9 489:11,13
489:20,25 493:3
501:21 502:5,25
503:6,9 507:15
509:8 539:12
542:6 556:16
558:11
looked 487:12
looking 489:5,6,12
494:8,12,13,16
502:22 558:8
568:14

looks 501:11
Lorraine 470:10
loser 566:7
lost 504:4
lot 472:17 501:11
521:4 542:25
543:2 545:12
548:22 550:19,21
558:23
lots 583:2
loud 470:18
low 528:9 534:17
535:11 551:11
lower 501:11
546:13,18
lump 553:10,15,23
lumped 551:24
Légère 470:10

M

macdougall 470:22
482:15 485:21
511:5,6,7 526:10
526:12 528:22
541:3,5 548:11
554:13 558:24
559:25 560:3,5
made 478:22 541:11
552:2 558:17,25
568:9,11 569:13
569:17 570:10
574:6 576:12,23
578:4 579:25
582:3
magnitude 488:4,7
494:10,17 568:6
579:21
main 533:16 536:8
566:9
maintain 580:13
maintained 570:25
571:8 572:13
maintaining 577:15
maintenance 566:11
major 563:23,25
564:5 565:10
majority 564:6
567:25
make 471:19 491:24
504:15 523:4
524:18 535:18,23
539:24 541:14
548:4 551:14
552:7 553:12
556:16 559:17
562:10 576:12
578:21
making 486:25
531:16 538:19
571:4,20 574:11
575:14 580:12

- 583:9
manage 496:4
managed 496:3
Manager 475:2
managing 579:13
manner 483:18,21
529:25
manufacture 567:6
manufacturers
564:10
manufactures
476:13
manufacturing
476:15 537:3
563:16,17,20
564:2,7
many 480:2 569:17
Marc 562:11
March 480:17
584:18
margin 507:18
514:23 556:3,11
marginal 573:5
Maritimes 547:14
mark 471:13 487:4
487:7,7
marked 480:6
482:17 485:22
486:3 488:22
489:18 490:25
499:22,22 500:7
502:23 503:6
505:4
market 479:12
506:21 511:19
513:8 518:25
520:6 525:24
527:2 551:3 558:2
570:5 571:3,20,21
571:24 572:7,8,9
573:4,14 574:19
574:22 575:6,8,12
576:8 577:3,9,11
577:17 578:7
marketers 514:23
marketplace 571:2
575:24
markets 511:16
572:21,22 577:23
marking 486:22
Mart 563:24
match 538:16
material 548:14
math 484:10
mathematician
495:25
matter 470:2 472:8
472:19 493:18
505:6 513:15
539:16 569:6
572:16 574:10
- 579:7
matters 474:18
505:13 548:15
563:10
mature 540:21
577:17
maximize 528:8,10
maximum 525:14
may 494:18 495:10
502:21 504:20
523:5 526:16,18
530:11 539:13
552:10 569:12
576:22 577:17
584:2,3
maybe 478:11
482:15 501:6
503:21 507:9
526:18,24 536:25
544:20 545:20,24
McLean 470:6
568:3 581:10
mean 473:18,21
486:18 583:2
means 522:21
530:22 533:12
534:5
meant 504:4 558:20
measure 508:6,15
508:22
mechanism 571:6
572:2 575:8,12,17
mechanisms 571:22
578:20
meet 570:22 571:24
member 470:6,7,7
563:4,6,7,11
members 471:4
476:12 511:8
562:9 567:8 569:4
573:21
Mere 576:14
merely 571:13,18
572:3
method 479:4,7
511:25 515:25
518:25,25 519:9
519:13,22,23
520:2 522:4,23
523:5,12,15,16
524:9 541:9,15,16
541:25 542:3,24
543:6,14 544:3
546:16 554:24
576:19
methodologies
576:25
methodology
479:19 485:15
491:15 494:6
512:3,7 513:3,5
- 515:9,16 516:5,7
516:15,17 520:7
526:3,4 527:18
529:22 532:25
541:21,23 554:20
574:11,19,23,23
575:6,14,15
576:13 580:11,21
582:21,23 583:19
584:4,5
Mexico 563:10
mid 473:4,22
middle 501:15,16
midnight 473:10
might 473:25 474:7
475:25 495:22
496:13 499:17
500:4 503:25
505:21 512:16
534:16 538:25
551:12 580:15
miles 545:7
million 484:17
488:12 491:18
498:22 499:16
503:20 504:5
506:14 509:17,18
544:16 545:14,16
546:6,9 549:16
555:9,11,12
558:10
millions 521:5
545:23,24
mind 540:9 559:13
mine 501:5
minimal 570:4
Minister 563:9
minute 510:24
misinterpretation
529:14,16
misnomer 516:14
missing 508:14
534:10
mistaken 487:17
misunderstanding
529:11
mix 567:22
Mmmm 560:17
mode 568:20
modification 476:4
modified 518:16
moment 493:19
520:12 564:6
money 509:5,7
510:13
monopoly 506:18
506:19,21,25
507:22 570:18
578:5
monopoly-pricing
578:23 579:19
- month** 477:20 478:6
481:22 498:25
501:18 522:23
524:15 548:10
monthly 483:2
484:8 485:7
489:14 491:14
months 485:5 491:5
503:2 543:17
555:22,22 564:6
more 474:10 478:8
488:18,20 494:21
496:20 499:7
506:16,17 509:14
509:15,18 517:25
522:10 525:14
540:21 549:13,16
552:22 553:13
556:24,25 558:7
564:3 575:8
577:16 579:18
morning 470:14,21
471:15,23,25
472:5,7,13,23
473:2,3,4,20,22
473:22 474:15,18
476:12 487:16
491:9 498:24
504:12 505:24
511:7,8 543:22
548:12 561:21
562:5 581:12,24
585:6
most 474:8 486:24
492:18 507:24
524:3 528:5 536:2
540:15 563:19
motion 517:13
561:15 574:7,8,15
574:17 575:21
576:18 577:4,20
578:10 582:17
583:8,10,21
motions 478:22
move 517:24 543:8
550:23 556:5
moved 496:20
much 472:14 494:22
496:7 501:24
508:3 509:9,25
541:4,4 546:13,13
546:20 548:24
549:7 551:8,11
556:15,22,25
557:25 564:3
565:12 566:7
must 493:7 514:10
522:21 557:8
563:21 567:5
575:9,10 576:12
579:5,9 580:17
- myself** 554:10
-
- N**
- name** 562:11,25
nature 496:13 580:8
580:10
NB 470:8 471:6
near 523:11 577:21
nearby 535:2
NEB 547:20
necessarily 537:9,19
537:20 538:11
542:12 547:16
necessary 495:7
496:16 521:23
578:4
need 473:7 475:10
480:3,4 504:19
517:9 548:23
553:20 557:18
572:7,8,20 573:4
585:2,2
needed 472:18
540:23
needs 574:3
negative 573:23
negatively 566:2
negotiating 535:7
neighborhood
478:11,14
neither 580:2
net 542:17
never 521:10
535:18 545:17
555:4 571:9
572:24
Nevertheless 570:6
new 470:1,2,4,23
476:14 484:16
500:18 501:2
510:11,15,18
512:3 513:6,16
515:14 516:15
521:24 523:17
526:6 527:4
529:23 530:6
531:17 532:13,25
536:6 537:12
539:8 547:18,19
558:23 563:3,6,11
563:19,23 564:22
565:7,21 566:2,4
566:5,6,15,17,23
569:7 570:20
575:24 580:13
next 472:18 473:25
492:16 495:14
514:7,20 522:20
530:23 531:3
532:11 559:21
560:20 583:6

nice 568:12
night 473:9,10
nobody 545:3
noise 470:15
nomenclature
 511:22 516:17
non-traditional
 518:3,6
normally 542:11,24
North 476:15
 537:23 538:6
 563:7
Northeast 547:14
note 581:3
noted 499:21
 573:13
nothing 529:12
 537:11 545:10
 551:3 572:11
 575:7 576:21
 577:8,16 579:18
notice 541:18
November 481:2,13
 482:11 487:10,24
 489:7,20 503:3
 569:22
number 479:24
 480:10,14 482:14
 482:20 483:10,16
 485:4 487:6,8,21
 488:10,25 489:14
 489:17,20,23
 491:6 492:19,24
 492:25 493:9
 497:25 498:19
 499:14,15 501:20
 502:5,17,25 503:4
 505:4 512:2
 526:17 535:14
 539:14,23 540:11
 557:18 558:25
 559:5 560:2,6,7
 560:15,24 561:6
 577:13
numbers 477:24
 481:5,15 486:12
 486:17 487:18,20
 487:23,24,25
 489:5,6,7 490:3
 491:10 500:2,9
 502:25 540:3,7
 560:23
nutshell 510:5
 582:11
N.B 470:4

O

object 476:24 494:2
objection 499:21
 505:18
objections 480:8

482:18 485:24
objective 494:22
 497:4
objectives 571:25
obligation 578:12
obtain 504:17
obviously 496:8
 554:10 568:11
 584:3,9
occur 510:2
occurred 527:16
October 483:3,4
 485:5,20 487:11
 487:19,19 489:15
 489:17 490:2,7
 498:25 499:2
off 481:15 488:17
 537:13 543:9
 552:10 570:10
offer 476:10 558:17
offered 534:20
 544:16 571:12,23
office 584:21
often 553:11
oh 478:11 500:14
okay 470:16 472:6
 481:10 489:16
 490:6 493:10,12
 501:7,8,8 502:24
 504:22 513:11
 515:7 519:8
 521:21 522:10
 526:8,23 527:11
 528:20 537:10,21
 540:18 559:12
once 497:9
one 475:18 480:4
 489:12 492:18
 499:5,12 501:7,9
 505:25 506:21
 515:4 522:17
 524:11 530:18
 532:20 535:7,21
 539:18 541:6
 543:4,25 546:19
 550:9,25 551:21
 555:4,16 556:2
 559:13 560:20
 568:3 570:4 571:9
 574:22 575:3,5,21
 577:5,9,14,22
 578:25 579:3
 580:18 583:6,14
ones 550:20
only 473:9 497:14
 509:8 520:6
 530:22 537:3
 546:8 550:2
 574:22 577:22
 578:20
onset 523:17

Ontario 562:19
 565:11
onus 575:22,25
open 547:4
opening 500:17
operate 580:13
operating 492:19
 570:25
operation 547:2
operations 564:8
 573:23 580:6
opinion 532:7,8
 572:14,14
opinions 574:14
 580:22
opportunistic
 579:18
opportunity 529:2,8
 529:8 532:10
 562:2,10 566:6
 582:16
opposed 482:8
 503:22 520:20
 521:18 536:8,9
 552:12
option 496:14 532:3
 532:6,11,18,19,22
 543:13 555:17
oral 471:19
oranges 501:14
order 473:7 488:4,7
 494:10,16 506:3
 506:13 538:16
 548:6,19 549:8
 550:2 563:23
ordered 548:13
original 517:19
 584:20
other 472:7 476:15
 478:2 491:8
 503:23,25 505:22
 512:20 517:16
 522:17 524:12
 529:21 531:21
 533:20 534:7,24
 537:7,13,23 539:3
 541:13,13 542:8
 548:7,9 550:6,18
 550:21 556:2,4
 559:13 562:6
 564:10 565:12
 569:16 571:24
 572:25,25 576:23
 577:6,15 578:21
 579:2 581:15,19
 584:3,5
others 516:9
otherwise 500:6
 510:2 576:2
ought 558:3
out 474:2 477:24

483:2,21,24
 484:12 485:21
 487:24 491:9
 496:4 511:24
 513:12 514:21
 520:2 523:5
 535:11,22 536:2
 539:20,23 542:17
 545:18 550:13,19
 550:22 553:21
 554:10 556:16
 565:5 567:7
 570:11
outcome 569:18
 579:3
outline 554:18
outset 515:13,22
 518:9
over 477:19 483:24
 485:12 488:10
 500:21 506:4
 508:17 515:7
 517:8 522:14
 544:8 554:8
 558:12 559:13
 573:10 575:16
 580:9 583:2 584:6
overcharge 509:21
overheads 507:8
overpaying 509:17
 551:9
oversight 577:18
overview 572:19
own 506:13 508:9
 508:20 512:13
 530:20,25 531:11
 532:4,4,9,12
o'clock 473:4
 561:14,15,18,21
 561:23

P

pace 577:17
page 479:10,11
 481:7,20,24
 490:13,20 492:17
 502:18,25 511:12
 511:13 513:21
 514:14,20 515:7
 516:23 517:6,17
 518:18,23 519:23
 520:10 521:21
 522:14 523:3
 524:2,18 526:24
 528:21,22,24
 539:24 578:9
pages 513:20
paid 552:3
pales 565:19
panel 480:3 511:8
 566:8 567:8

panels 476:13
paragraph 479:11
 514:7,13 515:8
 517:18 518:13,22
 520:10 521:21
 522:14,20 523:2
 524:2 528:16,23
 528:24
paragraphs 517:22
paraphrase 582:18
part 484:3 494:7
 496:14,25 497:25
 499:18,20 512:20
 527:7 528:5,12
 530:15 531:9
 583:11
partial 536:23
participate 568:23
particular 481:3
 542:19 577:11
 580:3
particularly 577:2
parties 472:10
 480:8 485:24
 517:17 532:24,24
 582:8
party 531:18
pass 564:23
passed 491:9 570:12
past 486:16 505:14
 538:10 555:3,14
 555:22 556:9
pay 492:4,11,11
 496:7 506:16
 509:22 530:9,16
 530:17,19 531:5
 531:21 537:10,25
 538:4,4,22 545:10
 546:6 548:23
 550:7 555:11,12
 580:17
paying 476:18
 493:20 506:14
 508:25 509:2,9
 521:14 549:8,11
 549:13 553:13,16
 555:8
pays 492:8,10,12,13
 493:21 538:18
penetrated 577:10
 577:25
penetration 577:3
people 539:3 545:4
 553:15 556:16
 558:4
people's 558:6
per 477:19 501:18
 515:16 534:17
 535:4,4 551:11
perceived 532:10
percent 479:15

- 485:11 488:18,20
494:22 497:22
507:19 508:16,17
533:6 546:11,12
564:15,15,16,19
564:21,23 565:19
566:13 569:24
percentage 481:21
488:15 495:12
497:7
perfectly 543:16
perhaps 471:23
472:10 474:6,21
476:9 486:2 495:4
495:10 497:21
498:15 507:12,12
567:6 584:13
period 478:9 483:8
483:24 484:22
488:6,11,20 514:5
517:8,23 518:2,14
518:19,24 519:19
521:4,25 522:13
522:17 523:8,10
524:11 525:8,10
540:19,23 548:16
549:22 555:25
564:20 566:12
575:3 577:5,14
578:8,11,25
579:12
perpetuity 540:20
person 521:6,7
562:21
perspective 585:2
phase 571:14,21
572:6,7 577:12,19
579:4
phrasing 559:20
pin 474:5
pipe 534:13,15
535:3 553:5 566:9
pipeline 511:17,19
547:14 566:9
pipelines 534:11
place 483:10 507:2
507:17 519:21
520:17 530:18
541:15,18,22
542:2 543:16
549:21 554:24
557:22 564:7
566:14
placed 575:25
plant 475:4 563:23
565:9 572:20
plants 564:5 566:6
played 573:18
please 485:23
493:11,14 498:18
559:3 562:8
pleased 584:19
point 474:16 481:17
487:5 508:15
510:25 514:14
515:20 516:14
531:9 534:9
541:25 543:7,25
549:3,21 570:11
573:17 576:21
584:19
points 570:6
policy 471:18
portion 471:20,22
472:12 473:13
474:17
portions 527:6
posing 486:9
position 471:25
496:11 507:15
537:6,15,17,22
538:22 543:24
544:10 562:12
563:3 571:19,23
576:21,22 577:8
577:21 578:24
579:9 580:3,7,14
581:22
positioned 573:5
positions 581:3
possibility 473:5
possible 472:14
528:10
possibly 508:3
postage 552:12
potential 527:2,10
533:21 535:19
570:8 571:16
potentiality 536:5
536:13
power 572:19
584:10
practice 576:23
577:15
practices 578:23
preceding 475:16
475:18
precise 494:12
557:10
precisely 497:22
predecessor 579:10
583:17
predication 572:22
predictable 580:9
preference 472:11
472:22 473:17
486:7,10
preferred 532:3,6
532:17,19
prefiled 486:23
preliminary 472:8
premature 523:6
premise 514:9
premises 470:4
prepared 475:8
476:5 485:19
493:22 497:6,11
497:17 505:8
562:16 579:12
preparer 496:3
present 542:17
562:5,7,18,18,21
presentation 562:10
562:16 563:15
presented 491:11
554:9 569:11
presently 501:3
President 562:14
563:2
Presidents 563:9
presumably 549:23
presume 486:18
560:21
pretty 535:24 555:5
prevented 530:21
562:19
previous 486:8,11
518:14 541:11
582:3 583:16
previously 525:23
531:8
price 471:2 483:16
483:16 484:23
486:13 494:9,20
508:12 509:5
514:9,10,17,21,24
517:9 534:19
537:5 538:8,9,18
538:19,21,24
544:20 545:20
553:16 557:15
564:22 565:2
573:25
prices 511:19
514:15 543:11
546:5 548:24
555:6 556:12,12
557:19 565:17
574:24
pricing 539:9
564:23
primarily 511:9
537:23
Prime 563:9
principle 552:15
580:16
prior 512:22 532:16
533:10 562:13
565:7 585:3
privilege 570:21
576:4
probable 579:3
probably 474:14
475:21 478:8,11
494:25 504:12,15
504:15 516:8
517:16 527:5
534:13 536:2
543:10 544:9
546:17 549:5
550:23 551:4
553:22 555:4
558:11 568:12
problem 527:3,10
539:19
problems 578:14
procedure 471:18
proceed 479:3
495:11 511:4
523:11 562:25
proceeding 478:23
495:17 497:8,8
510:20 517:13
548:19 557:21
569:9,19
proceedings 486:8
486:11 552:18
583:11 585:8
proceeds 571:10,20
process 532:2
549:22 569:18
575:16
processes 530:4
processing 566:3
produce 537:25
product 492:4,11
537:4,6 567:6
production 495:13
495:15 504:4
573:8
products 564:11
profit 514:23
profitability 565:4
projection 491:17
proof 570:5 576:10
propane 480:25
481:13,22 482:8
512:25 567:20,22
567:23,24
proper 573:19
proportion 493:6
493:12,23,24
495:17 498:3
proposal 564:17
565:7
propose 540:19
578:19 579:3
proposed 500:18
506:9 511:23
514:3,25 515:10
516:24 564:16
565:15,20 570:9
proposing 506:8
541:14 569:24
proposition 572:5
propositions 499:25
prospects 563:13
prosperity 566:19
prove 571:9
provide 476:20,23
479:13 481:21
485:6 486:8
493:14,22 497:7
505:20 506:19
507:12 508:16
519:2,24 520:7,15
522:5 533:25
558:17,18
provided 473:21
480:24 481:11
482:10,24 487:20
505:5 506:4 507:6
520:19,23 527:17
560:18 573:11
574:2 578:21
provider 508:8
570:18
provides 514:17
520:15,21 563:8
providing 481:15
512:9 519:4
521:15 558:15
560:21 569:9
574:2 575:7 580:7
province 526:6,23
527:4,4,7 545:11
547:17,19 563:13
566:23 570:19
proving 491:20
proximity 536:9,10
proxy 542:8 543:5,9
prudently 529:3
public 471:14 507:4
561:16 569:5
581:5,7,14,17,18
581:18
pull 539:5
pulled 550:22
pulls 550:19
Purchasing 475:3
purpose 484:23
542:5 582:9
purposes 494:19
515:12 522:22
538:21 548:9,21
550:4,7
pushing 496:25
547:7
put 472:19 485:18
496:11 499:24
515:16,17 516:15
521:4 549:21
566:10 580:11
582:17
putting 486:13

- 497:4 519:11
531:13
p.m 561:24,24
-
- Q**
- qualified** 531:12
qualifiers 536:21
qualify 559:16
Quebec 564:8
questions 477:5
480:23 481:3
499:7,9,10,23
500:4 504:6 510:8
541:3 543:19
547:22 551:17
561:9 567:8,11,13
568:2 581:9
584:18
quick 523:21
quickly 496:4
535:24
quite 496:25 534:17
548:11
quote 490:13,16
519:23 520:5
523:3 574:9
578:10
quoted 583:20
quotes 517:19
Q.C 470:5
Q.1 475:2 505:2
Q.10 477:22 511:22
Q.100 503:13 533:9
Q.101 503:16
533:15
Q.102 503:19
533:19
Q.103 503:25
533:23
Q.104 534:4
Q.105 535:17
Q.106 536:4
Q.107 536:13
Q.108 536:16
Q.109 537:10
Q.11 478:3 512:5
Q.110 537:16
Q.111 537:21
Q.112 538:10
Q.113 538:12
Q.114 538:15
Q.115 539:4
Q.116 539:10
Q.117 539:13
Q.118 539:16
Q.119 539:20
Q.12 478:5 512:9
Q.120 539:23
Q.121 540:5
Q.122 540:9
Q.123 540:14
Q.124 540:18
Q.125 540:23
Q.126 541:9
Q.127 542:4
Q.128 542:8
Q.129 543:5
Q.13 478:10 512:18
Q.130 543:22
Q.131 544:13
Q.132 544:23
Q.133 544:25
Q.134 545:5
Q.135 545:9
Q.136 546:11
Q.137 546:22
Q.138 546:25
Q.139 547:4
Q.14 478:13 512:20
Q.140 547:12
Q.141 547:16
Q.142 547:18
Q.143 548:2
Q.144 549:20
Q.145 550:5
Q.146 551:16
Q.147 552:10
Q.148 552:16
Q.149 553:6
Q.15 478:16 512:22
Q.150 553:9
Q.151 554:2
Q.152 554:8
Q.153 555:20
Q.154 556:6
Q.155 556:9
Q.156 557:3
Q.157 557:6
Q.158 557:12
Q.159 558:15
Q.16 478:21 513:2
Q.160 558:22
Q.161 558:24
Q.162 559:12
Q.163 559:17
Q.164 560:6
Q.165 560:10
Q.166 560:23
Q.167 561:2
Q.168 561:4
Q.169 567:15
Q.17 479:2 513:8
Q.170 567:17
Q.171 567:19
Q.172 567:21
Q.173 569:4
Q.174 581:12
Q.175 581:21
Q.176 581:24
Q.177 582:9
Q.178 582:14
Q.179 584:7
Q.18 479:7 513:11
Q.180 584:13
Q.19 479:19 513:19
Q.2 475:6 505:4
Q.20 479:23 514:2
Q.21 480:20 514:7
Q.22 480:22 514:13
Q.23 481:6 514:20
Q.24 481:8 515:3
Q.25 481:11 515:7
Q.26 481:19 515:12
Q.27 482:4 515:22
Q.28 482:6 516:3
Q.29 482:10 516:10
Q.3 475:11 505:8
Q.30 482:13 516:15
Q.31 482:21 516:20
Q.32 483:6 516:23
Q.33 483:12 517:3
Q.34 483:18 517:12
Q.35 483:23 517:15
Q.36 484:7 517:22
Q.37 484:11 518:6
Q.38 484:15 518:9
Q.39 484:19 518:12
Q.4 475:15 505:10
Q.40 485:3 518:22
Q.41 485:10 519:8
Q.42 485:14 519:15
Q.43 487:9 519:19
Q.44 487:13 519:22
Q.45 487:15 520:5
Q.46 487:18 520:10
Q.47 487:23 520:14
Q.48 488:4 520:23
Q.49 488:12 521:9
Q.5 476:7 505:12
Q.50 488:15 521:20
Q.51 488:18 522:8
Q.52 489:11 522:10
Q.53 489:17 522:20
Q.54 489:20 523:2
Q.55 489:23 523:15
Q.56 489:25 523:20
Q.57 490:5 523:25
Q.58 490:7 524:15
Q.59 490:9 524:17
Q.6 476:9 505:20
Q.60 490:11 524:22
Q.61 490:18 524:25
Q.62 490:20 525:4
Q.63 490:24 525:7
Q.64 491:7 525:12
Q.65 491:10 525:14
Q.66 491:13 525:19
Q.67 491:21 525:23
Q.68 492:2 526:3
Q.69 492:7 526:8
Q.7 477:9 510:10
Q.70 492:12 526:15
Q.71 492:16 526:17
Q.72 492:22 526:21
Q.73 493:3 527:9
Q.74 493:6 527:11
Q.75 493:9 527:16
Q.76 493:11 527:21
Q.77 493:16 527:25
Q.78 493:19 528:4
Q.79 498:18 528:6
Q.8 477:15 510:13
Q.80 498:24 528:15
Q.81 499:4 528:19
Q.82 500:17 528:23
Q.83 500:21 529:6
Q.84 500:24 529:16
Q.85 501:7 529:20
Q.86 501:9 530:4
Q.87 501:11 530:8
Q.88 501:13 530:15
Q.89 501:17 531:5
Q.9 477:19 510:18
Q.90 501:19 531:12
Q.91 501:21 531:16
Q.92 501:24 531:20
Q.93 502:5 531:24
Q.94 502:9 532:5
Q.95 502:13 532:12
Q.96 502:17 532:15
Q.97 502:25 532:19
Q.98 503:6 532:23
Q.99 503:9 533:4
-
- R**
- radford** 470:7
500:15,16 501:25
502:2 554:6,7
555:18 568:3,16
568:22 581:10,11
584:20,23
raised 522:12
573:17
range 568:21
ratemaking 531:19
582:21,23 583:17
583:19 584:4
ratesetting 571:22
rather 483:3 485:7
497:18 509:7
571:3 572:14
578:19 583:13
rational 521:15
Raymond 470:5
reachable 534:7
reached 533:13,14
534:6,9
read 475:21 484:21
493:3,16 517:12
559:18,18 583:23
reading 475:25
ready 473:21 511:4
real 508:15 509:10
553:3
realistic 557:6
reality 578:7
realized 488:5
really 473:11 474:5
486:5 496:25
499:25 512:14
536:11 537:2
541:25 550:20
551:10 553:19
556:10 561:15
reason 486:6 491:17
499:18 504:22
506:8,20 509:15
520:25 521:2
535:13 559:19
reasonable 494:17
494:18 506:10
507:17 525:17,20
529:2,7,8 538:4
547:10 555:13
573:13 582:13,14
582:19
reasonableness
553:24
reasonably 578:3
reasons 535:14
recall 503:16
529:24 533:25
recalling 504:21
receive 487:15
received 473:9
487:13,16 519:5
recent 522:11
540:15 556:9
recently 519:8,15
525:23 543:12
546:5
Recess 511:3 561:24
recognition 577:16
recognizing 472:22
495:14
recommendation
509:12 529:12
recommendations
505:25 548:4
recommended
519:21
recommending
509:24
reconcile 489:7
record 486:14 497:5
576:21 577:8,24
recorded 519:6
585:9
recover 529:2,9
recovered 499:4
552:6
recruiting 563:21
red 501:3,9
redefine 551:5
redirect 499:20

- 500:12 502:3,4
504:6 558:13,14
reduced 565:3,4
reduces 575:2
Reed 551:16 573:2
refer 479:23 480:18
502:17 511:11
533:5 559:2
reference 518:6
558:15,24 559:24
560:13
references 498:2
referred 476:2
511:14 513:8
523:15 559:25
referring 483:14
511:9 519:10
reflection 484:24
490:14,21 502:14
reflective 540:7
regardless 516:16
536:7
regards 483:10
484:4
regime 531:17
532:25
regulated 529:25
regulation 507:23
regulator 579:15
regulators 576:24
regulatory 505:13
505:17,19 506:10
518:3,6 529:6
531:16 532:24
576:22 577:13,18
580:16
reiterated 525:24
reject 506:2,8
rejected 579:22
rejecting 579:25
relates 560:11
578:14
relation 478:22
relationship 484:4
511:16 541:20
relative 483:16
495:2 553:19
relatively 550:10
relevance 494:3,3
494:19 496:20,22
relevant 493:17
495:16 496:8
497:15,16 513:20
rely 572:15
relying 540:24
remain 533:21
remaining 478:2,3
536:4 570:2
remarks 500:17
remember 481:15
521:5 522:3
- 533:15,19 535:6
removal 578:17
remove 576:8
removed 475:12
render 576:16
rendering 572:16
574:4
repeat 490:17
580:25
repeated 497:21
report 505:5
reporter 470:15
585:11
represent 488:16
492:18 493:14,25
494:11 495:18
498:5
representative
495:12
represented 482:6
581:16
representing 546:23
581:7,18
represents 488:25
494:23 500:25
581:19
repudiate 579:12
request 483:7
requested 502:11
566:21
requesting 478:17
require 480:2
574:16
required 517:24
567:24 570:5
requires 566:3
577:18
requiring 550:6
reserve 581:4
residences 536:3
residential 543:5
residual 514:24
respect 471:17
472:7,10 480:16
495:3 503:19
505:22 523:23
549:23 550:6
559:10,12 562:3
568:5 569:10
572:19 573:7
574:7 575:19,23
579:6 580:22
581:2 583:3,17
respectively 567:2
responded 497:12
response 477:12
479:23 480:23
482:13,22 483:6
485:3,4,10 487:20
488:21 492:22
493:4,16 496:10
- 496:16 498:19,19
520:13 523:20,21
524:18 526:9,17
526:25 529:18,20
530:8 533:4
536:21,24 539:5,6
539:10,13
responses 481:8
489:13 507:5
511:10
responsibilities
570:22 581:5
responsibility
528:25 575:13
576:7 579:7,13
responsible 570:14
rest 507:11
restated 572:5
Restaurant 471:10
restrict 575:15
restricted 564:24
rests 573:22
result 475:7,20
504:2 565:15
resulted 477:10
564:4
resulting 566:13
return 529:4,9
562:19
revenues 519:5
reverse 575:21
review 478:24
576:20 583:18,24
reviewed 548:11
reviewing 582:20
582:22
revisit 536:25 583:8
583:16
revoked 570:21
rides 475:24
right 470:17,20
473:12 474:13
481:15 482:4
488:17 496:23
501:16 503:23
505:6,18 508:22
509:14 513:9
516:16 519:20
521:12 524:23
527:19 546:25
547:20 550:3,9
551:23 555:5
556:10 557:6
559:17 567:11
570:21 576:3,7
581:4,21 585:6
rights 531:17,17
rise 580:23
Robert 470:7
role 569:9 573:18
581:6,17 584:16
- roughly** 477:24
501:16
ruled 519:16 554:19
576:18 577:4
rules 497:14
ruling 479:5 497:16
577:7
rulings 541:12
569:12,17 574:7
574:14 579:10,13
580:23 583:16
run 507:9 530:10
runs 539:23
- S**
- S** 557:3,8,9
Saint 470:4 534:22
558:18
saints 558:23
sale 570:13
same 487:20,23
488:10,10 490:10
491:15,20 502:18
512:7 519:10,13
524:9 529:23,25
532:2 539:24
541:10 543:2,13
550:5,7 553:17
555:3 566:4
576:19 578:21
Sarah 471:2
sat 480:21
satisfactory 543:16
Saturday 474:3
save 510:13
saved 488:20
saving 509:5,8
510:14
savings 479:12,16
479:20 480:24
481:12,21,25
482:7,10 483:2,7
483:19,21,25
484:3,4,8,25
485:7,11,16,20
487:10,18 488:5
488:10,15 489:14
490:15,21 491:2,4
491:14,16,18
494:22 498:25
502:14,19 503:2
508:17,18,24
510:20 522:5
547:9
Savoie 470:11
saying 536:13
541:25 542:2
545:5 546:22
549:20 558:9
582:21 583:18,22
says 490:20 501:18
- 514:3,8 515:8
524:13 529:5
560:17
scale 506:22 507:5
534:12
screw 475:9
seasonality 478:7
second 477:23
478:17 501:9
509:12 517:18
518:13 520:11
521:21 526:15,24
532:21 548:5
569:19 578:24
581:2,7
secondly 570:18
573:25
secretary 470:10,11
480:4 562:15
sector 479:15
see 479:17,20 480:9
491:7 513:15,15
513:18,22 514:3
517:18 518:4,12
520:5 523:3
539:20,21 540:2,5
540:14 551:23
552:24 553:23
560:24 581:17
583:24
seeing 538:20
seem 470:14 491:21
533:25 551:21
561:7 582:4,10
seen 502:7,8 548:10
565:17 583:4
584:14,16
self-sufficiency
565:22,22 566:22
sense 494:10 504:9
sentence 484:21
514:8 515:8
520:11 521:22
522:15 528:17,24
separate 524:5
551:18 553:20
separately 550:22
569:15
separates 570:12
series 536:21
572:12
serve 507:10 534:22
542:14 543:2
served 535:3 576:25
577:23 578:3,3
service 470:2
476:20 506:14,16
506:19 507:7,13
507:14 517:8
519:5 524:19
530:12 532:4

- 555:9 558:3,16,18
563:23 570:9,18
571:7 572:3
573:16 574:2,3
575:7,9
services 471:10,11
501:2 511:18
522:14 573:10,11
580:8,10
Service-Light 569:8
574:13
serving 506:21
542:18
session 568:24
set 479:3 483:2
484:12 487:24
506:3 509:25
511:24 518:25
523:11 524:4,5,6
529:25 548:6
561:25
sets 525:11
setting 514:4 515:9
522:4,22 523:5
524:9 529:22
532:25 541:10
556:23 574:19,25
575:8,12,14,17
576:13,19,24
578:19
seven 476:15
several 570:6 574:7
SGS 539:21 540:2,2
540:7
share 559:22
sheet 560:13
Shoppers 563:24
short 530:10
show 482:13 513:11
526:18
shown 487:19
503:10,10 536:5
shows 540:10
side 497:2
sign 535:9,18,22,24
545:21
signed 532:12
535:11,13,15
536:7,10 545:22
significance 565:19
significant 477:22
492:18 500:19
523:7 526:5,22
527:8,13 547:9
564:10 573:17
significantly 476:19
500:18 510:19
566:12
signing 536:12
similar 478:5
482:10 485:15
- 551:6 552:19
553:7,8
similarly 482:10
simple 549:4 550:10
simply 494:16
499:22 541:21
542:2 548:21
549:7
since 480:21,21
485:5 488:2
515:22 519:11
563:3,18,22
564:18 565:18
566:10,13 570:4
single 484:22
sir 541:9 581:17
sit 473:25 582:16
site 476:19
situation 472:20
517:25 535:20
575:23
six 544:15
size 534:10,12
548:25 549:17
550:20 553:4,8,9
slightly 552:22
slips 556:20
small 535:3 539:2
567:23
smaller 506:6
551:12
soaking 538:14
solely 543:4
some 472:18 475:9
478:7 483:24
486:3,10,15,19
495:2,3,4,21,22
495:22 500:8
503:16 507:8,20
511:18 512:24
516:8,14 524:13
529:13 534:10
535:10 538:6
543:7 549:11,23
551:5,16 552:2
553:18 556:10
564:8 567:7
somebody 492:13
498:14 509:3
something 475:12
504:13 542:17
543:12 556:14
568:13,13,20
584:9
sometimes 497:21
526:11
somewhat 547:2,3
561:7
somewhere 584:21
soon 552:16
sooner 473:24
- 560:14 578:13
sorry 478:13 487:7
489:12,15 493:7
500:14,15 501:8
531:25 539:12
560:11 563:6
568:16
sort 486:24 496:15
sounds 474:13
source 522:6
sources 566:18
speaking 470:18
581:15
specific 497:24
522:11 542:14
specifically 525:25
583:20
specifics 483:13
495:8 561:4
spend 558:9
split 551:10 583:13
spread 555:6
557:16,20,22,23
557:23,25 571:4
574:23 575:4
spreads 572:9,23
573:15 575:10
spreadsheet 485:15
491:15
squaring 572:4
St 475:3 476:14,19
507:6,11 533:11
534:7 558:16,20
563:2,17,20 564:9
564:13 565:9
566:10,24
stable 580:9
staff 470:9 471:8
499:9
stamp 552:13
stand 474:21 506:25
559:21
standard 506:10
standards 573:13
stand-alone 506:12
509:19 542:11,12
549:4 553:13,14
start 472:24 473:14
482:3 493:5
500:13 539:20
545:18 549:18
568:12
started 473:3 499:2
545:25
starting 470:21
474:3 514:14
520:11 521:21
starts 514:8
start-up 521:3
state 511:15 518:12
530:8 532:5
- 575:22
stated 479:22
518:18 521:22
522:8 524:3
529:24 544:2,6
578:9
statement 487:2
524:19 532:8
states 522:15
528:25 563:9,25
565:11
stating 517:7
533:15
stay 556:11
stayed 531:7
stays 507:19
step 514:20 551:21
554:13,13
Stephen 475:3
476:14,19 507:6
507:11 533:11
534:7 558:16,20
563:3,17,20 564:9
564:13 565:9
566:10,25
stepped 561:13
sterile 575:5
Steve 470:7
steven 504:23 505:2
stewart 471:2,2
473:16,18 474:9
474:10 477:4,5
510:8,9,23 582:16
582:17 585:4,4
Stewart's 574:9
583:21
still 538:18 547:9,18
556:12,13 570:25
571:21 572:6
575:23 577:12
579:4
stop 520:12
strategy 579:19
strictly 547:6
strike 581:23
strokes 583:4
strong 530:24
struck 543:22
structure 538:25
structured 572:24
struggling 530:15
study 548:7,20
549:3 550:7
submission 471:19
submit 494:23,25
507:22 521:11
557:24 565:24
567:2 571:8,12
572:15 574:3,14
575:5,13,17,19
578:6 579:6
- 582:20
submitted 475:7
566:8
substantial 560:7
substantially
529:23 554:3
substantive 579:23
successful 527:22
Sucor 471:17
suddenly 546:6
sufficient 479:13
suggest 482:16
536:11 539:9
577:7 578:14
584:10
suggested 509:15
551:17
suggesting 553:6
568:6 584:2
suggestion 549:25
568:7
suggests 529:14
571:15
summarize 554:2
summary 476:9
505:20 573:21
summer 478:9
Sun 563:5
sunk 545:12
supplier 578:5
Supply 562:12
support 502:7
571:12,23 576:21
577:8 579:20,24
supporting 486:4
569:22
suppose 474:16
surcharge 552:6
surcharges 552:8
sure 472:15 490:18
497:20,22 499:12
526:7 527:9
539:24 546:24
553:12 559:15,17
559:25 567:10
582:18
surrounding 582:22
swear 474:23
switch 479:14
512:21 521:16
538:19 544:8,21
545:3,4 546:9,19
556:17 558:6,25
switched 538:16
switching 536:2,19
536:23 558:5,12
559:8
sworn 474:21,24
504:23,25
system 506:3 512:13
515:14 521:23

522:3 527:12,19
531:18 545:10
549:24 584:7
systems 563:23

T

table 539:16 560:19
take 470:20 472:16
473:14 486:18
491:19 494:12,13
497:6 510:24
526:5,22 527:13
527:16 541:18
543:8,13 545:15
552:14 557:3,17
561:16 578:5
taken 530:6 532:4
581:3
takes 507:7 564:7
taking 522:7 545:6
545:8 568:15,22
584:24
talk 516:10 548:2
talking 518:16
521:12 522:12
524:22 526:25
531:22 533:20
535:2,8 537:17
546:19 551:21
tap 547:15,20
target 479:16
513:23 514:2,4,24
515:10
targeted 479:12
tariffs 513:14,17
tell 475:23 479:2
491:13 517:3
ten 494:22 507:19
508:16,17
tend 535:25 556:4
term 517:23 535:12
556:15,19,22
558:5 566:24
terminated 577:14
termination 577:19
terminology 516:12
516:21,22 517:4
terms 473:19 474:5
481:19 485:19
486:11 487:23
489:9 495:15,20
504:10 508:13
509:4,7,9,12
568:10
test 553:11,18,24
testified 551:16
testimony 505:5
508:5 510:5
511:13 515:20
516:14 517:3
521:6,17 528:12

529:14 531:9,13
531:15 532:23
533:19 535:5,10
536:11 542:16
543:23,25 545:14
546:14 548:22
558:17
thee 577:7
their 472:11 494:9
494:11 496:13
508:20 509:5,18
512:13,14 516:21
529:9,9 530:25,25
531:11 532:2,3,4
532:9,11,12,17,19
532:21 533:2
536:8 538:6,7,23
545:6 546:25
551:2,3 552:24
553:13,19 556:16
556:21 565:9
567:21 569:16
580:13 583:14
theme 575:20,21
themselves 506:24
509:3 534:20
548:25
theory 529:7 538:2
theriault 471:15,16
472:2,3 562:6
569:2,3 577:20
581:9,17,22 582:7
582:13,15 584:8
584:16,24 585:1
thing 529:14 550:9
550:25 557:13
things 496:19
535:21 537:7,10
537:13 543:22
545:18 548:8
third 477:23 478:18
528:16,23,24
579:6
Thirdly 570:24
though 500:4
506:25 557:13
thought 502:23
thoughts 555:20,24
three 475:25 503:2
534:16 540:2
554:8 555:22
558:11 570:24
571:4 578:14
through 473:11
476:15 481:24
488:20 497:6
501:21 506:15
515:14 516:4
519:8 530:24
532:2 554:13,13
554:15 575:20

581:12
throughout 525:5
549:24
throw 507:8 534:21
thumbs 554:22,22
555:11
tie 544:19
tied 475:11 508:6
521:3,11,13 538:9
538:18,23 546:21
tier 477:11,11,25
540:14 584:7
tiers 478:2
till 540:10 561:22
time 472:18 473:2
474:16 482:7
483:8,24 487:6
488:6,10,20
490:24 502:18
504:3,4 510:4,25
517:24 522:22
542:2 543:15
555:3,16,25
561:18 563:18
564:13 566:4,12
568:23 573:2
576:6 580:9
582:21 583:10
584:24 585:6
timelines 579:11,14
times 534:14,15,16
534:16 550:20
timing 504:10
577:19 579:21
tip 514:15 544:13
547:7,10
today 471:22
472:15 473:20
476:22 494:24
498:8 502:10
507:25 515:14,17
527:19 543:17
547:5 561:11
567:7 581:16
584:25
today's 568:24
together 551:6,25
553:10,15,23
556:5
told 480:5 484:7
tolls 514:22
tomorrow 472:16
474:15 561:21
585:6
toner 470:7 499:11
499:12 502:6,9
528:21 543:20,21
547:22 555:19
567:9,10 581:10
top 538:5
topic 552:10

topics 548:2
Toronto 564:8
total 481:25 482:7
484:8 486:12
489:14 493:12,23
493:24 494:11,23
495:18 496:5
498:3 514:9,17,21
527:2 545:20
totaled 484:8
totally 559:15
towards 584:18
town 474:2
traced 573:9
track 506:4 509:12
509:25 548:21
549:7 551:8
Trade 563:22
transcript 473:7,10
585:8
transition 548:17
transportation
508:8 511:18,19
514:22 530:12
572:3
transporting 570:14
treated 550:22
treating 496:14
tremendous 554:11
tried 530:20
trouble 567:7
true 475:6 476:7
484:25 490:14,21
505:10 511:17
543:10 550:5
585:8
try 500:5 508:3
528:8 581:22
trying 508:9 510:18
539:7 557:13,15
581:13 582:10
Tuesday 487:16
488:2 491:9
turn 479:8,10
482:22 484:19
489:11 490:12
492:3,16 497:8
498:18 513:19
514:20 523:5,21
523:25 539:4,10
549:17 559:5
two 478:2 481:3
484:5,6 493:19
505:24 517:22
518:14 548:4
550:20 551:18,24
552:20 555:22
556:4 557:16
558:11 562:4
571:3,5 572:17
573:22 575:10

type 486:13 567:15
572:25 574:22
types 571:5
typical 478:10
typically 506:20

U

U 557:3,8,9
ultimately 531:2
unchanged 570:2
uncompetitive
565:14
under 475:8 476:5
489:13 506:10
507:19 508:4
514:2 518:11
521:12 547:20
570:22
underlying 565:22
575:6,20
understand 476:20
479:5 497:5
500:24 512:24
517:7 530:20
534:20 540:18
543:7,24 548:6
549:20,25 554:12
559:15 562:4,22
581:24 582:10
understanding
475:11 510:12
512:19 513:10
515:6 517:5
520:18 540:5
understood 515:15
523:16 529:6,17
542:4
undertaking 497:7
497:12,17,20
498:10,13 504:10
undertakings
497:22
undue 580:11
unit 534:17 535:4,4
551:11,12
United 563:9,25
565:11
University 563:6
unless 474:17 500:8
564:25 579:12
unreasonable
566:14 568:12
until 472:16 561:14
561:18 582:5
585:6
unusual 555:5
564:25
upper 542:13,22
up-to-date 480:9
usage 477:10 478:7
478:9,10 552:19

use 478:5 479:14 487:4 505:25 506:25 513:2 519:3,25 520:8 524:8 528:4 531:6 542:21 544:14 545:2 556:3 572:2 572:7,8,25 576:19	verge 536:12 versus 483:10,16 545:2 555:21 567:24 very 472:14,19 495:25 496:4 501:24 515:13 523:6,21 535:5 541:4,4 545:13 548:23,24 549:13 554:8 556:25 558:2 564:25 567:23 583:15 584:16	wasn't 475:12 476:2 476:3,4 486:23 526:15 567:10 583:22 way 491:20 495:22 497:17 511:18 524:4 538:10 546:15 547:7 559:16 562:21 583:23	505:13 529:22 wouldn't 484:7 487:6 504:4 509:5 542:11,11 543:8 545:2 550:5 560:8 wrestling 582:3 written 471:19 505:5 562:20 573:12 wrong 493:7 526:16	507:9 508:10,20 509:2 553:15 \$4.2 491:18 \$4.54 566:21 \$500,000 545:20 \$65,923 503:4 \$66,514 503:7 \$78,000 565:16 \$81,700 503:10 \$81,726.94 482:5 \$88,900 503:11 \$9 537:12 \$9.6 488:12
used 483:24 484:2,2 491:15 499:20 500:19 501:20 502:7 512:2,7,23 512:24 513:3,5,6 514:4 515:19,22 515:23 516:22 517:23 518:3 519:11 521:10 525:5 527:21 529:23 535:12 545:3 548:7 555:21 573:2 575:4,9	viability 566:19 vice 526:10,14 547:24,25 554:5 562:13 567:13,14 568:2 Vice-Chairman 470:6 Vice-President 562:11 view 511:17 517:7 520:6 522:13 529:13 vigorously 581:6 virtually 565:10 vitae 505:12 volatility 580:11 volition 532:12 volume 526:10 534:14,16 volumes 501:13,13 534:25 voluntarily 530:9 530:16,17 531:5 531:21 532:19 voluntary 532:3	well 470:20 472:6 472:25 473:12 474:4,13,14 478:10 480:3,16 487:11 488:11 489:9 492:5 495:3 504:20 507:10 512:16 516:10 520:25 526:8 527:11 531:23 532:14 534:4 538:20,25 546:11 551:20 553:6 554:19 560:25 565:18 566:19 567:20 568:9,18 568:22 573:19 581:19 582:19 went 516:4 532:11 546:15 561:7 western 527:7 whatsoever 507:24 while 473:24 566:4 569:14,25 577:15 whole 476:23 497:8 523:23 545:16 549:24 wide 583:15 winter 478:8,9,10 wish 487:4 580:25 wishes 475:15 504:16 witness 496:3 499:24 504:21,25 505:19 510:6 561:12,13 572:19 573:2,3,7,12,17 witnesses 542:16 wonder 475:25 wondering 548:18 568:6 word 491:19 500:19 words 475:20 568:16 578:22 work 472:21 476:2 481:24 worked 483:23	X X 552:18 Y year 498:6 499:5 506:13 507:8,9,12 508:10,21,25 509:18 518:24 519:15,18 555:9 555:11,12 560:20 565:16 578:20 years 481:16 505:15 512:3 535:8 544:15 546:4,14 549:18 554:17 558:11 562:13,14 564:18 573:10 yesterday 478:21 517:16 528:8 532:23 533:15,20 540:25 551:16 yesterday's 473:10 562:18 Young 470:10 471:8 Z zero 534:23 \$ \$1 549:16 \$1.2 506:14 555:9 555:11 \$10 537:11 \$19,000,000 509:21 \$2 544:16 545:14,16 546:6,9 555:12 \$2,000,000 506:16 507:13 508:25 \$2,217,618 484:8 498:25 \$2.1 484:16 \$2.3 498:21 503:20 \$200,000 507:12 \$25,160 489:16 \$250,000 507:8 \$3 558:9 \$300,000 509:20 534:19 545:25 \$320,000 553:16 \$350,000 506:13,17	0 04 503:3 05 482:3 503:9 053 502:23 06 540:6 07 540:6 1 1 481:20 482:14,20 487:7,21 518:17 539:11,14,16,23 540:14 1(a) 482:21 1/2 549:16 1:00 561:15 10 477:9 479:15 485:11 488:18,20 513:21 516:23 546:11,12 10:20 511:3 10:40 511:3 100 497:22 533:6 545:9 11:00 511:2 12 491:4 515:7 12:00 561:24 13 533:17,24 545:6 14 475:10,11,15,16 475:19 562:14 14th 470:4 149 564:15 15 475:20,21 510:24 525:2,20 564:6 18 517:12 518:23 522:8 523:25 525:24 528:15,18 540:14 550:21 581:15 18th 478:22 574:6 583:8 18,000,000 509:19 1873 563:17 1977 563:4 1999 570:12
user 492:7 users 566:15 uses 477:16,22 574:24 using 479:3 480:24 481:12,22 482:8 483:2,7 484:22 485:6,7,12 488:5 491:15 493:12,23 498:3 499:2,14 501:2,19 507:10 508:4,19,19,21,23 508:23 509:6 512:17,22 518:25 521:13 523:12 526:3 531:6,7 539:16 543:2,14 544:6,25 545:2,5 554:23 564:18 567:15,17,20 573:15	wait 472:16 Wallboard 508:2 531:23,24,25 548:23 574:8 Wallboard/JD 470:24 Wal-Mart 563:24 want 472:2 474:5 487:6 494:9,9 496:11 507:13 516:10 536:24 541:14 543:23 548:2 556:10,15 558:7 559:5 584:17 wanted 490:4 529:16 532:9 539:24 544:2 559:17 wants 583:7	wasn't 475:12 476:2 476:3,4 486:23 526:15 567:10 583:22 way 491:20 495:22 497:17 511:18 524:4 538:10 546:15 547:7 559:16 562:21 583:23 weather 562:19 week 472:18 473:25 487:13 505:23 583:3 well 470:20 472:6 472:25 473:12 474:4,13,14 478:10 480:3,16 487:11 488:11 489:9 492:5 495:3 504:20 507:10 512:16 516:10 520:25 526:8 527:11 531:23 532:14 534:4 538:20,25 546:11 551:20 553:6 554:19 560:25 565:18 566:19 567:20 568:9,18 568:22 573:19 581:19 582:19 went 516:4 532:11 546:15 561:7 western 527:7 whatsoever 507:24 while 473:24 566:4 569:14,25 577:15 whole 476:23 497:8 523:23 545:16 549:24 wide 583:15 winter 478:8,9,10 wish 487:4 580:25 wishes 475:15 504:16 witness 496:3 499:24 504:21,25 505:19 510:6 561:12,13 572:19 573:2,3,7,12,17 witnesses 542:16 wonder 475:25 wondering 548:18 568:6 word 491:19 500:19 words 475:20 568:16 578:22 work 472:21 476:2 481:24 worked 483:23	505:13 529:22 wouldn't 484:7 487:6 504:4 509:5 542:11,11 543:8 545:2 550:5 560:8 wrestling 582:3 written 471:19 505:5 562:20 573:12 wrong 493:7 526:16 X X 552:18 Y year 498:6 499:5 506:13 507:8,9,12 508:10,21,25 509:18 518:24 519:15,18 555:9 555:11,12 560:20 565:16 578:20 years 481:16 505:15 512:3 535:8 544:15 546:4,14 549:18 554:17 558:11 562:13,14 564:18 573:10 yesterday 478:21 517:16 528:8 532:23 533:15,20 540:25 551:16 yesterday's 473:10 562:18 Young 470:10 471:8 Z zero 534:23 \$ \$1 549:16 \$1.2 506:14 555:9 555:11 \$10 537:11 \$19,000,000 509:21 \$2 544:16 545:14,16 546:6,9 555:12 \$2,000,000 506:16 507:13 508:25 \$2,217,618 484:8 498:25 \$2.1 484:16 \$2.3 498:21 503:20 \$200,000 507:12 \$25,160 489:16 \$250,000 507:8 \$3 558:9 \$300,000 509:20 534:19 545:25 \$320,000 553:16 \$350,000 506:13,17	507:9 508:10,20 509:2 553:15 \$4.2 491:18 \$4.54 566:21 \$500,000 545:20 \$65,923 503:4 \$66,514 503:7 \$78,000 565:16 \$81,700 503:10 \$81,726.94 482:5 \$88,900 503:11 \$9 537:12 \$9.6 488:12 0 04 503:3 05 482:3 503:9 053 502:23 06 540:6 07 540:6 1 1 481:20 482:14,20 487:7,21 518:17 539:11,14,16,23 540:14 1(a) 482:21 1/2 549:16 1:00 561:15 10 477:9 479:15 485:11 488:18,20 513:21 516:23 546:11,12 10:20 511:3 10:40 511:3 100 497:22 533:6 545:9 11:00 511:2 12 491:4 515:7 12:00 561:24 13 533:17,24 545:6 14 475:10,11,15,16 475:19 562:14 14th 470:4 149 564:15 15 475:20,21 510:24 525:2,20 564:6 18 517:12 518:23 522:8 523:25 525:24 528:15,18 540:14 550:21 581:15 18th 478:22 574:6 583:8 18,000,000 509:19 1873 563:17 1977 563:4 1999 570:12
usually 550:14 utilities 470:1,4,8 471:6 529:7 569:10,21 584:12 utility 540:21 utilized 574:12 utmost 575:19 579:6 580:22	valentines 567:5 valid 573:16 value 486:5 542:18 variable 553:3 various 506:5 524:5 532:23 540:12 576:25 577:23 583:13	valentines 567:5 valid 573:16 value 486:5 542:18 variable 553:3 various 506:5 524:5 532:23 540:12 576:25 577:23 583:13	valentines 567:5 valid 573:16 value 486:5 542:18 variable 553:3 various 506:5 524:5 532:23 540:12 576:25 577:23 583:13	valentines 567:5 valid 573:16 value 486:5 542:18 variable 553:3 various 506:5 524:5 532:23 540:12 576:25 577:23 583:13
				2 2 477:11 479:10,11

483:10,16 487:8	23 517:19 518:10	499 499:1	550 550:1
488:10 489:17,23	23rd 513:13,17		551 551:1
502:17 505:4	518:15	5	552 552:1
517:17 524:18	25 511:2 534:16	5 481:7 502:18,25	553 553:1
526:18	25,160 489:19	560:15 569:22	554 554:1
2(a) 485:4	250,000 478:3	50 556:12,13 557:18	555 555:1
2(b) 498:19		557:20	556 556:1
2(c) 526:8,9	3	50,000 501:18	557 557:1
2,000,000 501:8	3 477:11 481:7	500 500:1	558 558:1
546:3	491:6 492:25	500,000 544:20	559 559:1
2.3 504:5	493:9 497:25	546:2	560 560:1
2:00 473:4,21	499:14 502:5,18	501 501:1	561 561:1
561:14,18,22,24	502:25 511:12,13	502 502:1	562 562:1
20 540:16 545:23	518:18,23 519:23	503 503:1	563 563:1
550:18,20	520:10 521:21	504 504:1	564 564:1
2000 513:14,17	524:17	505 505:1	565 565:1
515:17 517:19	3(a) 493:6	506 506:1	566 566:1
518:10,15 519:11	30 505:15	507 507:1	567 567:1
520:17 528:15	300 506:13 508:10	508 508:1	568 568:1
2004 480:15,16	508:20	509 509:1	569 569:1
481:2,13 482:11	307 563:19	510 510:1	570 570:1
482:11 483:4	31 518:20	511 511:1	571 571:1
485:5,20 487:11	365 555:21 557:3,9	512 512:1	572 572:1
487:19 489:15,17		513 513:1	573 573:1
489:20,25 490:5	4	514 514:1	574 574:1
491:16 498:25	4 481:7 511:12	515 515:1	575 575:1
502:23	522:15 524:2	516 516:1	576 576:1
2004/2005 502:19	528:22,24 578:9	517 517:1	577 577:1
2005 477:11 479:24	4.249 499:16	518 518:1	578 578:1
480:14,17,18	4.54 568:13,21	519 519:1	579 579:1
481:2,14 482:8	400 477:24	520 520:1	580 580:1
483:4 484:13	400,000 477:25	521 521:1	581 581:1
487:10,19,24	471 471:1	522 522:1	582 582:1
490:2,7 499:2	472 472:1	523 523:1	583 583:1
518:17,17 525:2	473 473:1	524 524:1	584 584:1
525:21 564:12	474 474:1	525 525:1	585 585:1
565:18 566:11	475 475:1 564:19,20	526 526:1	
2006 482:14,20	566:13	527 527:1	6
484:13 485:8	476 476:1	528 528:1	6 479:24 480:14
487:21 539:23	477 477:1	529 529:1	490:13,20
540:14 561:5	478 478:1	530 530:1	6(b) 481:9
564:14	479 479:1	531 531:1	6(c) 481:9
2007 484:13 485:21	480 480:1	532 532:1	6.4 564:23
487:11,25 493:5	481 481:1	533 533:1	60 478:11,14 555:22
498:8,9 540:3,15	482 482:1	534 534:1	63 565:19
561:5 564:15	483 483:1	535 535:1	650,000 477:16
569:22	484 484:1	536 536:1	66,514 489:22,24
2008 470:4 485:2	485 485:1	537 537:1	7
490:15,22 491:3,3	486 486:1	538 538:1	7 517:6
491:5,5,14,18	487 487:1	539 539:1	7(b) 523:22
502:15 517:12	488 488:1	54,000 477:19	7(c) 529:20 530:8
522:8 528:18	489 489:1	540 540:1	70,000 478:12,14
564:16 565:7	490 490:1	541 541:1	79 564:14
574:6	491 491:1	542 542:1	
2010 518:20 578:11	492 492:1	543 543:1	9
578:20,21	493 493:1	544 544:1	9 517:6 558:25
2025 565:22	494 494:1	545 545:1	559:5
21 518:17 556:18,19	495 495:1	546 546:1	9:00 561:21 585:6
557:12 564:15	496 496:1	547 547:1	90 555:21 564:16
21-day 555:20	497 497:1	548 548:1	569:24
557:24 558:5,9	498 498:1	549 549:1	