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MR. BLODGETT: Let me send you a new link. (Off-the-record discussion.)
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q Mr. Orfano, you have in front of you Exhibit 1, which is a request for proposals to provide strategic initiative financial services, dated -- the issue date is December 20th, 2017.

A Ido.
(Orfano's Exhibit 1 was marked for
identification.)
Q To your knowledge, Mr. Orfano, was JEA, through consultants or otherwise, involved in this privatization RFP?

A I -- I can only answer for myself. I did not become aware of this RFP until a banker brought it to my attention at a bond closing dinner that we had here in Jacksonville. So that's the first I personally became aware of it.

Q Okay. Did you come to understand, after becoming aware of this privatization RFP, that it related to the potential privatization of JEA, as well as other City assets?

A Yes.
Q Do you know what PFM did in connection with this RFP, Mr. Orfano?

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

A Again, not certain about their particular role as it pertains to this request, but I will -- I guess we'll get to another exhibit where they did perform services for JEA. But I -- I don't have any direct know ledge of their role in this RFP.

Q Okay. Do you know now who paid Public Financial Management, PFM, for its work under this RFP?

A I do not.
Q Do you know if JEA paid any money to Public Financial Management in connection with this RFP?

A I do not.
Q Okay. Let's go to Exhibit 2, which is dated
December 20th, 2017. And that was the same day that the RFP was issued by the City of Jacksonville. Exhibit 2 is an e-mail. The e-mail is from Mark Weinberg of Citi Bank.

And it was sent to you and says -- and what I wanted to ask you about is Mr. Weinberg says, This is interesting.

Referring to the Exhibit 1.
Apparently the primary reason for this is the potential privatization of JEA that a -- that a few members of the JEA board asked for last month. The airport may also be in play. I'll try to get more info Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
and report back to you. I assume we are still not interested in an advisory role.

Do you know why --
MR. POWELL: I just --
(Orfano's Exhibit 2 was marked for identification.)

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, sir.
MR. POWELL: Lanny, I want to be clear. I want to be clear. Weinberg did not send this e-mail to Mr. Orfano. It was ultimately sent to Mr. Orfano by Mr. Miller from the Citi.

MR. RUSSELL: Right. Thank you, Steve, that's correct. I misstated that.

BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q Make sure I got it right. The e-mail you received that was, in fact, authored by Mark Weinberg, was forwarded to you by John Miller, it makes the statement: This is interesting. Apparently the primary reason for this is the potential privatization of JEA that a few members of the JEA board asked for last month.

Do you know why Mark Weinberg believed that the primary reason for the RFP was the privatization of JEA?

A I do not.
Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

Q As we sit here today, based on what you now know, would you agree with Mr. Weinberg's opinion that the RFP was primarily directed to a privatization of JEA?

A Well, again, I don't have knowledge of the airport and port, but I do know that, as we sit here today, it certainly appears that the privatization was one of the major components of that RFP.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm sorry. Could you read that

## back, Terrie?

THE REPORTER: The answer?
MR. RUSSELL: The answer, please.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry?
(The following answer was read by the reporter:
"Answer: Well, again, I don't have knowledge of the airport and port, but I do know that, as we sit here today, it certainly appears that the privatization was one of the major components of that RFP.") BY MR. RUSSELL:

Q And the privatization of JEA, is that what you were referring to, Mr. Orfano?

A That's correct, Mr. Russell.
Q Thank you.
Exhibit 3 is an invoice from PFM Financial
Advisory Services provided to JEA in connection with
Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

Was Michael Mace doing that work pursuant to Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

Exhibit 1, the request for proposals by the City of Jacksonville?

A No, he was not. He was doing that work directly for JEA at the direction of senior management.

Q On -- an entry on January 18th of Exhibit -page 3 of -- it's the third page, I believe.

A Yes.
Q Okay. Mr. Mace's entry is eval -- eval
project, banker discussions and data review.
Do you know anything more about that entry than what the words are? Mr. Orfano, do you know what work that's describing?

A Not -- I can't recall specifically, but it was certainly related to Mr. Mace's final work product.

Q Do you know what bankers Mr. Mace was speaking to?

A I believe that he would have had conversations with Morgan Stanley and -- and J.P. Morgan and possibly Goldman Sachs at the time.

Q Were those investment bankers, the ones who received the award from the City of Jacksonville for the services described in Exhibit 1?

A They did.
Q Do you know if JEA provided to PFM a contract that expressly authorized PFM to provide these services Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
described in Exhibit 3?
A To my knowledge, the services would have been provided under the existing PFM engagement letter with a contract.

Q The invoice, I believe, you approve in Exhibit 3 , is dated September 14th, 2018. And the services began almost seven months earlier, on 12/20/17.

Do you know why PFM delayed for that seven months before submitting this invoice?

A Well, I do know that they're often tardy in their billing. I don't really have any additional information to share there.

Q Okay. What we've marked as Exhibit 4 is an e-mail from Ryan Wannemacher to William -- let me get his name right -- Pedersen?

A Pedersen.
(Orfano's Exhibit 4 was marked for identification.)

Q Pedersen.
A Correct.
Q Okay. It's pronounced Pedersen. Pedersen. What was your relationship to Mr. Wannemacher in January of 2018?

A We were colleagues at that time.
Mr. Wannemacher was the director of financial planning Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

## and analysis and I was treasurer. We were director

level colleagues working in finance.
Q Okay. And William Pedersen is with Morgan Stanley. You see that in the e-mail address?

A Correct.
Q Did you know Mr. Pedersen?
A Correct.
Q Okay. Did you know Mr. Pedersen?
A We did not meet until February --
Q Okay.
A -- of 2018.
Q Do you know why Mr. Wannemacher was providing Morgan Stanley with a ten-year pro forma for JEA on IRP case on electric?

A To my knowledge, Mr. Wannemacher was providing pro forma information for the banks to use in preparing presentations.

Q Presentations to who, Mr. Orfano?
A Presentations that were ultimately made to senior management and to the City.

Q And what -- those presentations were about what, Mr. Orfano?

A Well, presentations for JEA and the City to select the financial advisor for a potential transaction.

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

```
Mr. Orfano?
```

A The privatization of JEA.
Q Let's look at Exhibit 4 -- Exhibit 5, excuse me, the news article. I wanted to see what you knew about what this news article says.

The first bullet point on the top of page 4 of Exhibit 5, it says, Michael Mace of PFM, Michael Weinstein, CFO for Mayor Curry and the senior leadership team of Moelis \& Company, an investment bank, visited JEA on January 23, 2018.

Were you at that meeting, Mr. Orfano?
A I was.
(Orfano's Exhibit 5 was marked for identification.)

Q Can you tell me what was discussed at that meeting?

A Moelis is a New York bank investment banking firm and they were making a presentation on -- on their relative strengths in the mergers and acquisitions area. They were interested in advising the City and JEA.

Q Do you know why the mayor's staff, and particularly Mr. Weinstein, attended this meeting?

A I -- I do not. I just -- I was asked to attend Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

## 15

## so I did not know they were going to be there.

Q Okay. And do you know why Moelis was invited to this meeting?

A I do not.
Q And ultimately did Moelis \& Company end up providing services to JEA in connection with the potential privatization of JEA?

A To my knowledge, no.
Q Do you know why Moelis did not provide those services?

A I do not.
Q Okay. If you can look at both exhibit -- well, actually three exhibits, I want to ask you about all three of those exhibits. Exhibit 6.

A Okay. Yes, sir.
Q And I'm out of order here. Just one moment. Hold on a second. My exhibits are out of order. 4 --

A That's okay.
Q -- 5, 6. I'm missing Exhibit 7. Excuse me while I get the correct exhibit. It wasn't in my stack. I need 7 and 8.

MR. BLODGETT: Joe, while Lanny's looking for an exhibit, I just want to make sure the record is clear. You said that Moelis gave a presentation on its M\&A strengths, was that basically a pitch for Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
the potential privatization of JEA?
THE WITNESS: That's how I would interpret it personally.

MR. BLODGETT: So they weren't giving a pitch on their strengths and M\&A services of other City assets, that's your understanding?

THE WITNESS: That's my understanding. Two of the individuals were known to me from my prior career.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q Okay. Exhibit 6, 7 and 8, if you'll look at them together because they're, I believe, related about meetings at the Jacksonville airport.

Did you attend any of the meetings at the Jacksonville airport on January 24th, 2018, Mr. Orfano?

A I did not.
(Orfano's Exhibits 6, 7 and 8 were marked for identification.)

Q Do you know what happened at this meeting?
A I do not.
Q Do you know if -- actually, it's more than one meeting, if at -- from somebody who attended the meeting, telling you that these meetings related to the privatization RFP that was issued by the City on December 20th, 2017?

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

A I do not recall any conversations about these meetings --

Q Okay.
A -- specifically.
Q Okay. Let's go to Exhibit 9, then, please.
A Yes, sir.
(Orfano's Exhibit 9 was marked for
identification.)
Q It's a February 1 letter to Joey -- from Joey
Greive to Mike Weinstein that identifies --
Excuse me.
(Brief telephone interruption.)
Q It identifies in this letter to Mike Weinstein
that the recipients of the award under the December 20th
RFP were J.P. Morgan, Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley and KPMG.

Do you know, Mr. Orfano, did JEA have any input to the selection of these recipients of the work under the December 20th RFP?

A Not to my knowledge.
Q Do you --
A I was not personally involved. I can't speak for other members of JEA, but I was not personally involved.

MR. BLODGETT: Mr. Orfano, do you know if PFM Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc. Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
just trying to find the exact --
A Yeah, I'm there.
Q Okay. It says that we -- the non-DA -- the NDA that was being provided to Morgan Stanley was for a potential engagement to provide financial advisory service to disclosing party, JEA, in connection with the transaction.

Do you know why JEA was providing this nondisclosure to Morgan Stanley in February of 2018?

A It was because JEA -- from that earlier e-mail from Mr. Wannemacher, he was providing sensitive financial information to Morgan Stanley. And so -- so an NDA -- it was determined that an NDA should be executed.

Q And what was the transaction, Mr. Orfano, that was the subject of this nondisclosure agreement, do you know?

A The transaction -- again, I -- I would be speculate -- it's not specifically identified here, but I would be speculating.

Q Do you believe that it was the potential privatization of JEA?
$A \quad$ That would be my interpretation.
Q Okay. And Exhibit 10 is an e-mail from Michael Mace to Jody Brooks and copied to Melissa Dykes, Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

都
in which Michael Mace says to Jody: Thanks, Jody. I will coordinate with Joe Orfano -- Orfano, excuse me, I used to know a female Orfano -- to determine the appropriate individuals that will be signing and get this out today.

Did you work with Mr. Mace on getting the appropriate individuals to sign?

A To correct the record, that's Exhibit 11. (Orfano's Exhibit 11 was marked for identification.)

Q I'm sorry. Thank you. Do you recall my question or should I state it over?

A Yes.
Q Okay. It was pretty simple, I guess. Do you recall coordinating with Michael Mace to get the appropriate individuals to sign the nondisclosure agreement and get it out on February 1st, 2018?

A Ido.
Q Tell me about that. What was --
A I believe it was done by Mr. Mace though --
Q Okay.
A -- but I coordinated with Mr. Mace.
Q And what was it you were coordinating with Mr. Mace?

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

A Getting the appropriate individuals from the bank to -- to sign the NDA.

Q And what banks were you coordinating that activity with?

A Morgan Stanley, J.P. Morgan and Goldman Sachs.
Q And, ultimately, J.P. Morgan \& Morgan Stanley went on and assisted JEA in the potential privatization of JEA; is that correct, Mr. Orfano?

A That is correct.
Q And Mr. Goldman -- or Goldman Sachs, Mr. Orfano, I understand did not provide services to JEA in connection with this potential privatization.

Do you know why JEA did not do that work -- as to why Goldman Sachs did not do that work?

A I can only speak for the process that led to the selection of the financial advisor in February of '18. I cannot speak for the selection of the banks in 2019.

Q I'm going to have the court reporter read your answer back.

MR. RUSSELL: Could you read that answer back, please, Terrie?
(The following answer was read by the reporter:
"Answer: I can only speak for the process that led to the selection of the financial advisor in

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

February of '18. I cannot speak for the selection of the banks in 2019.")
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q Tell me what you can speak to about the selection of the advisor in 2018 for -- by JEA, please.

A Certainly. The three banks that I mentioned did presentations, and to reiterate that's Morgan Stanley, J.P. Morgan and Goldman Sachs. I was asked to participate in those presentations. The presentations were then scored and one of the banks was selected as the financial advisor.

Q Okay. And which one was selected?
A Morgan Stanley.
MR. BLODGETT: Mr. Orfano, can I just ask a couple questions about those presentations?

Where were those presentations given?
THE WITNESS: An airport hotel, a conference room in an airport hotel. I can't, for the life of me, remember which hotel it was, but it was down that hotel row at the airport.

MR. BLODGETT: Was that --
THE WITNESS: It wasn't connected to the airport, I should say.

MR. BLODGETT: Do you recall if it was the SpringHill Suites? Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

THE WITNESS: I believe it was.
MR. BLODGETT: Okay. And I just want to make sure the record's clear because we got a screen shot of an e-mail that's dated February 13, 2018, from you to Melissa Dykes, the subject is SpringHill Suites, Jax Airport and it was regarding Michael Mace. I'm sorry, it's actually from you to Michael Mace and Melissa Dykes was cc'd.

And it talks about a potential meeting and address at SpringHill Suites. Looks like that was dated February 13th, 2018. So is it possible that that meeting happened after this February 1st, Exhibit 11?

THE WITNESS: It did.
MR. BLODGETT: Okay. So I guess just to -- to clarify, Lanny was wondering how were the banks, as of February 1st, 2018, that received the nondisclosure agreements, how were those banks selected?

THE WITNESS: Recall that they were three of the four parties, what were selected by the City through their RFP process.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q And do you know --
This is Lanny again.
Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Kevin.
Q -- what services was JEA going to have these banks perform?

A Financial advisory.
Q Was that financial advice in connection with the potential privatization of JEA?

A That's my understanding.
Q And -- and was that this meeting that three of the banks were chosen to perform services to JEA?

A No. Correct that statement.
According to a prior exhibit, I don't recall the number, but the City had selected four firms, including these three, and KPMG, I believe, was the fourth. So these three banks, out of the four, were invited to present in -- in a series of three meetings at the airport.

Q Okay.
MR. BLODGETT: Mr. Orfano --
A Airport hotel, I'm sorry.
MR. BLODGETT: -- do you remember how -- do you remember how the identities of the three or four banks that won the City's RFP were communicated or provided to JEA or PFM? In other words, how did you know which banks won the RFP?

THE WITNESS: I -- I don't recall that. I was Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
Hedqust Assiat
not privy to those conversations.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q Okay. If we could look at Exhibits 12 -excuse me, yeah, 12, 13 and 14 .

The first one is a nondisclosure agreement for J.P. Morgan Securities, LLC. Do you see that, Mr. Orfano?

A Ido.
(Orfano's Exhibit 12, 13 and 14 were marked for identification.)

Q And it's dated February 2, 2018. And as you just said, J.P. Morgan did go on to perform services for JEA.

And on page 3 of the R -- of the nondisclosure agreement, it says, In event that the end -- in paragraph $D$, In the event that the disclosing parties determines to pursue a sale of all or a portion of assets, securities and businesses and that the receiving party is not engaged to act as the disclosing party's financial advisor, the employees of -- receiving party and its affiliates may provide investment banking and commercial services to potential purchasers.

Was this nondisclosure agreement, I guess, from that sentence, it was related to the potential of JEA selling a portion or all of its assets?

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

A That would be my interpretation.
Q Okay. And we have also as Exhibit 13, a confidentiality agreement and that one is for Morgan Stanley \& Company, I believe, Mr. Orfano?

A Correct.
Q And do you know, was this confidentiality -confidentiality agreement, was it for the same potential transaction, the sale of -- all of JEA's assets?

A Again, that would be my interpretation,

## Mr. Russell.

Q Okay. And the last one is with Goldman Sachs \& Company and it has the same language of a potential sale of all of JEA's assets.

So this asset -- this nondisclosure
confidentiality agreement related to the potential privatization of JEA?

A Again, that would be my interpretation.
Q And, I'm sorry, I just don't recall if I asked you this before. I think I confirmed with you that Goldman Sachs did not go forward in providing those services and I don't remember if I asked you why.

Do you know why Goldman Sachs did not provide
the service -- any services to JEA in connection with privatization?

A As a result of the presentation and subsequent
Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
scoring, I indicated Morgan Stanley was selected as the financial advisor as part of that process.

Q Okay. And does that mean --
A Again, I can't speak to the process that led to the selection of both Morgan Stanley and J.P. Morgan in 2019.

Q Okay. Now, I think I understand what happened. In that process you just described, there were three potential candidates and Goldman Sachs dropped out because they weren't chosen?

A Only Morgan Stanley -- one bank was selected as part of that process.

Q Okay.
MR. BLODGETT: Just to make sure the record's
clear, Mr. Orfano, J.P. Morgan and Goldman Sachs provided no services that you're aware of to JEA or the City relating to the potential privatization of JEA, correct?

THE WITNESS: In 2018.
MR. BLODGETT: Got it. Did -- how about Morgan Stanley, did Morgan Stanley provide any services to JEA relating to its potential privatization in 2018?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall because subsequent to their selection, the process pretty much came to Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

\author{

}
a halt. I mean, it was -- there were a series of events in March and I believe early April that led to the privatization effort being halted.

MR. BLODGETT: What were those events that led to a halt in the privatization efforts?

THE WITNESS: I can't recall specifically, but I know, generally, the City -- well, Jacksonville City Council was made aware of activities, the JEA board was made aware of these activities, I believe the JEA board ultimately determined that it did not want to pursue a privatization of any kind.

MR. BLODGETT: When you say the JEA board became aware of these activities, what activities are you referring to?

THE WITNESS: Potential privatization.
MR. BLODGETT: And those activities include these communications with investment banks, Morgan Stanley, J.P. Morgan and Goldman Sachs?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. BLODGETT: So the JEA board was aware of the activities and communications with the three banks that won the RFP?

THE WITNESS: I -- I don't know that. I don't have direct knowledge of that. I could only comment, as I said earlier, that I was involved in Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc. BY MR. RUSSELL:

Q Okay. I think that probably helps us with Exhibit 17 also. No, I had some other questions about that. 15 and 16.

A Goldman Sachs?
Q Right.
A And $\mathbf{1 7}$ is -- $\mathbf{1 7}$ 's a different --
Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

Q Right. You -- your answers that you gave Kevin and me in connection with 15 would also be applicable to the Exhibit Number 16, about your lack of involvement --

A Correct.
(Orfano's Exhibit 16 was marked for identification.)

Q -- and lack of knowledge of selection --
A I did not have any -- I did not have any involvement in this matter.

Q Okay. Did JEA ever issue its own RFP for the financial advisors in connection with JEA's
privatization, to your knowledge?
A Not to my knowledge.
Q Do you know why JEA did not issue an RFP for the selection of those financial advisors?

A Again, I could only speak to the process that I was involved in in early 2018.

Q Okay. Are you familiar with the concept in procurement activities called piggybacking,
Mr. Orfano?
A I am.
Q And given what we've discussed about the City's RFP, do you believe that JEA piggybacked off the City RFP that we've identified as Exhibit 1 to obtain its Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
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advisors for privatization -- potential privatization of JEA?

A I -- I can't answer. I can't answer that. I -- I just don't -- I don't -- it wasn't expressed -- I would say it wasn't expressed that way to me.

Q What was expressed to you, Mr. Orfano?
A What was expressed to me is that three banks will be presenting and I was asked to participate in that selection process.

Q And do you know how the three banks that were presenting were chosen?

A It -- it was expressed to me that they were three of the four firms that were indicate -- that -that were supported to be the selected parties as part of the City's RFP.

Q Okay.
MR. BLODGETT: Who told you that, Mr. Orfano? THE WITNESS: I believe it was Mr. Mace.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q Okay. Let's move on, please, Mr. Orfano, to Exhibit 17. And this is an e-mail that I believe is giving you access to an Intralinks Exchange. And it was for --

A Yes.
(Orfano's Exhibit 17 was marked for Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
identification.)
Q And it related to a data room for Project JEA.
Do you know why JEA set up this data room in
2018?
A My understanding is that it was set up to provide the confidential information to the -- to the banks that were presenting their financial advisory capabilities.

Q And this e-mail, Exhibit 17, refers to Project JEA in the subject line.

What was Project JEA --
A Yes.
Q -- if you know, Mr. Orfano?
A The -- the potential privatization of JEA.
Q And what use, if any, did you make of this Intralinks to a data room, Mr. Orfano?

A Not -- not a lot.
Q Okay. Do you recall discussing, in February '18 and thereafter, Project JEA with other employees of JEA?

A We certainly had discussions around the -around the selection of a financial advisor. And there were information -- as I said earlier, there was information provided to those prospective banks at -for the financial advisory services, so that would have Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
been what the conversations were regarding.
Q And who were you having those conversations with?

A Specifically, Ms. Banks and Mr. Wannemacher.
Q And did you have any input to what information was provided or put in this data room?

A My memory is generally pretty good. Would indicate to me that I had little or no involvement in what was in that data room.

Q Okay. Well, you may have no memory of my next question, but Exhibit 18, if you'll look at it, please, Mr. Orfano, is an e-mail in which Ryan Wannemacher in -on February 7, 2018, is giving -- I don't know if I can pronounce it right -- Graeme Conway access to the data room and Graeme Conway was an executive with Macquarie Infrastructure and Real Assets. I think they're commonly called MIRA.

Do you know why MIRA was being given access to the Project JEA data room?

A To correct the record, that's Macquarie.
(Orfano's Exhibit 18 was marked for identification.)

Q Okay. Thank you.
A And I did not have any direct involvement in why they would have been granted access.

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

```
right -- if MIRA was --
```

A Yes, sir.
Q -- a potential --
A Again, I -- I would be speculating. I did not have any direct involvement in why they were granted access.

Q Okay. Do you know if MIRA was a potential JEA purchaser?

A To my knowledge, yes.
Q Okay. And in 2018, were you aware of any entities, other than MIRA, that may have been potential purchasers of JEA or -- or exploring the purchase of JEA in 2018?

A I do not.
Q What we've marked as Exhibit --
MR. BLODGETT: Sorry. One more.
Mr. Orfano, do you know if any potential purchasers, other than MIRA, had access to that data room in 2018?

THE WITNESS: I do not.
MR. BLODGETT: Do you know if the City,
including its financial department, had access to
that data room in 2018?
THE WITNESS: I do not.
Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

MR. BLODGETT: Okay.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q On Exhibit 19 is The Future of JEA report. Do you recall this report, Mr. Orfano?
A Ido.
(Orfano's Exhibit 19 was marked for identification.)

Q And how did you come to be familiar with this report?

A I was in -- involved in -- in discussions with Mr. Mace on the report and had specific knowledge about JEA's debt and investment portfolios. And so it's -- it was more limited to debts or -- debt service or investment portfolio, but, for instance, the -- the valuation information, I -- I was generally familiar with, but -- but I'm not a subject matter expert on it.

Q Okay. Do you know what use was made of this report?

A The report was presented to city council at a special meeting on February 14th, 2018.

Q And Exhibit --
MR. BLODGETT: One question.
Could you just explain for us Mayor Curry and
his staff's involvement, if any, in the preparation
of that PFM evaluation report?
Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

THE WITNESS: I -- I don't believe they had any involvement in it.

MR. BLODGETT: Do you recall Mike Weinstein having any meetings with Michael Mace involving the preparation of that PFM report?

THE WITNESS: I couldn't speak to that. I'm not aware.

MR. BLODGETT: Thank you.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q You mentioned, in my prior question, the meeting of city council on February, I believe, 14th, 2018. You said this is where the Mace report was presented, that is, Exhibit 19 was prevented -presented to the city council.

In connection with this February 14 meeting, do you know if JEA worked with the mayor's office to coordinate this meeting of council, PFM and JEA officials?

A I do not.
Q Do you know why JEA obtained the PFM valuation before it began assessing the potential for privatization?

A I -- I believe the PFM report was really -- was at the direction of the JEA board.

Q Okay. And do you know why the JEA wanted that Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
report? Was it a first step in beginning the assessment of privatization?

A That's how I would interpret it.
Q Okay.
MR. BLODGETT: Mr. Orfano, did you have any
discussions with any JEA board members back in 2018 about their views on privatizing JEA?

THE WITNESS: No, I did not.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q Just a minute, please. Let me ask you, please, Mr. Orfano, to look at Exhibit 21.

Are you familiar with this document,
Mr. Orfano?
A Yes, I am.
(Orfano's Exhibit 21 was marked for identification.)

Q And do you know who else at JEA was provided copies of this document?

A These individuals that would have participated in the airport hotel meetings, I believe it's now been identified as SpringHill Suites, which would be Paul McElroy, Melissa Dykes, Ryan Wannemacher and myself.

Q And what was the purpose of this document, Exhibit 21, that was prepared by Morgan Stanley for JEA?

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

A The purpose of this document would -- would have been to present this to -- to JEA and to -- to the City --

MR. BLODGETT: You said to the City, were there any -- go ahead.

A -- as part of that February presentation.
MR. BLODGETT: When you say presented to the City, were there attendees at this meeting from the City?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q Okay. Let's make sure we've got the meeting identified. Was this the meeting on February 15th, 2018, at which JEA discussed the issues with PFM?

A Yes, the February 15th meetings -- meeting, there were a series of three meetings.

Q Right. And they all occurred --
A Mr. Mace attended those.
Q Okay. You --
A Mr. Mace attended those meetings.
Q There were three meetings and they all occurred on February 15th, 2018?

A I believe they all -- yeah, they were all in one day.

Q Okay. And you attended those meetings? Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

A I did.
Q Okay. Is there a reason there were three separate meetings?

A Yes.
Q Okay.
A Banks presented their individual advisory capabilities, financial advisory capabilities, I should say.

Q Okay. And you identified, I believe -- or maybe it was who received the report.

Who from JEA attended the February -- and first let me confirm, you were at these three meetings on February 15th?

A I was.
Q Okay. And they were held in the hotel we just confirmed, I believe --

MR. BLODGETT: SpringHill Suites.
Q -- which is at the Jacksonville airport?
A It's adjacent to the J acksonville airport.
Q Okay. Understand.
And could you tell me who from JEA attended these meetings?

A Yes. To reiterate, it was Mr. McElroy,
Ms. Dykes, Mr. Wannemacher and myself.
Q Thank you. I just couldn't remember the list. Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

And did anybody else attend these meetings other than those JEA executives?

A Mr. Mace from PFM. And there were representatives from the City.

Q Do you recall who those representatives were?
A I believe Mr. Mousa, Mr. Weinstein and Mr. Greive.

Q And do you know why those City employees were at these meetings?

A The City employees were participating in the selection process.

Q Okay. And tell me about the selection process. How did that go about and happen?

A There was a selection grid set up by Mr. Mace that was reviewed by all the individuals at the meeting, I believe. And then three -- three individuals were requested to -- to be part of a selection committee.

Q And who were those three individuals?
A Myself, Mr. Greive and Mr. Mace.
Q And what was the result of the selection process?

A As I indicated earlier, the result of the selection process, Morgan Stanley was selected as the financial advisor for a prospective transaction.

Q Okay. Are you familiar, Mr. Orfano, with the Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

## Plant Vogtle litigation?

A I am.
Q Do you know of any connection between the Plant Vogtle litigation and the privatization of JEA?

A No.
Q What was the impact, if you can summarize for me, Mr. Orfano, of the Plant Vogtle problem on JEA's financial performance?

A Well, Moody's I nvestor Service, as a result of the litigation, downgraded JEA's electric system and water and sewer system ratings by three notches so that had an impact on -- on JEA. They also downgraded the City bonds as well. So -- so that was an immediate impact to that litigation.

Q Okay. Would Plant Vogtle, in your opinion, Mr. Orfano, have been an obstacle towards the privatization -- to the privatization of JEA?

A I wouldn't call it an obstacle. I would certainly call it a consideration --

Q Okay.
A -- that had to be -- that had to be identified. And so I would -- I would characterize it as certainly a consideration.

Q And would one of the things, I think, that would make that consideration somewhat of an obstacle is Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
it would be hard to quantify what was the risk presented to a potential purchaser by Plant Vogtle issues?

A Are you -- Mr. Russell, are you asking my opinion on that?

Q Yes. That would have to be something you would have an opinion -- if you have an opinion on it.

A I have an opinion. Certainly at that point in time, within service dates projected as November of ' 21 and November of '22, and that's 2021 and 2022, it's certainly something an investor -- a potential interested party or bidder would need to be concerned about.

MR. BLODGETT: Before we go too far down the road, I just want to make sure I wrap up the February 15, 2018, meeting. I think I heard you say that there were -- there was a selection grid, a document that was used, I guess, to record the rankings that the selection members made for the potential banks. Is that accurate, were there documents related to that selection process?

THE WITNESS: That's accurate.
MR. BLODGETT: Do you know where those documents are or who has them?

THE WITNESS: I believe Mr. Mace has those documents.

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

MR. BLODGETT: Do you recall him gathering those documents before he left the meeting?

THE WITNESS: I do.
MR. BLODGETT: And Morgan Stanley was selected --

THE WITNESS: But I think that meeting would have occurred the following day.

MR. BLODGETT: So February 16th, 2018, is when the selections were made?

THE WITNESS: That would be either the -- I don't have a calendar in front of me, but it seems like that would have either been a Thursday or a Friday. It was in that time frame.

MR. BLODGETT: So where did that selection meeting happen?

THE WITNESS: I can't recall where that meeting took place.

MR. BLODGETT: And it was you, Patrick Greive and who else -- who else attended that selection meeting?

THE WITNESS: Mr. Mace.
MR. BLODGETT: Okay. Did anyone else attend that meeting?

THE WITNESS: Again, I don't recall who else was there.

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

MR. BLODGETT: And you -- that group chose --
THE WITNESS: But we were the three evaluators.
MR. BLODGETT: Understood. And that group chose Morgan Stanley to provide financial services relating to the potential privatization of JEA, but did -- did Morgan Stanley ever sign a contract with JEA or the City relating to those prospective services?

THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge.
MR. BLODGETT: Did you discuss the compensation
Morgan Stanley would receive for its services?
THE WITNESS: I did not.
MR. BLODGETT: Okay.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q Okay. Exhibit 23, Mr. Orfano, is a Nixon
Peabody invoice for its services to J--- invoice to
JEA. And in this invoice, your name is mentioned a couple of times, several times.

Do you see on the entry, on the first page, dated January 16, 2018, an entry that begins, Review Vogtle, PPA for provisions relating to assignment of such contract, conference with Melissa Dykes, M. Dykes, J. Orfano and B. Rothchild to discuss findings and next steps.

Can you tell me what this conference was about Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
that you participated in, Mr. Orfano?
A I know we had asked Nixon Peabody to look at the potential assignment of the power purchase agreement to -- to another prospective party in conjunction with a privatization.
(Orfano's Exhibit 23 was marked for identification.)

Q And did Nixon Peabody eventually reach a conclusion on whether the Plant Vogtle contract was assignable?

A I -- I don't recall whether they ever issued an opinion on that.

Q Okay. The last phrase in this entry is discuss other elements of privatization analysis.

Do you recall what other elements were discussed in this conference call? I believe it was a call.

A Yeah, conference call. Provisions in our bond documents and it -- it would really be related to Nixon Peabody's role as JEA's bond counsel and how addressing various covenants, assignment provisions, things like that. So it's kind of captured in the item below it.

Q Okay. And the item below it is an entry on $1 / 17 / 18$, by Eric Rothchild. He was a lawyer at Nixon Peabody, Mr. Orfano?

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

## A He is.

Q And on that date, the day after the Columbo entry, Mr. Rothchild -- Rothchild and you had a discussion regarding one item that's listed as an asset transfer agreement.

What asset -- can you tell me what that refers to, the asset transfer agreement?

A I -- I believe at that time there would have been a form of a document flowing around on an asset transfer. I -- again, I can't recall the specific agreement, but --

Q Do you know, did the agreement relate to the transfer of substantially all of the assets of JEA?

A I -- I don't -- I can't recall.
Q Okay. Did you -- did you actually see a
document that was entitled Asset Transfer Agreement, at
about this time, February -- excuse me, January 17, 2018?

A I just -- I vaguely recall seeing a rough form of a document.

Q Okay. In the last entry on January 17, the last portion on the time entry, says, Discuss conclusions from review with J. Orfano.

Do you know what conclusions you and
Mr. Rothchild discussed on January 17, '18, January 17th Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

## 47

of 2018?
A I -- I don't have specific knowledge on that.
Q On February the 7th, 2018, Mr. Rothchild has another entry in which it says, Discuss status of study reviewing possible sale of JEA with Joe Orfano.

Do you know what study Mr. Orfano --
Mr. Rothchild -- Rothchild is referring to in this entry?

A Yeah, that would have been Mr. Mace's report.
Q Okay. And do you recall the -- the lawyer, Elizabeth Columbo, was on this call with Barry Rothchild and you?

A Yes.
Q And do you recall -- can you give me the substance of this discussion or what you recall about it?

A The -- yeah, as both our bond counsel and our disclosure counsel, they would have been reviewing the report to make sure that there wasn't any information that -- that really shouldn't have been in there, financial projections. They would have been reviewing it for, basically, just ensuring that the report was accurate and correct, didn't contain any untrue statements, but couldn't be used by our bond investors to make an investment decision.

Q Okay.
A It was really from the lens of Nixon Peabody as our bond and disclosure counsel. And -- and the report, for that matter, was made public and we included it in our website, in our investor section, right after it was presented.

Q Okay. And the next entry that refers to you, Mr. Orfano, is on March 26, 2018. And it was a call with you, L. Boynton, C. Cicero and B. Rothchild, the -and Elizabeth Columbo. Those were four lawyers who worked for Nixon Peabody?

A No, these are colleagues of mine in treasury. Laurie Boynton and Chris Cicero.

Q Okay. And then Barry Rothchild and Elizabeth Columbo were the two lawyers who were on the phone call --

A Correct.
Q -- with you and your two colleagues?
A Correct.
Q Okay. And what were the recent developments you discussed with Nixon Peabody in this time entry?

A I believe this was the -- there was a board -they're referring to a board workshop on privatization. So we would have released the -- a voluntary filing on I MMA --

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
Q Okay.
A -- to -- to disclose this. And that's what --
again, I don't have specific knowledge of that I MMA
filing in it. It's an acronym and I can't recall what
it -- it's an electronic -- it's similar to EDGAR with
the SEC --
Q Right.
A -- but I MMA -- I MMA is the MSRB's electronic repository for disclosure.

Q Did you participate in preparing that disclosure, Mr. Orfano, that was ultimately filed?

A I did.
Q And give me, if you can, the substance of that disclosure.

A I don't recall it. I'd have to go back and -and look at it.

Q Okay. Excuse me.
MR. RUSSELL: Do we have that disclosure,
Kevin?
MR. BLODGETT: I believe so.
MR. RUSSELL: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q And --
A I did participate in all of JEA's both mandatory and voluntary disclosure in my role as Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

## treasurer.

Q I see.
And was it this disclosure that is being made that's discussed about proposal to sell JEA, did that turn out to be a voluntary disclosure or mandatory disclosure?

A It would have been voluntary.
Q Okay. And on 4/17/2018, there was a board meeting that describes -- regarding the appointment of interim CEO and adoption of resolution providing for signing authority and the lawyer making that time entry is Elizabeth Orfano. And then she says she had a call --

A Elizabeth Columbo.
Q Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah. Excuse me. Reading the bottom line.

A lawyer, Elizabeth Columbo, with Nixon Peabody made that entry and the last part of the entry, Elizabeth Columbo describes a call with R. Hahn and you, Mr. Orfano.

A Yeah, Robert Hahn works with me in treasury, $J E A$ treasury as well.

Q Okay. And what was that call about, if you recall?

A The need for another voluntary IMMA filing. Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

Q And that IMMA filing concerns what?
A The appointment of the interim CEO.
Q Okay.
A The resignation of -- the resignation of -well, retirement, not resignation. The retirement of Mr. McElroy and the naming of an interim CEO.

Q Okay. The entries that were talked about in this Nixon Peabody refer often to the sale of JEA. Are you aware of any non-sale options for JEA in connection with Nixon Peabody's work that were considered?

A I -- I don't recall any.
Q Okay. Do you know if there was a separate contract entered into with -- between JEA and Nixon Peabody for these privatization consider -- services?

A No, there -- there was not.
Q And so this was done under the same engagement that hired Nixon Peabody to provide disclosure and bond counsel to JEA?

A Correct.
Q Okay. This document -- do you have this document in your custody, Mr. Orfano?

A Yes, we -- well, not in my personal custody, but we do have it electronically.

Q Did anybody ever speak with you about obtaining documents relating to the potential JEA sale from you? Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

A Yeah. Obviously, the documents that were in my possession -- or, yeah, absolutely.

Q Do you know if this document, Exhibit 23, was produced to the City Council Special Investigatory Committee?

A I -- I don't know.
Q Okay. Did you provide this document for the production of it to anybody?

A I -- I don't recall --
Q Okay.
A -- providing it, no.
Q Well, I guess what I'm trying to find out, did anybody come to you, Mr. Orfano, about a search for documents that were being asked by the Special Investigative Committee of the City Council?

A Yeah, I -- I turned over all the documents that I had in my possession either -- I -- I didn't routinely save invoices in -- electronically.

Q So you wouldn't have had this document?
A I wasn't requested to specifically provide

## Nixon Peabody invoices.

Q I understand. If you'll look at Exhibit 24, please, Mr. Orfano.

A Okay.
(Orfano's Exhibit 24 was marked for Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

## identification.)

Q And that's an e-mail from Leslie Skipper of Wells Fargo to you?

A Yes.
Q And it's dated Thursday, November 29th, 2018, and the subject of the e-mail is Today's Meeting. Do you know what meeting Ms. Skipper is referring to?

A They would have had their -- this looks familiar. They would have had the -- one of their chief credit officers -- Wells Fargo's -- chief credit officers of Wells Fargo and several other bankers to meet with senior management.

Q Okay. And in the body of the e-mail, in item 1(c), it mentions privatization and the introductory sentence is Aaron's top priorities over the next one to three years, $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ and C .
$B$ is privatization; is that correct?
A That's the way I' $m$ reading it, correct.
Q Do you know where Ms. Skipper got the information that Aaron's top priorities would include privatization?

A I do not.
Q And do you recall that it was on November 28th, 2018, that was the day that the JEA board appointed Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

Aaron -- Mr. Aaron Zahn as CEO of JEA?
A I -- I cannot recall, but --
Q So --
A -- certainly it was around that time frame. I don't have an exact date.

Q Based upon your knowledge as of February -November 29th, 2019 -- 2018, excuse me, do you believe that privatization of JEA was a top priority of Mr. Zahn?

A I -- I did not.
Q Okay. Do you believe that privatization
eventually became one of the top priorities for Aaron
Zahn?
A Based on everything that transpired in 2019, yes.

Q Okay. And the meeting -- there's a -- in Leslie Skipper's e-mail, it refers to a meeting today, do you recall that meeting?

A I -- I can't specifically recall this meeting.
Q Do you know if it actually happened?
A I can't recall.
Q Okay.
MR. BLODGETT: Lanny --
MR. RUSSELL: Go ahead, Kevin.
MR. BLODGETT: This is going to be kind of a Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
broad question so I apologize because it's a lot to chew on, but you may recall on May 15th, 2018, the JEA board passed a motion prohibiting any further work relating to the privatization of JEA.

Are you aware of any activity by JEA senior leadership team between May 15th, 2018, and Aaron Zahn's appointment as permanent CEO in late 2018 that related to the privatization of JEA?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall any. I -- I was not involved in any activity.
BY MR. RUSSELL:
Q And Exhibit 25 is an e-mail, it's from you.
It's dated August 20, 2019, and you're sending this
e-mail to David Bodek -- if I said that right.
Who is David Bodek?
A David Bodek, that's correct.
(Orfano's Exhibit 25 was marked for identification.)

Q Okay. And what does he -- what does Mr. Bodek do?

A He is one of the senior rating analysts that's at S\&P Global Ratings.

Q Okay. And what we've attached to that e-mail, I think, is an excerpt of what you actually sent to Mr. Bodek.

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

A Yes.
Q Okay. If you'll turn -- actually -- well, I guess it's hard to see, if you look in the lower right-hand corner, you'll get in here to pages 58 and 59 of the presentation.

A Okay.
Q And on -- well, no, that's page 5, I actually
had a question that's on page 5 . On page 5 , the
statement is made in this submission of the rating agency that, Financial metrics reflect a thriving utility today and long into the future.

Do you believe that was an accurate statement in this document, Mr. Orfano?

A Yes.
Q And if you look in the excerpt further, on 58 and 59, there are five different forecasts presented on those pages, including JEA's February 2019 IRP. Can you help me understand what the difference between these forecasts are, Mr. Orfano?

A The first one -- IRP stands for integrated resource plan and that's what we file with the Florida Public Service Commission and that has some modest increases in kilowatt hours sale -- or megawatt hour sales as is portrayed here.

The class sales is what we typically would Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
present for the rating agencies. We -- we haven't seen a tremendous amount -- while our customers continue to group at 2 percent per year, we haven't seen a significant increase in megawatt hour sale and we like to be conservative, so this would be the class sales case, which also matches the current forecast.

And then on the next page, again, we show the current forecast and then the -- the various scenarios, status quo and traditional utility response, that show declining sales.

Q Okay.
A And that's the -- that's the major difference in these sales forecasts.

Q Historically, in presenting information to the rating agencies, had JEA provided the rating agencies with multiple forecasts?

A At times, we would present the IRP sales case, particularly with S\&P Global Ratings because it was just another view. And I wouldn't call it an aggressive view, but it was maybe -- we're talking about over the last few years, we had shown both an IRP and a flat sales forecast, but we had never presented the other scenarios that we did here.

Q Okay. And I understood you to say that the three forecasts that are presented on page 58 show that Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
the electric system sales of electricity are either increasing or remaining flat for the --

A Correct.
Q -- period covered by the disclosure.
Do you know if the information in this document
that was given to the rating agency was also ever given to the JEA board?

A I believe they saw the status quo and traditional utility response figures in the -- in -- in the summer of last year -- of 2019.

Q Okay. And you don't recall, this would be a JEA board meeting that occurred in the summer of 2019?

A I don't remember which one, but they definitely saw forecast information on the status quo and the traditional utility response.

MR. BLODGETT: Mr. Orfano, from my understanding, the IRP, at least the preliminary results, were completed by March of 2019.

Do you know if the -- those IRP results were ever provided to any JEA board member before the July 23, 2019, board meeting?

THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of whether they were or not.

MR. BLODGETT: You stated you agreed with the statement on page 5 of the rating agency

Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.
presentation, that JEA metrics reflect a thriving utility today and long into the future.

And you still believe that to be true today, correct?

THE WITNESS: I very much believe that.
MR. BLODGETT: Okay. Do you know whether the JEA board or any of its members were told that in 2019, prior to the July 23, 2019, board meeting?

THE WITNESS: I do not know.
MR. BLODGETT: And do you have any insight into why, other than what you've already talked about, the IRP modeling and then the flat sales modeling were not provided or discussed with the JEA board in 2019 prior to the July 23rd, 2019, board meeting?

THE WITNESS: I do not know why.
MR. BLODGETT: Who was typically in charge of making decisions about what type of modeling information and forecast information were provided to the JEA board in 2019?

THE WITNESS: Mr. Wannemacher and Mr. Zahn.
MR. BLODGETT: Do you believe that the IRP forecast and flat modeling forecast and the optimistic statements on page 5 of this rating agency presentation were material that should have been provided to the JEA board prior to the July Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

23rd, 2019, board meeting?
THE WITNESS: I can only comment on what -what my opinion is.

MR. BLODGETT: That's fair.
THE WITNESS: In my opinion, these two scenarios were commonly provided to the rating agency so -- so should the board have seen these? Again, my opinion is yes, because the -- the board chair would typically participate in these meetings if we're meeting face-to-face. So that's my opinion, that yes, the board should have been presented with the -- these forecast assumptions.

MR. BLODGETT: Do you have any knowledge as to why the board was not provided with that information?

THE WITNESS: I do not.
MR. BLODGETT: Do you recall any discussions about the discrepancy between the IRP modeling and the status quo, traditional modeling that was provided to the JEA board during the May, June and July 2019 board meetings?

THE WITNESS: I recall specific conversations with -- with S\&P.

MR. BLODGETT: That would have been after the
July 23rd, 2019, board meeting, though, correct? Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

THE WITNESS: It would have been, correct.
MR. BLODGETT: And you're referring to --
THE WITNESS: Because we met with -- we met with S\&P in August.

MR. BLODGETT: Could you just briefly summarize those conversations for us?

MR. RUSSELL: With S\&P?
MR. BLODGETT: Correct.
MR. RUSSELL: Okay.
THE WITNESS: They've recently been reported -the e-mails have been reported on in the media.
And, frankly, I -- I agreed with the -- the colleague of Mr. Bodek was Mr. Panger, Jeffrey Panger. And I, frankly, agreed with his assessment that -- that he should be utilizing either the flat sales or if he wanted to be a little more aggressive, the IRP case. And because he asked me point blank whether I agreed with the projections on the following page, on page 59 and I told him I -- I did not -- I -- I personally did not agree with those sales forecasts.

MR. BLODGETT: And I believe I know the e-mail that you referenced with Mr. Panger. My recollection, it was in October of 2019, but maybe I'm wrong, but the e-mail -- in the e-mail, Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc.

|  | 62 |  | 64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mr. Panger laid out, I think, nine issues that he | 1 | November of 2017 and then the RFP was issued about |
| 2 | saw with JEA's representations and modeling | 2 | three weeks later by the City. |
| 3 | assertions made to the JEA board at the July 2019 | 3 | To your knowledge, was -- did JEA and the City |
| 4 | board meeting. Is that the e-mail you think you're | 4 | in any way coordinate or work together to |
| 5 | referring to? | 5 | conceptualize or develop that RFP? |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: Well, we had conversations prior | 6 | THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge. |
| 7 | to that e-mail, but, yeah, that -- that's the e-mail | 7 | MR. BLODGETT: Okay. That's all I've got. |
| 8 | that I was referring to. | 8 | BY MR. RUSSELL: |
| 9 | MR. BLODGETT: Okay. And -- and you said you | 9 | Q One last question, I just want to make sure |
| 10 | agreed with Mr. Panger's comments and issues with | 10 | we've gotten all the information that is relevant to our |
| 11 | the modeling presented to the JEA board at the July | 11 | investigation. |
| 12 | 19 board meeting, correct? | 12 | Mr. Orfano, you're aware that Kevin and I |
| 13 | MR. RUSSELL: July 23rd. | 13 | represent the City Council Committee Special |
| 14 | THE WITNESS: Again, that's my opinion. | 14 | Investigative Committee concerning JEA and particularly |
| 15 | MR. BLODGETT: Okay. Do you know what Ryan | 15 | the matters surrounding privatization. |
| 16 | Wannemacher and the other senior leadership team | 16 | Are you aware of any events that occurred in |
| 17 | members involved in those communications believed | 17 | connection with that potential privatization that would |
| 18 | about Mr. Panger's issues? | 18 | be material to our investigation that we haven't talked |
| 19 | THE WITNESS: I -- well, I do know that the | 19 | about today? |
| 20 | tone of the e-mail was very negative and we did not | 20 | A I'm not aware of any. |
| 21 | respond directly to that e-mail. And then he | 21 | MR. RUSSELL: All right. Thank you for your |
| 22 | subsequently sent a follow-up e-mail that was | 22 | time, Mr. Orfano, Steve. |
| 23 | more -- that was toned down and we -- we ultimately | 23 | MR. POWELL: Thank you. Y'all have a good |
| 24 | responded to a follow up e-mail. | 24 | weekend. |
| 25 | MR. BLODGETT: Do you know why the initial Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc. | 25 | MR. RUSSELL: All right. Appreciate it. Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc. |
|  | 63 |  | 65 |
| 1 | negative e-mail from Mr. Panger was not responded to | 1 | THE WITNESS: All right. You guys, appreciate |
| 2 | directly? | 2 | it. |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: I -- I can't recall specifically | 3 | (Witness excused.) |
| 4 | why, but -- but Mr. Wannemacher indicated that we -- | 4 | (The interview was concluded at 11:42 a.m.) |
| 5 | we wouldn't respond to that. He was upset with the | 5 |  |
| 6 | e-mail. | 6 |  |
| 7 | MR. BLODGETT: Did he state his rationale for | 7 |  |
| 8 | not responding to you? | 8 |  |
| 9 | THE WITNESS: I -- I don't recall specifically. | 9 |  |
| 10 | MR. BLODGETT: Okay. Thank you. | 10 |  |
| 11 | MR. RUSSELL: Give us just a moment please and | 11 |  |
| 12 | see where we are in winding this up. | 12 |  |
| 13 | THE WITNESS: Sure. | 13 |  |
| 14 | (Off-the-record discussion.) | 14 |  |
| 15 | MR. RUSSELL: Kevin has just a few more | 15 |  |
| 16 | questions, then I may have one or two. | 16 |  |
| 17 | Kevin, would you go ahead and do yours now? | 17 |  |
| 18 | MR. BLODGETT: Right. | 18 |  |
| 19 | So, Mr. Orfano, we've talked a lot today about | 19 |  |
| 20 | what happened after the City's privatization RFP | 20 |  |
| 21 | that's dated December 20th, 2017. I just have a few | 21 |  |
| 22 | questions about the period of time immediately | 22 |  |
| 23 | before that. | 23 |  |
| 24 | So Mr. Petway made his recommendation or | 24 |  |
| 25 | suggestion that JEA explore privatization in | 25 |  |
|  | Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc. |  | Hedquist \& Associates Reporters, Inc. |
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