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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? | 1 | MR. MULLEN: Thank you. |
| 2 | THE WITNESS: 1 will. | 2 | BY MR. GRANAT: |
| 3 | MR. NINS: Thank you, sir. | 3 | Q And because we're making a formal record here, |
| 4 | Have any promises, threats, or inducements of | 4 | will you state your name? |
| 5 | any nature whatsoever been made by me in order to | 5 | A Aaron Zahn. |
| 6 | obtain your consent to this statement? | 6 | Q Okay. |
| 7 | THE WITNESS: No. | 7 | MR. MULLEN: And for the sake of the record, |
| 8 | MR. NINS: Do you understand this recorded | 8 | with Aaron is John Mullen as counsel, and also to |
| 9 | interview will be subject to public disclosure | 9 | my left, Jacob Peek as counsel. |
| 10 | pursuant to Public Record Law and other laws of the | 10 | BYMR. GRANAT: |
| 11 | State of Florida? | 11 | Q Okay. I'm going to be asking you about some |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 12 | documents and other things, and so I have copies. I |
| 13 | MR. NINS: Thank you very much, sir. | 13 | have one copy for counsel of my documents. Okay? I |
| 14 | AARON ZAHN, | 14 | didn't know that there would be two, but 'Ill just use |
| 15 | having been produced and first duly sworn as a witness, | 15 | these |
| 16 | testified as follows: | 16 | My intention is to label the copy 1 give to |
| 17 | examination | 17 | Mr. Zahn that will be attached to the record, and then |
| 18 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 18 | counsel can keep the copy. So l'll just use these |
| 19 | Q Morring, Mr. Zahn. My name is Sean Granat. | 19 | exhibit stickers. |
| 20 | I'm an atlorney with Office of General Counsel. Iknow | 20 | So we'll start with Exhibil I. We'll just |
| 21 | we have a big team here. I'm just going to ask them to | 21 | call this - Exhibit 1 and 2 are going to be Mr. Zahn's |
| 22 | just do some introductions so you know who everybody is. | 22 | employment contract and employment separation -- Form of |
| 23 | MR. POWELL: I'm Steve Powell. Good moming. | 23 | Separation and Transition Agreement. Okay? |
| 24 | MR. GARrEIT: Chris Garrett. | 24 | (Exhibit Numbers 1 and 2 were marked for |
| 25 | MS. TEODORESCU: Adina Teodorescu. | 25 | identification.) |
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| 1 | MS. HARRELL: Sonya Harrell. | 1 | BYMR GRANAT: |
| 2 | MR. PHILLIPS: Jon Phillips. We've met | 2 | Q And another - |
| 3 | before. | 3 | MR, MULLEN: Thank you. |
| 4 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 4 | Q -- thing, if I hand you a document, please |
| 5 | Q And these are all attomeys with OGC. | 5 | take your time to review it. Take all the time you want |
| 6 | Before we get started, I had a discussion with | 6 | and let me know when you've done that. Okay? |
| 7 | your attorney, John Mullen. We sent you a Garrity | 7 | A Uh-huh. |
| 8 | Rights form that we don't have printed yet, but we will | 8 | Q Have you reviewed the documents, Exhibiil and |
| 9 | at one of the breaks and have you sign, but it's, I | 9 | 2 ? |
| 10 | think, everyone's understanding that this is a compelled | 10 | A Yes. They appear to be the -- my contract. |
| 11 | interview at the request of the JEA board and Melissa | 11 | Well, this one appears to be the formal contract and |
| 12 | Dykes, and so full Garrity protections are in effect | 12 | this one appears to be the separation. |
| 13 | regarding this interview. | 13 | Q And is Exhibit 1 the contract that you entered |
| 14 | MR. MULLEN: Thai's understood, Sean. Thank | 14 | into on July 23rd, 2019? |
| 15 | you. | 15 | A That's how it would appear by the signature |
| 16 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 16 | page. |
| 17 | Q And also, before we get started, I do think | 17 | Q Any reason to doubt this is -- |
| 18 | we'll be here most of the day. We want everybody to be | 18 | A No. |
| 19 | comfortable, so if you need to take a break, let us | 19 | Q -- your contract? |
| 20 | know. We can do that. It's not an endurance test. | 20 | Okay. So l just want to go over some of the |
| 21 | If you need to confer with your counsel, as | 21 | terms of your contract. |
| 22 | long as there's not a question pending, let me know and | 22 | On the second page, on Paragraph 1.2, it talks |
| 23 | we can do that and break whenever you'd like, any | 23 | about Terns and Duties. And really this contract, would |
| 24 | comfort breaks. And that's for your attomeys as well. | 24 | you agree, has no ending term? It would extend in |
| 25 | Okay? | 25 | perpetuity until it was terminated through either cause |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | or without cause? Or there's a death or disability | 1 | A Uh-huh. |
| 2 | provision as well. | 2 | Q -- plan? |
| 3 | A Yes. | 3 | That's basically - is that's what -- is that |
| 4 | Q Mr. Zahn, when you entered into this contract, | 4 | what is considered the short-term incentive plan at JEA? |
| 5 | were you aware that there was no end date? | 5 | A It is the shor-term, yeah, annual pay for |
| 6 | A Actually, I thought it had a six-year - my | 6 | performance plan. |
| 7 | thought -- not specifically in terms of -1 thought | 7 | Q And did you ever receive a bonus through that |
| 8 | 3.1.6 kind of broadened the six-year effective date, | 8 | plan? |
| 9 | but -- | 9 | A Yes, I did. In conjunction with all 2,000 |
| 10 | Q Well, doesn't 3.1.6 say that if you're | 10 | employees, I received it either in November, I believe, |
| 11 | terminated without cause or for good reason within six | 11 | or - of this - of the past year. |
| $12$ | years, then you would get a 12-month consultation | 12 | Q Or 2019? |
| 13 | agreement? | 13 | A Correct. |
| 14 | A Yeah, you're correct. Yeah, so ... | 14 | Q And what was the amount of your bonus? |
| 15 | Q But would you agree as it stands, this | 15 | A 1 don't recall specifically, but my guess |
| 16 | contract makes you the permanent CEO of JEA forever | 16 | would be somewhere between 25 - and \$30,000. |
| 17 | until you're terminated -- | 17 | Q And did your senior leadership team also |
| 18 | A Or resigned. | 18 | receive bonuses under this pay for performance pian? |
| 19 | Q - with or without cause or you resign or the | 19 | A All 2,000 employees received bonuses. So yes, |
| 20 | death or disability clause kicks in? | 20 | senior leadership and all 2,000 . |
| 21 | A Or resign, yeah. | 21 | Q And did your senior leadership team receive |
| 22 | Q Okny. Also on Page 2 it talks about an annual | 22 | bonuses in the five figures? |
| 23 | salary. Do you see that? | 23 | A I am not aware of their specific figures. |
| 24 | A Uh-huh. | 24 | Q Okay. And Paragraph 2.3 of your contract, it |
| 25 | Q Your annual salary as of July 23rd, 2019, was | 25 | provides you with an automobile allowance of \$850 a |
|  | Page 10 |  | Page 12 |
| 1 | \$520,392 per year? | 1 | month; is that right? |
| 2 | A Correct. | 2 | A Correct. |
| 3 | Q And that was actually made retroactive to some | 3 | Q And so monthly that would be a little over |
| 4 | period in the past; is that right? | 4 | \$10,000 a year? |
| 5 | A Per the board's request. | 5 | A Correct. This was directly from the prior |
| 6 | Q But it was made retroactive? | 6 | CEO's employment agreement. |
| 7 | A Per the board's request. | 7 | Q I understand that. But it's in your contract; |
| 8 | Q So did you receive a lump-sum payment of back | 8 | right? |
| 9 | pay? | 9 | A It is. |
| 10 | A I do not recall, but I do know that the board, | 10 | Q And then the next paragraph grants you, it |
| 11 | in discussing this contract, requested that it be made | 11 | says, business allowances, and it provides you with |
| 12 | retroactive to the date of when I was first appointed | 12 | \$2,200 monthly for general business expenses -- |
| 13 | the permanent CEO. | 13 | A Correct. |
| 14 | Q Do you recall what that date was? | 14 | Q - is that right? |
| 15 | A November 27th, 2018. | 15 | And so annualized, that's over \$26,000 a year; |
| 16 | Q 2018, okay. | 16 | is that right? |
| 17 | And also in Paragraph 2.1 of your contract, it | 17 | A Approximately, yes. |
| 18 | also says that every 12 months there's going to be a | 18 | Q Okay. And then in Paragraph 2.5, there's \$50 |
| 19 | review and perhaps an adjustment of your salary with the | 19 | for parking, so that's roughly $\$ 600$ a year. |
| 20 | market - | 20 | Paragraph 2.7 grants you 280 hours of leave |
| 21 | A Correct. | 21 | annually; right? |
| 22 | Q -- is that right? | 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | On the third page of your contract in | 23 | Q And then the next page, Paragraph 2.8, says |
| 24 | Section 2.2, it says you're qualified for a pay for | 24 | you get all the fringe benefits, healthcare, general |
| 25 | performance -- | 25 | employee benefits that other employees at JEA get; |

correct?
A Yes.
Q It also includes a half-a-million-dollar insurance policy that's paid for by JEA; is that correct?

A Yes. I believe JEA's policy around life insurance is one times the base salary, so that would be approximate. It's in here as 500 , but the policy for all employees is to provide that.

Q And it's in your contract as well?
A Correct.
Q And then it also says in Paragraph 2.9 you participate in either the pension program or a $401(\mathrm{a})$, defined contribution plan; correct?

A Correct.
Q Then in Section 3.1, there's a -- it explains four different ways the contract can be terminated; for cause, for good reason, upon the employec's death or by either party without cause; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q $\ln$ Paragraph 3.1.1, cause is specifically defined. Would you agree with that?

A Yes.
Q Are you aware of who drafled the for-cause terms in your contract?

## Page 14

A So it would be a collaboration of counsel Shane Murioz that was engaged by myself and turee other senior leadership team members, and then a draft -in order to produce a draft that was then produced for Pillsbury, Foley, and OGC to finalize and complete,

Q Do you have a copy of the - and say the name of the lawyer again. Shane who?

A Shane Muñoz.
Q Muñoz. And what law firm is he with? Is it Ford \& Harrison?

A Yeah, Ford Harrison.
Q Do you have a copy of the draft that you received from Shane Muñoz that you provided to one of the JEA's attorneys?

A I think we provided that as part of the production --

MR. MULLEN: We produced --
A - request.
MR. MULLEN: That prior to today.
MR. GRANAT: You did? Okay. BYMR. GRANAT:

Q In Paragraph 3.1 .5 of your contract, it provides that if you're terminated without cause or for good reason, you receive 20 weeks of severance, basically; is that right?

A Yes.
Q And also you get -- you'll receive 20 weeks' worth COBRA payments paid by JEA; correct?

A Yes.
Q And then, as we discussed earlier, 3.1.6 of your contract says if you're terminated without cause or for good reason within six years, you would get a 12 -month consulting agreement that is the subject of Exhibit 2, the Form of Separation and Transition Agreement; correct?

A Correct.
Q And part of that Form of Separation and Trunsition Agreement also includes a mutual release?

A That's correct.
Q So that's all part of your contract; right?
A Correct.
Q All right. I want to back up and ask you about 2.4 , Business Allowance provision, the $\$ 2,200$ a month that you're provided.

What's your understanding of what that's for?
A So as a govemment employee, offentimes I would take my team to lunch or I would take, you know -and it was previously in the prior CEO's contract as his business allowance. And it allows for me to spend money on coffees, dinners, where I'm paying for myself in
order to, you know, make sure l'm complying with all, you know, haws and ethics codes.

Q But is this moncy that's put into your paycheck that you receive every month -

A Yes.
Q -- whether you spend it or not?
A Yes.
Q Okay. So was it your understanding that this business allowance, this $\$ 2,200$ a month, was to be used by you for business expenses, or was this just another way for you to increase your salary?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A It was, again, a - this was a paragraph that typically was in the prior CEO's contract and was came out of the OGC's approved form contract, and it was intended to use business expenses.

And if I recall, I'm pretty sure almost every month I either met or exceeded that relative to paying for myself on doing things, you know.

Q When you're referring to the prior CEO's
contract, are you talking about Paul McElroy?
A Yes.
Q Do you know -- so you believe Paul McElroy's

|  | Page 17 |  | Page 19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | contract included a business allowance provision as | 1 | interim CEO contract drafted by OGC. That was the form |
| 2 | well? | 2 | contract that - that was provided to Shane Muñoz to |
| 3 | A Yes. | 3 | update with a -- with more normal employment terns. |
| 4 | Q Do you know how much per month he received? | 4 | And then that - and that actually did not |
| 5 | A I don't. | 5 | include a form of separation, transition or a mutual |
| 6 | Q Okay. Did you keep receipts or records of | 6 | waiver of release. Actually, that was just a simple |
| 7 | your expenses that you used your business allowance to | 7 | employment agreement with far less. And then that |
| 8 | pay for? | 0 | version was provided to OGC and their special counsel to |
| 9 | A No, not specifically. | 9 | complete and review with, you know, compensation |
| 10 | Q It wasn't required? | 10 | committee members as well as the Chair. |
| 11 | A No. | 11 | Q So Ford \& Harrison took your interim contract, |
| 12 | Q So if there was money lefl over from your | 12 | modified it, and it was presented to OGC; is that -- |
| 13 | business allowance, the $\$ 2,200$ a month, that you didn't | 13 | A Uh-huh. |
| 14 | spend, is that just money that you kept for yourself? | 14 | Q - right? |
| 15 | A In that hypothetical situation, sure. | 15 | Was it presented to OGC by Ford \& Harrison or |
| 16 | Q You don't think that ever occurred? | 16 | by you? |
| 17 | A 1 know I paid for a lot of things out of my | 17 | A I don't recall. |
| 18 | own pocket just as a standard matter of course in order | 18 | Q And you said that there were some others of |
| 19 | to make sure I was always paying for my own way. | 19 | the senior leadership team that had retained |
| 20 | Q Okay. You've been on paid administrative | 20 | Ford \& Harrison. Who were those? |
| 21 | leave for, I think it's been over a month now; is that | 21 | A Melissa Dykes, Herschel Vinyard, and |
| 22 | right? | 22 | Ryan Wannemacher. |
| 23 | A Yes. | 23 | Q Do you know when you hired Ford \& Harrison? |
| 24 | Q And in your paycheck that you received, did | 24 | A It would have been, 1 believe, late May. |
| 25 | you receive the business allowance pay for this past | 25 | Q Or? |
|  | Page 18 |  | Page 20 |
| 1 | month? | 1 | A Of2019. |
| 2 | A I did. | 2 | Q 2019. |
| 3 | Q Did you return that to JEA? | 3 | A And I had discussed it with the Chair of the |
| 4 | A Am I required to? | 4 | board that, you know, we were doing strategic planning, |
| 5 | Q I'm just asking if you returned it. | 5 | and we needed to contemplate giving senior leadership |
| 6 | A l used well in excess of that to pay for my | 6 | protections because of - well, all of the political |
| 7 | attomeys, you know, to -- which I don't know if that's | 7 | sensitivities around all the strategic planning that we |
| 8 | a business allowance -- or business expense or not, but | 8 | were doing, |
| 9 | it's certainly -- I've applied substantially multiples | 9 | And so -- and so I said, well, you know, I can |
| 10 | of that paying for attomeys to deal with JEA matters. | 20 | certainly serve up a draft and then give it to JEA's |
| 11 | Q For your personal matters? | 11 | counsel, and you guys can work through it. |
| 12 | MR. MURPHY: Object to the form of the | 12 | Q So why did you feel the need to hire outside |
| 13 | question, | 13 | counsel? |
| 14 | You can answer. | 14 | A Well, in employment matters, my understanding |
| 15 | A I don't -- some might be JEA matters, some | 15 | is I needed my own attomey, and OGC and Pillsbury and |
| 16 | might be personal matters. | 16 | Foley would be representing the interests of JEA. And |
| 17 | Q And what attomeys are you referring to? | 17 | sol needed my own counsel. |
| 18 | A Phelps Dunbar and Peek \& Associates. | 18 | Q Okay. Do you know who at OGC received the |
| 19 | Q Any others? | 19 | contract from either you or Ford \& Harrison? |
| 20 | A No. | 20 | A My understanding was Lynne Rhode received it, |
| 21 | Q So you told me that the first -- well, let me | 21 | and then 1 believe you reviewed it. At least that was |
| 22 | ask you this. | 22 | my understanding. And then Pillsbury and Jessica Lutrin |
| 23 | The first draft of your contract was done by | 23 | and then Kevin Hyde of Foley. |
| 24 | Ford \& Harrison? | 24 | Q What makes you think I reviewed your |
| 25 | A No. The first draft of the contract was the | 25 | employment contract? |

A My understanding was that Lynne would meet frequently on matters with OGC, with special counsel at OGC around -- and you're the specialty employment attomey.

I've seen memos on other employment-related matters between you and her that have been produced recently. So I ...

Q So did Lynne Rhode receive the contract from Ford \& Harrison or you?

A Yes.
Q Do you know whether she did or not?
A Yes. I mean - no. I cannot confirm who exactly received it, whether it was Lynne or special counsel.

But, you know, what I do know is that once it was delivered to the right party -- and you would have an email of that, I would imagine - all the remaining development of this contract was developed by JEA's counsel.

Q And so was your underslanding that the CEO's contract is something that should be negotiated between the CEO and JEA through counsel?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.

Page 22
A Inegotiated it with April Green and Camille Lee-Johnson, the compensation Chair and the Chair of the board, and presumably they were consulting with OGC and ...

Q Did you ever direct JEA's attorneys as to what your contract should include?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A I'm not clear on the question. Did I direet on what my contract should include?

Q Did you ever tell one of the OGC - I'm sorry - one of JEA's attomeys, whether it was OGC or Foley or Pillsbury, what should be contained in your contract?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A I was given drafts from OGC and Pillsbury to provide comment on. In terms of directing what should be contained in it? Certainly we gave the first draft. I don't know what your -

Q Was there a back-and-forth negotiation of your contract at all that you know of?

A Yes.

Q And who was that negotiation between?
A I spoke at length with April Green about it, about the -- all the -- about all the terms and conditions. I know she reviewed a copy of it, and Camille Lec-Johnson reviewed a copy of it.

In fact, actually, I talked about it with Reverend Newbill. Actually, many of the board members, because it had a substantial pay increase from my interim from 330 to 520 . We talked about where the 520 cane from. That was the prior CEO's salary.

The 20 -- the 850 remained the same as what was in my interim CEO contract, because -- you know, the business allowances in my interim CEO contract. Pay for performance was part of - so we went through this -and I went through this with most of the board members in terms of reviewing my contract, correct.

Q Do you know how Pillsbury became involved with your contract?

A I would imagine at the direction of OGC. They brought in special employment ...

Q Your understanding is that OGC brought in Pillsbury to work on your employment contract?

A Well, Pillsbury was engaged by OGC, and Pillsbury was brought in for a number of - and Foley, by the way, were brought in for a number of -- 1 haven't
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seen their engagement letters, but as 1 understand it, Pillsbury and Foley were brought in for a whole myriad of engagements.

Q When you say Pillsbury and Foley were brought in by OGC, you understand that any of the independent agencies or departments of consolidated govemment must go through OGC to retain outside counsel, don't you?

A 1 do.
Q And so was it at your request or your direction that Pillsbury was retained by OGC?

A So when we were getting ready for the July board meeting, I spoke with Jason Gabriel, and we talked about the potential of issuing the ITN. We were also going through collective bargaining, or at least getting ready for collective bargaining.

And my understanding is that OGC, through Jason Gabriel and Lawsikia Hodges, had interviewed -back when Paul McElroy was the CEO and you -- and this whole privatization thing kicked up with them, my understanding was OGC interviewed Pillstsury and Skadden and Latham Watkins and Kirkland Ellis.

And so in the discussion with Jason, he said, do you have a preference? And I said, all things considered, Pillsbury is a great firm.

Q Do you have any connections with Pillsbury --
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```
    A Yeah.
    Q - or anyone who works there?
    A Uh-huh.
    Q What's the connection?
    A I know Stephen Amdur, the managing partner,
very well for a number of years.
    Q And how do you know him?
    A Through college, actually.
    Q You were friends at college?
    A Yeah, we were friends.
        I know a lot of the other partners at the
    other law firms, too, though, so ...
    Q Right.
        So your understanding was that Pillsbury and
    Foley and OGC were representing the board regarding your
    contract, and then on the other side was you and
    Ford & Harrison; is that right?
        A Yes.
        Q Do you know if Ford & Harrison ever had any
        communication with Pillsbury or Folcy or OGC regarding
        your employment contract?
            A I am not aware of that.
            I'm not sure I need -- required them to
    provide, you know, other services in terms of ...
        Q So did your contract, your permanent contract,
            Page 26
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        Exhibit 1, differ from Paul McElroy's prior contract?
        A Yes.
        Q How did it differ?
        A I don't have Paul McElroy's contract in front
        of me to go line by line.
            Q Did your contract contain benefits that Paul's
        didn't?
        A Maybe.
        Q As we sit here today, you don't know?
        A It certainly had -- you know, his had benefits
        I remember that mine didn't include.
        Q What were those?
        A I think he had like an executive pension
        program that we didn't have. And then I know that the
        difference between the interim CEO, which was really
        predominantly the mirror image of his, and that mine
        incorporated standard employment terms that we just
        discussed.
            Q You told me earlier that you met with board
        members to discuss your permanent contract?
            A And other senior leadership contracts.
            Q Did you discuss with those board members what
    And the rationale was that we were going through a full analysis of compensation for the entire company for all 2,000 employees, and I had made a promise to the board and to the union leaders that I would not ask for a, you know, employment agreement with the board until such time as all 2,000 employees total compensation - the total compensation strategy was completed and until such time as all 2,000 employees were taken care of.

Q I've heard you say that before. But you said you wouldn't take -- you wouldn't worry about your contract until the total compensation plan was passed by the board; is that right?

A Correat.
Q And that total compensation plan included a long-lerm incentive plan as well; right?

A Correct.
Q So you didn't want to enter into your permanent CEO contract until the board approved the long-lerm incentive plan as well; correct?

A Ididn't want to enter into the contract until all total compensation for the whole company had been established.

Q And that would also include the long-term incentive plan; right?

A I can't opine on that. I'm not a public sector expert - employment expert.

Q Are you aware of any other public sector job where you've seen a CEO with a Form of Separation and Transition Agreement like yours?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A Paul McElroy got a Form of Separation and Transition Agreement. I don't have - we asked for a copy of it, and we haven't receeived it. But he had a, I want to say, nine month or six month or something like that.

Q Have you seen his form of separation agreement?

A I was on the board when it was approved, and it had a whole bunch of indemnifications, and it paid his salary for that period of time.

Q And do you think that your form of separation agreement mirrors his? Does yours have increased bencfits over his?

A We've asked for that and have not received that.

Q Don't know?
A I can -- is it going to mirror his? Probably

A It would include benefits. It would include, you know, the terms for collective bargaining. It would include everything, so -- taking care of all 2,000 and yes, it would include the long-term as weil.

Q Your contract contains a Form of Separation and Transition Agreement that we discussed, right, if you're terminated within the first six years?

A Correct.
Q It's a pretty substantial agreement with some pretty substantial benefits; would you agree? MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A I don't agree.
Q You don't agree that a 12-month --
A I've seen - no. I've seen far more
substantial employment agreements through my career as a CEO and as a private equity.

Q Okay. Let me rephrase the question. Your Form of Separation and Transition Agreement contains pretty substantial benefits for a public sector job, doesn't it?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
not, because, you know, these documents were drafted by different attorneys.
(Exhibit Number 3 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Show you Exhibit 3. Give you a minute to take
a look at that. Give your attomey a copy of it as
well.
A Okay.
Q And this Exhibit 3 is a series of cmails discussing Paul McElroy's Transition Services Agreement; correct?

A Yep.
Q And his transition services agreement, the two-page document is attached?

A Yes.
Q And through the email, Jon Kendrick; who's the VP of $\mathrm{HR}-$ is that right -

A Correct.
Q - is discussing the agreement with you?
A Correct.
Q And then at the top, there's an email from you to Jessica Lutrin.

A Uh-huh.
Q Who is Jessica Lutrin?

A She's special counsel to $O G C$ at Pillsbury for employment-related matters.

Q And you say special counsel to OGC. She was working on JEA matters; correct?

A Yes.
Q Did you have a lot of contact over the last year with Jessica Lutrin?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A Define "a lot."
Q You don't know what "a lot" means?
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A She worked a lot with JEA employes on a number of employment-related matters, including Kevin Hyde. I talked to her more around the time of, you know, the employment agreement and that kind of stuff.

Q Have you met with Jessica Lurin in person?
A Yes.
Q Over a number of matters; right?
A Yes. But with -- not -- not one-on-one. Just 1 met with her on --

Q You met with her regarding the PUP, regarding
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the ITN; right?
A Yeah, in a collective meeting with 40 or 50 people.

Q And you had emails or at least were copied on emails to and from Jessica Lutrin; correct?

A I have this one. I'm not sure I was copied on -- if I was copied on others.

Q So your email to Jessica Lutrin says, "FYI. Here is it" -- and I'll represent what's attached to that email is this Paul McElroy contract.
"Looks like we will need to add some additional provisions."

A Okay,
Q Right?
A Yeah.
Q So tell me about what you were telling Jessica Lutrin, the Pillsbury attomey, and why.

A Well, I don't recall this email, but clearly -

MR. MULLEN: And, Sean, I'll note for the record I don't think this was one of the documents you provided to us ahead of time. I'm trying to -you made some effort to provide me with some documents before today, but Mr. Zahn may need time to review a document like this that he hasn't seen
before or hasn't seen recently.
MR. GRANAT: Sure.

## BYMR, GRANAT:

Q And if you want to take a minute to review this further, I told you at the beginning, I want you to take all the time you need -

A Sure.
Q - to review documents.
A It looks like I'mproviding that form of separation, transition to her, again, as a starting point for what I guess ultimately became the separation, transition agreement.

Q And what provisions did you suggest be added to your separation agreement? What did you mean?

A My recollection -- I'm going to hold these up and look at them side by side.

Q Sure.
A For example, there's a lot of severability, survivability, notices, waivers, typical paragraphs that just are in normal contracts, employment agreements. Compliance with tax issues, you know, execution, entire agreement authority. None of those typical legal provisions exist within this transition services agreement.

Q Did you see that Paul McElroy had a mutual Page 36 release included in his?

A Does he?
His has the pension and supplemental pension plan. But it did have - this does not look like the final one.

If it is - and the reason 1 recall that is
there was a motion at the boand meeting to include indemnification for Paul McElroy and I believe a release, but - and that would be on television, from my recollection of that board meeting.

Q You think Paul McElroy's had a mutual release as well?

A Yeah. And the reason I know that is he was hotly debating that on his -- during his resignation. And actually, $I$ asked the question in the board meeting, Paul, is there anything in your -- not in this agreement that you wanted in this agreement?

And his statement was indemnification, whether it was, you know, fulsome and robust as a release as well. But - and I believe -. and there was a motion at that board meeting to include that type of language as part of his protections. And that would be on - well, whatever the boand, you know, meeting was that -- where he resigned.

Q Now, you said that there were standard
contract terms that - when 1 asked you what the additional provisions were, you said standard contract terms like severability and things like that.

A Yeah.
Q How were you aware of what standard contract terms should be included in a separation and transition agreement?

A Again, from my experience of having reviewed thousands of legal documents in my career, I know what looks like a short-term contract and what actually has appropriate contractual legal provisions. I mean ...

Q You were on the board when this Paul McElroy Transition Services Agreement was entered into?

A I was.
Q Why didn't you insist on those standard appropriate contract terms being put into Paul McElroy's Transition Services Agreement as a board member?

A He was willing to accept it.
Q The email, Exhibit 3, your message to Jessica is, "FYI. Here is it. Looks like we need to add some additional provisions."

Would you agree that this is evidence that there had been a prior conversation with Jessica Lutrin and you regarding your transition and services agreement?
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MR, MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You car answer.
A Certainly at least a request for a - for Paul McElroy's separation, transition agreement.

Q Do you recall any other prior conversation or what that request was from Jessica?

A So the form of separation, transition agreement and mutual labor and release as well as the form employment agreements for both myself and the senior leadership, Jessica was working with Lynne and Kevin Hyde, and they were trying to complete a lot of the -- you know, finish all of the forms for presentation, you know, and discussion with the board.

And I remember, you know, Melissa Dykes and Herschel and Ryan and Kerri and a whole bunch of people, you know, it was provided to them because it was -again, it was a form for the senior leadership.

And I think the question was from -- and the impetus of this email was the draft prepared by Shane Muioz, our attomey, and provided to you, did not actually have a form document.

And so, you know, my understanding was that OGC and Pillsbury and Foley were trying to - instead of have a Section 3.1.6 that just left a, hey, you'll have
a contract, but it's not defined, that they said, well, we should actually define it. And so then this was me providing the prior form of the CEO's separation, transition agreement.

Q Okay. So what I was asking you is, do you recall a prior conversation or request from Jessica Lutrin?

A Request for?
Q For the transition services agreement or information about provisions that may be required?

A I'm not sure I understand -
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
A - the question.
Q Okay. Let's back up.
Exhibit 3 is an email from you to Jessica, it says "Here it is."

A Yeah. And so like I said, this would appear to be a response to her request for that document.

Q What I'm asking you is, do you recall her request or do you recall prior conversations with Jessica regarding this email or her request?

A I don't recall prior conversations - this is July 9th?

Q Because would you agree you didn't copy anyone
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else; you sent this directly to Jessica; right?
A Correct.
Q And so just so I'm clear, you were the permanent CEO at the time; is that right?

A Correct.
Q And you believed it was appropriate for the permanent CEO to be telling Pillsbury, an attorney who is representing JEA, that additional provisions needed to be included in your employment contract?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A I was being responsive to a request. And to remind you, April Green and Camille Johnson were part of the negotiations for these and reviewed all these documents. As to whether or not they interfaced -- how much they interfaced, I don't know the answer to that.

Q Do you know whether April Green had conversations with Pillsbury or Foley \& Lardner regarding your contract?

A Noidea.
Q Do you know whether April Green or Camille Lee-Johnson had conversations with Lynne Rhode regarding your employment contract?

A Part of a standard process for getling ready
for board meetings was oftentimes for April Green to talk to Lynne Rhode about substantive resolutions and/or documents that were going to be contained in the board packages. So do I know? I don't have specific evidence of that.

Q Okay.
A But it would seem logical to me that they would.

Q So I think you've told me this before, but did you specifically discuss the tems of your contract, Exhibit 1 and 2, with April Green?

A Yes.
Q You discussed all the terms that were contained in there?

A I would review -- in board packages, I would review all documents and prepare them and make sure that they had them to review ahead of time and then answer any questions that they may have.

Q So I think there's a difference, would you agree, between handing someone a stack of documents and saying, here they are, look through it, and let me know if you have any questions. There's that, and then there's going through something with someone page by page, line by line. Agreed, that those are two separate things?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Did you sit down with
Camille Lee-Johnson and have your contract in front of you and talk about your contract with her?

A I don't know if we sat down, but we -- or did it over the phone, but we talked about it,

Q Do you know if she had your contract in front of her when you had that conversation?

A Again, I don't recall if it was in person or over the phone. And if it was over the phone, I can't prove what she had in front of her.

Q Did you have a sit-down with Reverend Newbill to discuss your contract?

A 1 did.
Q Did you have a sit-down with Andy Allen to discuss your contract?

A He would have been just coming on the board. I don't recall.

Q Think it might have been most important to have a sit-down conversation with a new board member to discuss your contract that he would be voting on?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A My view is board members are sophisticated
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A Yes, I would agree.
Q Okay. Did you go through your employment contract provision by provision with April Green?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
A From my recollection, yes. I went through -now, did ! go, you know, every single little line? That's not how April Green reviewed documents. That's not how a lot of my board members reviewed documents.

A lot of times you'd get - we'd give it to them, give them an opportunity to review, say call me, you know, let's talk about this. Here are the major terms that you need to be aware of. So I would have definitely reviewed the major tems.

Q With April Green?
A Yes. And I actually reviewed major terms with, I want to say, Alan Howard, Reverend Newbill, Camille, because, again, the standard procedure for getting ready for a board meeting would be to schedule meetings with each one of the board members and review the major documents.

Q I understand your standard procedure, but I'm asking you, did you go over - did you sit down with April Green and have the contract in front of both of you and talk about it?
individuals that have the ability to review documents, and they're on a -- they're on a very sophisticated board and have the ability to review documents and ask appropriate questions as board members. I certainly would, as a board member.

Q So your position is that it's on the board members to review the documents and either understand them or let you know that they don't?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A I'm telling you what I would do as a board member. And what I normally -- the normal -- what is normal process for any board member that's going to vote on something is to thoroughly review, analyze, and understand all the provisions.

In fact, I believe the resolution that
April Green signed approving all of these documents specifically says that she reviewed, analyzed, and had an opportunity.

Q So back to my question. You didn't feel the need to have a special sit-down with Andy Allen to go over your contract?

A That's not what I said. I said I don't recall specifically reviewing this with him. But that's just a
recollection issuc. I don't -- I don't recall.
Q Okay. And --
A I did -- Alan Howard, I did.
Q You had a sit-down with Alan Howard?
A Uh-huh.
Q What about Kelly Flanagan, did you sit down with her to discuss your contract?

A Kelly Flanagan at the time was flying back and forth between London and San Francisco, so my guess would be that would be a phone call.

Q Why do the rest of the senior leadership leams have contracts?

A Great question. So in discussing with April Green and the board members the, as we all know, politically charged strategic planning process, one of the scenarios that was being contemplated for voting on in July was Scenario Number 2 that would have necessitated a substantial reduction in the force, including a number of the senior leadership team members, including myself.

And so we talked about -- or we talked about the need to make sure that you had senior leadership team members that could effectively manage through that type of transition in the event that Scenario 2 was effectuated or voled on and approved by the board in
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July, because that was one of the things under consideration.

In addition, you know, I had expressed to the
board that it was my belief that, you know, senior
leadership team members -- and it's very normal in the industry for vice presidents and above to have employment agreements that give them protection, because they're in high turnover roles and they have a lot of exposure.

Q Are you aware of any other public sector utilities where senior leadership teams have employment contracts?

A I know it's very normal for the CEO. As to whether the large public power entities go another layer down, I don't have specific knowiedge of it, but it wouldn't surprise me.

Q Within the consolidated City of Jacksonville, are you aware of anyone other than CEOs of independent agencies who have employment contracts?

A I have not reviewed all the other independent agencies.

Q And so if 1 understand correctly, Scenario 2 contemplated reduction in force of many senior leadership team members, including yourself?

A It did.

Q And that's because Scenario 2 would require JEA to cut costs, including payroll, as a major cost cut; is that right?

A Yeah. In the next year or two, 200-t the EBITDA will probably drop from 750 million to about 550 million, so that's about $\$ 200$ million of profitability that will be lost.

And so either you have to raise rates substantially in order to cover that cost, that additional expense of Vogtle, as well as the additional expense of increasing costs - throughout the organization, or you need to cut costs, and that could be done through paying off debt, reducing cutbacks, as well as - one of the initiatives was to do a reduction in force, yeah.

Q And so if Scenario 2 proceeded, JEA would be in a dire situation that would require reduction in force; would you agree with that?

A No. I think that's a perspective that media has painted. I don't -- all the scenarios we've produced are viable business scenarios. It's just a matter of a policy decision as to whether or not you want the customer to have to pay for all the additional expenses increasing or you want to, you know, take cost out of the business and thereby not increase rates on
your customers substantially. I don't consider that dire. That's just normal business.

Q All right. But under Scenario 2, you negotiated for yourself that if you were part of the reduction in force, you would receive 12 montis of continued pay?

A So part of that discussion, number one, was we have a very complicated lawsuit around Vogtle, which is, you know, our nuclear contract that I'm a key party in, that don't know the period of time that that would take to resolve, if ever. So there was a discussion about how long would that take.

There was a discussion about you don't just do a reduction in force overnight. You have to manage through it and establish new processes and protocols and make sure that the organization structure was in place.

There was we have -- there were a number of, call it major tail issues that that 12 months was intended for me to provide those services. And again, the idea for it really came from Paul McElroy, because one of the reasons we - the board asked him to stick around was to provide guidance on Vogtle, because there was substantial changes in the cost of that project at the time of his departure.

Q You're aware now that privatization is off the
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | table; right? | 1 | 1 actually expensed my own expenses. So perhaps because |
| 2 | A Asl understand it. | 2 | these aren't - these are expenses for my direct reports |
| 3 | Q And the situation JEA finds itself in now is | 3 | and I did not expense my own expenses, that may be why |
| 4 | with a senior leadership team that all has contracts, | 4 | the Chair didn't, you know - I don't know if she was |
| 5 | employment contracts; correct? | 5 | asked or not, but she -- |
| 6 | A Yes. | 6 | Q You spent two nights in Charleston; is that |
| 7 | Q Do you think that it's appropriate for the | 7 | right? |
| 8 | senior leadership team of a municipal utility under | 8 | A Correct. |
| 9 | today's circumstances to have the benefits of the | 9 | Q And it was with Ryan Wannemacher, Julio, |
| 10 | contructs that they currently have? | 10 | Melissa Dykes, and Herschel Vinyard and yourself? |
| 11 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the | 11 | A And our wives - or spouses. |
| 12 | question. | 12 | Q And what was discussed at this meeting? |
| 13 | You can answer. | 13 | A So we went through a whole bunch of strategic |
| 14 | A Define "appropriate." | 14 | planning options. We went through status quo -- because |
| 15 | Do 1-- yes. So did the board of directors, | 15 | we started strategic planning in January. |
| 16 | clearly, because they put them in place, and that was | 16 | We went through traditional response. We went |
| 17 | part of the discussion in June and July. So it would | 17 | through the legal constraints that -- you know, because |
| 18 | seem that not only I, but several board members thought | 18 | what was starting to get framed up was that there were |
| 19 | it was appropriate. | 19 | these constraints as a government entity around how do |
| 20 | (Exhibit Number 4 was marked for | 20 | you -- you know, whether it's lending of credit, |
| 21 | identification.) | 21 | constitutional limitations, those kinds of things. |
| 22 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 22 | We had a full day and a half of talking |
| 23 | Q All right. Let's look at Exhibit 4. Take a | 23 | about - so this was in April. Then we had May was our |
| 24 | minute to look through that, please. | 24 | presentation to the board of directors around the status |
| 25 | A Yep. | 25 | quo and talking about, well -- all that. |
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| 1 | Q All right. So are you familiar with | 1 | We did talk about whether or not |
| 2 | Exhibit 4? | 2 | recapitalization would potentially be an altemative, |
| 3 | A 1 am . | 3 | but we touched upon it. Certainly, you know, didn't do |
| 4 | Q And it's - the first thing is a check to you | 4 | much in the way of work on that. We did talk about |
| 5 | for $\$ 4,316.04$ ? | 5 | timeline of working with McKinsey. We talked about a |
| 6 | A Correct. | 6 | lot of things. |
| 7 | Q And then there's some payment requests | 7 | Q Why did that take place in Charleston? |
| 8 | relating to some hotel rooms in Charleston, | 8 | A Team building. I mean, Herschel was new. |
| 9 | South Carolina? | 9 | Julio was new. I wanted the spouses to meet each other. |
| 10 | A Correct. For Ryan, Melissa, and Julio. | 10 | Q Mr. Zahn, these were over $\$ 700$-a-night hotels; |
| 11 | Q So what was this for? What happened here? | 11 | right? |
| 12 | A Sol took -- well, Julio, Ryan, myself, | 12 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the |
| 13 | Melissa, and Herschel all went to Charleston to sit down | 13 | question. |
| 14 | and talk about, you know, where strategic planning was | 14 | A Okay. |
| 15 | going and talk about the different permutations of it. | 15 | Q I mean, take a look at the invoices and you |
| 16 | I paid for my own room, and I believe Herschel | 16 | tell me. \$629 and \$88 in tax per night. |
| 17 | paid for his own room. And I paid for -- well, I | 17 | A Okay. |
| 18 | expensed Ryan and Julio and Melissa's rooms. | 18 | Q Yes? |
| 19 | Q And who approved this trip? You? | 19 | A Yes. |
| 20 | A Normally when we would travel, my EA would ask | 20 | Q Why did you stay at \$700-a-night hotel rooms |
| 21 | for an approval. That would be handled by my EA. | 21 | to discuss JEA business? |
| 22 | Q Ask for an approval from who? | 22 | A That's where the team decided to stay. |
| 23 | A From the Chair. | 23 | Q And you expensed these 700-a-night hotel rooms |
| 24 | Q Do you know if the Chair approved this trip? | 24 | and JEA paid for them; right? |
| 25 | A So the Chair would only have to approve it if | 25 | A For Melissa, Ryan, and Julio. |

Q Two nights each; right?
A Correct.
Q Do you think that's good stewardship of JEA's money?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A In my experience as an executive, team building with your icam is normal course. I can certainly appreciate different people's perspectives, but ...

Q You said that that's where the team decided to stay.

A Uh-huh.
Q So everyone took a vote and decided, or -- is that what happened?

A I don't know if we did ballots.
Q Wasn't it your ultimate decision on where you would stay, as the CEO?

A My ultimate decision? Certainly I-my managerial style with my team was one of -- I didn't give directives. I think we researched a number of places to stay and, you know, wanted to get out of town over, you know, a few nights together so that we could spend time together, so the spouses could spend time
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together.
Q Well --
A Because we were working 100 -hour workweeks.
Q You understand that JEA is a public municipal
business --
A Yes.
Q .- right? And as CEO, you were in charge; right?
A Correct.
Q And you were in charge of every dollar of JEA's money ultimately, weren't you?

A Which is why I cut substantial costs.
By the way, you know, large public power, if you - I mean, if you go look at the other 25 large public power, they - there's an LPPC, which is a large public power conference group. They travel around to Ritz Carltons, Montauk, Asheville.

1 actually went to the first one and decided that it was not a good use of funds and so actually stopped going to the CEO summits because I was trying to be a good steward of public dollars.

So to use this as a - an item in isolation, you know - I also cut $\$ 180,000$ a year from -- of -well, actually, more than 180,000 . Over $\$ 180,000$ of excess, call it memberships in organizations where JEA
derived no value. So, you know, we also cut almost $\$ 30$ million in interest expense, which was $\$ 100$ million for the taxpayers.

So, you know, when I look at being a good steward, yes, I think I've been a very good steward of JEA's money.

Q Well, regardless -a and in Exhibit 4 -- you were the CEO, and you could have decided to have this team building in Jacksonville rather than Charleston; correct?

A Yes.
Q And as the CEO, you could have decided that you could go to Charleston and stay at a $\$ 150-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{night}$ hotel rather than a $\$ 700$-a-night hotel; correct?

A The whole team could have decided that, yes.
Q And you could have overridden the tearn as the CEO; right?

A You know, again, my management style isn't to sit and be a dictator. li's to build consensus and be a team.

Q So are you telling me that if your senior leadership team told you that they wanted to go have a week retreat at a Ritz Carlon that that's what would happen and you, as CEO, wouldn't stop it?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
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question.
You can answer.
A That's an interesting hypothetical. I think I
would have a pretty strong debate with them about
whether or not that - you know, we needed to have a
week retreat at a Ritz Carlon. But I always respected
their opinions.
Q And so at the end of the day, under that
hypothetical, if the team still said no, we'd like to do
this, you would go along with it?
A I am the CEO, so I have the ability to make
that decision.
Q Are travel expenses accounted for differently
at JEA than other types of business expenses?
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
A I don't know how travel expenses are accounted
for.
Q You don't know whether travel expenses are
kept and maintained separately?
A I do not.
My -- what I would do is submit receipts to my
EAs, and my EAs would then submit receipts to -- I don't
even know how the expenses get processed.
Q Let's talk about the scenarios, Scenario I, 2 ,
question.
You can answer.
A That's an interesting hypothetical. I think I would have a pretty strong debate with them about whether or not that - you know, we needed to have a week retreat at a Ritz Carton. But I always respected their opinions.

Q And so at the end of the day, under that hypothetical, if the team still said no, we'd like to do this, you would go along with it?
A I am the CEO, so I have the ability to make decision.

Are travel expenses accounted for differently

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
A I don't know how travel expenses are accounted for.
Q You don't know whether travel expenses are kept and maintained separately?

A Idonot.
My -- what I would do is submit receipts to my
EAs, and my EAs would then submit receipts to --I don't even know how the expenses get processed.

Q Let's talk about the scenarios, Scenario 1, 2,
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | and 3. You know what I'm referring to? | 1 | strategic planning, I guess it started -- you know, I'm |
| 2 | A Yes, sir. | 2 | going to revise the question. The actual strategic |
| 3 | Q We're going to get into those in detail, but | 3 | planning started in May or June of 2018 - |
| 4 | tell me in general, when did you first start - I | 4 | Q Okay. I'm just asking you to focus really on |
| 5 | guess - and Scenarios 1, 2, and 3 are what you consider | 5 | the scenarios. When did the different scenarios and |
| 6 | to be part of the strategic planning; is that right? | 6 | options come to light and work started on those? |
| 7 | A Yeah. And 3 has 3(A) to 3(F), right. Yeah, | 7 | A I would imagine, you know, as with all |
| 8 | and 2 has $2(A)$ and $2(B)$, correct. | 8 | scenarios, that you get framed up, right? So you just |
| 9 | Q But that's all part of the strategic planning? | 9 | don't come in one day and go, here's this, but -- |
| 10 | A Process. | 10 | Q All right. |
| 11 | Q Okay. When did you first start working on | 11 | (Exhibit Number 5 was marked for |
| 12 | that strategic planning and come up with those | 12 | identification.) |
| 13 | scenarios? | 13 | BY MR. GRANAT: |
| 14 | A So I believe the RFP for McKinsey was issued | 14 | Q Let me give you Exhibit 5. Exhibit 5 is the |
| 15 | in December. | 15 | minutes from the May 2019 board meeting -- |
| 16 | Q Or'18? | 16 | A Okay. |
| 17 | A Of ${ }^{\prime} 18$. | 17 | Q -- is that correct? |
| 18 | We gave a presentation -- I believe McKinscy | 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | came in in January and gave a presentation to the board. | 19 | Q And if you look on the second page under |
| 20 | If you have a board package from the January board | 20 | Agenda Item IV, it says, Strategy? |
| 21 | meeting. That's one. | 21 | A Uh-huh. |
| 22 | We did certainly in the transition when I | 22 | Q And JEA's last ten yeats and the status quo |
| 23 | became - and now that I can go back further. | 23 | baseline were presented? |
| 24 | In the interim -- as the interim CEO, one of | 24 | A Yep. |
| 25 | the things that I did was put together a transition plan | 25 | Q And then in bold at the botom it says, "Board |
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| 1 | that was reviewed with the board at every meeting from | 1 | Chair Green requested a motion that management come back |
| 2 | May through -- well, October. And it talked about, you | 2 | with strategic plans and options." |
| 3 | know, migrating to different -- taking care of the | 3 | A Uh-huh. |
| 4 | balance sheet, taking care of expenses, hiring a | 4 | Q Right? |
| 5 | permanent CEO, agreeing on the different ways we measure | 5 | Is that, 10 your knowledge, the first |
| 6 | value, which was done in August of '18. | 6 | direction from the board that you got to begin working |
| 7 | And then we got to really doing full-blown | 7 | on strategic plans and options and bringing them |
| 8 | strategic planning starting in January. | 8 | something? |
| 9 | Q Of'19? | 9 | A That's the first time they asked us to bring |
| 10 | A Yeah. | 10 | them something for consideration. |
| 11 | Now, we did -- and I did have off-sites with | 11 | Q Okay. |
| 12 | senior leadership where we would talk about the | 12 | A The -- you know, as a management team, it |
| 13 | struggles of JEA. A lot of that would be -- we tulked | 13 | would be wholly appropriate for us to be able to |
| 14 | about morale. We talked about constraints. | 14 | whiteboard and say, what does the world look like? If |
| 15 | You know, one of the things that pushed the | 15 | you recall, and still to this day, many people didn't |
| 16 | senior leadership team on while I was the interim was, | 16 | even have a thorough understanding of what the last ten |
| 17 | hey, what are the things you'd like to do that you can't | 17 | years of JEA looked like. |
| 18 | do? And so there was a whole lot of just getting a | 18 | And so one of the things we were trying to do |
| 19 | groundwork of how do you measure value, what does | 19 | is to be very transparent and kind of puil the curtain |
| 20 | success look like, what have been the challenges in the | 20 | back so that you could you say, well, here's what Vogtie |
| 21 | past. | 21 | is, here's what employee morale is -- that's why we did |
| 22 | There's a strategic planning document from | 22 | the OHI in February - here's what the last ten years of |
| 23 | 2013 that had a whole bunch of new revenue businesses | 23 | financial performance looked fixe, here's -- so, you |
| 24 | that never had been implemented. There was the vision | 24 | know, there would be a myriad - I think it would be |
| 25 | and the mission. And so if you want to think about | 25 | normal course for a management team to be thinking about |

all the different permutations of a business in order to try and solve business issues.

Q Prior to this May 2019 direction from the board to come back with strategic plans, did you have authority to conduct any activities tied to privatization of JEA?

A There was a May 2018 that said, you know, don's conduct activitics, but -- define activities. We didn't engage any consultants. We - in ternss of privatization. We didn't engage any banks, We didn't engage law firms.

We didn't - now, it is perfectly reasonable for a management team to be talking about a whole bunch of other - you know, what are the options. And privatization was not a new concept, as -- you know, because it was actually heated when -- it was a heated debate when I became the CEO, actually.

Q Surc. Let me show you that May '18 -- May 2018 board --

A Sure.
Q -- minutes package.
(Exhibit Number 6 was marked for
identification.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q And so Exhibit 6 is the board minutes from
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May of 2018. And on Page 5 of Exhibit 6, top part of the page, it says, "Board members held discussions regarding privatization. On motion by Vice Chair Cumber and second by Secretary Newbill, the board unanimously approved, absent a future board decision, any activities tied to privatization efforts would be put on hold."

A And they were.
Q And you were aware of that; correct?
A And we complied. And the reason I know we complied is because when the board Chair passed this motion in May was we - when we, as a management team, in earnest started looking at all the different other real options.

Now, we talked about a lot of things, you know, but we didn't actually go pursue privatization.

Q And so in May of 2018, did you understand what the board meant when they said any activities tied to privatization efforts would be put on hold?

A My understanding would be - and the reason ! know - I'm very cognizant of this issue is because I was sware of this issue, consulted with OGC, Lynne Rhode and Herschel Vinyard. And the advice I received from as a CEO was, look, talking about things and kind of doing hypotheticals, that's not an activity. Actually pursuing in eamest and engaging and - you know, that's
an activily,
Q Okay. And so -
A And so we literally, because of this motion and then April Green further clarified the motion in the June board meeting -- and actually, I spoke with her numerous times about this - this was really the time where we, as a management team, said, okay, we now have flexibility to go look at any and all options.

Q And when saw "now", are you referring to May 28th of 2019?

A Correct.
Q Okay.
A In terms of really earnestily developing the plans.

Q So -
A So after this we developed the ITN. We
developed - you know, we went through all of those things.

Q 1 just want to understand what you're saying,
then. You understand that on May 15, 2018, the
direction was take no activities regarding privatization?

A And as I got counsel from OGC as well as from -

Q Counsel from OGC meaning Lynne Rhode?

A Yes. And then from - and also from Herschel Vinyard, who was my CAO.

We specifically were aware of this, and while as a management - and the advice I received was that, hey, look, you can talk about things, you can - you know, you can think about kind of what are all the options in the future, and - but there was a line that we didn't want to go past until the board approved it.

Q And then so your understanding is on May 28, 2019, that's when the board gave you the authority to then take action and really pursue or seek what's out there regarding privatization?

A in terms of truly pursuing it, yes.
MR. GRANAT: Let's go ahead and take a short break.
(Recess taken from 11:07 a.m. to 11:21 a.m.)
THE WITNESS: One of your earlier questions
was kind of around the appropriateness of senior leadership and all the employment agreement stuff,
And the reason -- one of the main reasons why I
thought OGC had completed its thorough review is because of this July 22nd document that was -because I refused to go forward with any of the things in the July meeting until Jason Gabriel, Lawsikia, and Lymne had signed off on it.

Now, to me, this -- what I read this was as OGC saying that it was appropriate and that it had done its review all the way to the top.

I just wanted to -- I was thinking about that, because that was a really critical point where I know that, from my understanding, OGC was doing a lot of work with JEA and special counsel in the periods of June and July, and I wanted to make sure that that was memorialized before we ever moved forward.

And I just wanted to help you - in my frame of mind in terms of why I thought, you know, some additional checks and measures on kind of why I didn't question the appropriateness, because I felt as a broader consolidated government, we had reviewed a lot of that.

MR. MULLEN: Sean, would you mind if we had this July 22, 2019, memo marked as an exhibit?

MR. GRANAT: If you'll just hold on. Give me one minute on that, please.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Okay. Yeah, Mr. Zahn, I was definitely going to get to that memo, so --

A Yeah.
Q -- we just take things a little out of order.
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1
2
3

|  | Page 65 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Now, to me, this -- what I read this was as | 1 |
| 2 | OGC saying that it was appropriate and that it had | 2 |
| 3 | done its review all the way to the top. | 3 |
| 4 | 1 just wanted to -- I was thinking about that, | 4 |
| 5 | because that was a really critical point where I | 5 |
| 6 | know that, from my understanding, OGC was doing a | 6 |
| 7 | lot of work with JEA and special counsed in the | 7 |
| 8 | periods of June and July, and I wanted to make sure | 8 |
| 9 | that that was memorialized before we ever moved | 9 |
| 10 | forward. | 10 |
| 11 | And I just wanted to help you - in my frame | 11 |
| 12 | of mind in terms of why I thought, you know, some | 12 |
| 13 | additional checks and measures on kind of why I | 13 |
| 14 | didn't question the appropriateness, because I felt | 14 |
| 15 | as a broader consolidated government, we had | 15 |
| 16 | reviewed a lot of that. | 16 |
| 17 | MR. MULLEN: Sean, would you mind if we had | 17 |
| 18 | this July 22, 2019, memo marked as an exhibit? | 18 |
| 19 | MR. GRANAT: If you'll just hold on. Give me | 19 |
| 20 | one minute on that, please. | 20 |
| 21 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 21 |
| 22 | Q Okay. Yeah, Mr. Zahn, I was definitely going | 22 |
| 23 | to get to that memo, so -- | 23 |
| 24 | A Yeah. | 24 |
| 25 | Q - we just take things a little out of order. | 25 |

BY MR. GRANAT:
Q And if you look at Bates stamp JEA 344.
MR. MULLEN: What's the tab number, please?
MR. GRANAT: Tab 5, but they're all just
sequentially Bates stamped.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Okay. So is the document in Exhibit 7, JEA 344, is this the July 22nd memo that you were talking about?

A This is -- yeah. So I talked to Jason Gabriel and said, look, you know, there's a lot of, you know -there's a lot of legal documents that I want to make sure OGC had reviewed.

And then Herschel, I believe, and Lynne Rhode, to my understanding, were working with all of OGC to make sure that, you know, the retention - all the different things that were -- the legal documents were thoroughly reviewed.

I know, you know, since then they pointed to the, you know -- the footnotes, right, of relying on special counsel, but that doesn't seem abnormal.

Q So you were aware of this July 22 nd memo and the contents of it?

A Yes.

A I apologize. It dawned on me that MR. GRANAT: No, that's fine. Thank you. Are we up to 6 ?
MR. POWELL: Number 7.
(Exhibit Number 7 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q What l'm going to do is mark as Exhibit 7a
binder that is actually the documents from Councilmen Rory Diamond and Ron Salem's --

A Okay.
Q - meeting of - is it December 16 th?
Although it says a different date on the front. And 1
have a copy for you and your counsel that we'll mark.
MR. MULLEN: Thank you. I'll --
MR. GRANAT: And -
MR. MULLEN: This is the officially marked exhibit.

MR. GRANAT: Yeah. One of those is for you and one is for the record.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. GRANAT: And -- yeah, okay.
So these are all Bates stamped as presented at the meeting.

MR. MULLEN: Understood. Thank you.

Page 68
Q On July 23rd at that big board meeting; right?
A My understanding is that's the reason why
Lynne Rhode was able to represent to the board that OGC had reviewed everything.

Q Well, isn't it the that you actually sent Lynne Rhode and Herschel to talk to Jason Gabriel and sort this out before the July $23 \mathrm{rd}, 2019$, meeting?

A 1 absolutely --
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A I absolutely wanted to make sure OGC was fully signed off on everything we were doing.

Q Okay. So I want to just point you to and read of some of this memo, JEA 344. And I'm reading from the third paragraph, second sentence. It says, "The Office of General Counsel, in consultation with outside counsel" -- Footnote 2 - "has reviewed the proposed resolutions associated with each option, Resolutions 19-06 through 19-10, and we believe the board is authorized under its charter provisions, subject to applicable laws, to proceed with implementing through formal action one of the options as presented."

A And it references Resolutions 2019-06 to 2019-10.

Q Okay. Right.
And then let's look at Footnote 2. It says,
"Office of General Counsel engaged and relied on various
outside specialized counsel to assist JEA in the preparation of the resolutions and underiying documents required for each option presented by SLT. Accordingly, the scope of this memorandum does not address the legality of the underiying documents drafted to implement such resolutions, as such legality has been confirmed and will continue to be developed and approved by special counsel to JEA appointed and supervised by the Office of General Counsel pursuant to the course of action approved by the JEA board."

Right?
A Yeah. I would imagine that it - OGC does rely on special counsel a lot.

Q And so --
A Tax counsel, bond counsel.
Q - what Jason Gabriel was saying is the board's authorized to proceed subject to legal review and that OGC was stiij going to review these things for legality; isn't that right?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A That's not how I read -- that's not how I read
it. 1 read it - you know, I would imagine, as with any legal opinion, you always have to say, you know, subject to all applicable laws. I don't see how that's abnormal.

And 1 did not talk to Jason Gabriel about this specific memo. It was provided to me. 1 mean, it seems rational to say everything has to be subject to all Jaws and ethics codes and ordinances --

Q Right.
A -1 would imagine.
Q And you were never told, were you, that OGC
specifically had reviewed those resolutions for Jegality?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A I would - the way I read this memo is that OGC has reviewed them, and I don't know why OGC would review anylbing other than for legality. It's general counsel's office.

So, you know, I wouldn't expect them to review it for brokerage issues or, you know - I would expect them to review it for legal issues.

Q So even though in Footnote 2 it soys, "The scope of this memorandum does not address the legality of the underlying documents drafied to implement such
resolutions"?
A So this document references a lot of resolutions, 06 -2019-06 to 20-10. And if you'll recall, there's a lot of work that we did in good business judgment after even these resolutions passed to ensure that all the - you know, all of the materials incorporated were reviewed by special counsel. We asked for, you know, a whole bunch of -0 a slew of opinions.

So, I mean, to me this is a -- this is a -says, hey, I've reviewed it. We think that they're appropriate. We think we've done our initial review, but we have further diligence and review to complete in order to finalize and implement. And that's normal business.

Q And actually, let me back up, Mr. Zahn, because you brought up this memo in reference to my question to you of whether you thought the senior leadership employment agreements were appropriate.

A Well, because one of the resolutions in here actually is the employment agreements, and that - so it just downed on me when you -- and I'm not, you know, trying to parse words. I just wanted to say, hey, look, you know - I always tried to be very inclusive of consultants and OGC and board members and - to make sure that they reviewed these things and -Page 72
Q Wouldn't you agree that OGC's job is to make sure that what the consolidated government is doing is within the bounds of the law?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A And provide broad ranges of legal services and policy advice, which often happened.

Q OGC doesn't set policy?
A They don't, but they do provide a lot of policy advice, you know, what's $\#$ you know, what's appropriate, what - you know.

Q You, as the CEO, were the ultimate policy setter.

A No, the board is. MR. MULLEN: Object to form.
Q The board is.
A The board is ultimate -
Q You, as CEO, ultimately provide a suggestion for the board to approve; isn't that right?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A Or 1 implement what they tell me to do.
Q You, as CEO of JEA, are the one who made the
policy decision to produce these SLT contracts to the board for passage?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A In consultation with individual board menbers around needing to protect the senior leadership team. It wasn't an -- it wasn't as though I made the policy decision unilaterally without consulting with, you know, board members.

Q But as the CEO of JEA, you were in agreement that those SLT contracts should be passed? That was your position?

A 1 agreed with the board's position as well.
Q As well as -
A Yeah.
MR. GRANAT: All right. Thank you. Here's the - John, here's the Garrity Rights form -

MR. MULLEN: Thank you,
MR. GRANAT: - that Mr. Zahn can sign. BY MR GRANAT

Q Okay. So before we took a break, we were discussing that in May of ' 18 , the board directed that no action tied to privatization be taken, and then basically in May of 2019 that restriction was lifted;
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correct?
A That's the advice that I received from OGC as well as my chief administrative officer, correct.

Q Now, between May of 2018 and May of 2019, you told me that you had internal discussions about privatization with your team; right?

A No, we did not have intemal discussions about privatization. We had intermal discussions about growth strategies, expense initiatives, CapEx reductions, the integrated resource planning for the water that integrated water resource planning.

We talked about the constraints of - you know, when you're talking - when we're talking about those types of things, you start to talk about the restraints of capital and access to capital.

One of the main reasons why new revenue lines had not been pursued was they kept finding that they could not compete as a goverument entity in solar. So we talked about unionized labor and the restrictions of that.

You know, the concept of privatization well predated me, so to think that it - that no conversation ever came up and said, well, you know -- one way to solve these constraints would do that, but, you know, that's like the difference between planning -- talking
about Id like to go to Alaska on a trip and actually sitting down and planning it and buying the tickets and doing all that kind of stuff.

Q So my question is, between May of 2018 and May of 2019, were there internal discussions regarding privatization?

A Internal discussions. There were discussions that a nongovemment entity did not have the constraints that a government entity had. But we -- from - we made sure to comply with the May 2018's directive.

Q Okay.
A And - and we made sure to -- and I did that by consulting with who I thought were my appropriate advisers on making sure we complied with that directive.

Q So between May 2018 and May 2019, did JEA expend any funds, research - on any research regarding privatization?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A If you have a document, you know --
Q I don't. I'masking you.
A I don't - to my knowledge, JEA did not expend funds - well, we engaged the banks after the July board meeting. We engaged special counsel after the June
board meeting where the motion was passed to allow for us to actually explore all scenarios. We did not talk to McKinsey about the concepts of privatization until after those motions passed as well.
Q And when?
A I believe in May.
Now, again, the difference between privatization and thinking about where do you get the capital to grow businesses and how do you think about funding distributed energy resource business, how do you think about funding, you know, purified water facilities, and what are the constraints given the current balance sheet that we have -- yeah, we absolutely would talk about where does capital come from and how do you - you know, do you get it out of expense cutting, do you get it out of borrowing more money? You know - yeah. That would be nommal course of business.

Q Let's talk about the scenarios ..
A Sure.
Q - the strategic scenarios.
What was Scenario 1? Was that status quo?
A Yes. So Scenario I was -- and this was really interesting, actually. Before me, JEA had not created consolidated and consolidating financial statements or management forecasts. They created IRP forecasts for
engineering planning and PSC. And so one of the things that we started doing in strategic planning was -- and what took us from January to, really, May was integrating the trends of the industry around solar, storage, energy efficiency, water efficiency, and doing a real management revenue forecast, and then obviously ii's casy to then extrapolate our current expense structure, especially because we have long-term employment -- you know, collective bargaining.

And so the status quo effectively was looking out ten years and solving for a cash flow of zero by raising rates and - but not cutting service quality, not doing expense cutting, not cutting the CapEx budget, not -- and that was effectively intended to establish a baseline upon which then you could measure the performance of everything else. You could do better or worse financially or even operationally in customer service perspective.

Q So that was an option, Scenario I, status quo?
A It's absolutely an option, yeah.
Q Okay. So Number 2 was the traditional utility response; is that right?

A Correct. And that - that's effectively the strategy that was implemented by JEA over the last ten years.

Q And so the policies that Melissa Dykes and Ryan Wannemacher are explaining are your policies; correct?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A No. They are - they were actually - the scenarios that were being developed were developed with probably 100 JEA employees giving input; senior leadership developing all the cost-cutting initiatives for their specific area's interests; McKinsey providing backup data around the trends in energy efficiency, solar, storage, water efficiency, and providing all of that data.

The financial forecasts actually were not developed by me. They were developed by ieams of -- you had rate - you had our financial planning and rate group. We had a number of - it was a highly collaborative build of both the status quo and the raditional response.

Now, in the traditional response, one of the things that was -- that we did talk about as a team was that we were -- we would not be able to implement those things that as a government we legally could not implement.

Q So just, if you can in just a few sentences, summarize what the traditional utility response is.

A Accelerate debt as fast as possible in the face of declining sales, decrease expenses while maintaining a reasonable service quality for your customer, and deferring CapEx and, you know -- and trying to find the most efficient way to run the business to generate the cash necessary to pay all off all the long-term liabilities of the business.

Q And what did you explain to the board would be the traditional utility response by JEA if that was selected?

A Do you have the board package? So I didn't explain. I believe Melissa and Ryan actually made that presentation.

Q Well, let me just -- that's a good point.
You may not have personally explained it, but -- and we're talking about now the July 23 rd board meeting; is that right?

A No. I think the traditional response was actually in June.

Q Okay. You were certainly there?
A Oh, absolutely, yeah.
Q And you're the CEO?
A Absolutely.

And so what I - what we did explain to the board was that the traditional response over the next ten years between 2020 and 2030 was very similar to the last ten years, because in the last ten years JEA had cut 20 percent of its workforce, 407 jobs. It had decommissioned a major asset to save 400 million, SIRPP.

It had done a number of cost-cutting initiatives and efficiency measures around procurement and supply chain, and that was all effectively to generate - and also under Paul they deferred over a billion dollars of CapEx in terns of reinvesting in the system in order to pay off the debt, because in ' 07 or ${ }^{1} 08$ debt was -- debt to capital was 115 percent debt to assets.

And so you had this very poorly managed balance sheet when Paul took over, and they took over doing all of those -- what I just articulated as expense -- you know, efficiency measures. And so the traditional response for going forward was effectively continuing a very similar strategic approach in the next ten years.
Q Okay. As the CEO, you had a senior leadership team; correct?

A Yes.
Q And at these board meetings where these
scenarios were presented, you presented some information and your senior leadership team members presented other information to the board; correct?

A Yes.
Q But as the CEO, do you take responsibility for all of the information that was presented to the board?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the fomm of the question.

You can answer.
A I certainly take responsibility as the CEO, if that's what you're asking. DoI --

Q Ithought you were to suggest that Melissa told the board something -

A That's not what I said.
Q - and Ryan told the board something, and it wasn't you.

I just want to see whether you, as the CEO, take the position that the information provided by the senior leadership team to the board is known by you and approved by you and accepted by you?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A So yes, it is known by me and approved by me, but not before it being known by a number of teams. So the typical board package approval process, which we've
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asked for, because I know it exists, has an approval process that starts at director level --

And by the way, the ADRs, our disclosures, work very similarly. They start with managers and directors developing the draft information. Then they go to review of the - from the director to the senior leadership, and then they go from the senior leadership to the president CO, CFO CAO, and chief legal officer, and then they go to me.

So yes, at the end of the day, 1 absolutely approve $i t$, but not before getting sign-off and buy-in from the entire organization.

Q So --
A Not -- it's not myopically just me.
Q But the buck stops with you as CEO; right?
A I think l've said that publicly.
Q Okay. Now, the traditional utility response, okay, you've told me about that. Let me just ask you what I want to get at.

When you explained the traditional utility response to JEA, is this the scenario that would include a large number of layoffs and rate increases?

A So it was a large number of layoffs. It was cutting the CapEx budget. It was continuing to implement operational efficiencies which were cost
measures that had nothing to do with overhead. And part of the overhead layoff was my recommendation to the board that they don't need a senior leadership team as robust as you have if you're not going to be pursuing growth and other, you know, objectives, so -- including myself, which we covered earlier.

Q So what's the nontraditional utility response? Is that Scemario 3?

A Yes, that's how we labeled it.
Q Now, I know that there was a Scenario 4 and 5, but I think that over time, Scenario 3 was the name of everything else of the nontraditional response.

Do you agree with that?
A So there was also -- and I want to take you -so between June and July -- so June was when we presented the initial traditional response, and that was the first kind of public discussion about how would you manage the business in the face of market trends.

Alan Howard asked for variances on that, which we presented in the beginning of July. Because obviously every scenario - every forecast, you would look at different variances. So we ran variance analysis between June and July.

And then the board also asked for an implementation plan of the traditional response between Page 84
June and July. That was part of -- do you have the motion?

One of the motions from the June board meeting specifically instructed management to develop an implementation plan for overhead reductions, expense cutting, all that stuff, which we did.

Q Yeah.
A And then Scenario 3, you're right, in July had $3(A)$ to $(F)$, and what ended up happening is we carved out 3 (A), which was the co-op, as an Option 4, and we carved out $3(B)$ as an Option 5 , because that was the 1PO. And then the balance, $3(\mathrm{C}$ ) to ( F ), remained Option 5.

Q ITN?
A It remained -- anything that was - yeah. It effectively then got embodied into the ITN document.

Q So is the nontraditional response -- well, I need you to tell me, if you can, a summary in a few sentences. What is the nontraditional response?

A The nontraditional response is a change in the governance structure of JEA such that it would eliminate the legal constraints that the government entity had, which was what we presented in - which was the analysis that OGC and the ieam had conducted between May and June identifying statute of timitations and charter

|  | Page 85 |  | Page 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | limitations and constitutional limitations. | 1 | and Facebook -- you have to actually go ask them. |
| 2 | And by the way, before I get --2 -- Scenario | 2 | And so the ITN was basically a invitation to |
| 3 | 2 , which was the traditional response, we actually had | 3 | everybody and anybody to propose any structure that |
| 4 | 2(A) and 2(B). 2(A) was just, you know, do cost-cutting | 4 | might help solve a nurnber of the business issues that |
| 5 | and defer CapEx and pay off debt. | 5 | had been discussed publicly from - you know, for a year |
| 6 | 2(B) we presented in July as well, which was | 6 | and a half. |
| 7 | take measures of cost-cutting and overhead reduction | 7 | Q And would the ITN, the invitation to |
| 8 | while also pursuing charter changes, constitutional and | 8 | negotiate, involve a sale of some or all of JEA's |
| 9 | statute changes. And so that one got broken into two as | 9 | assets? |
| 10 | well | 10 | A Not necessarily, no. Actually, the concession |
| 11 | Q So the nontraditional utility response, did | 11 | didn't have a sale. So the ITN did not specifically |
| 12 | that include elements of privatization with the | 12 | dictate a sale of assets. It said, here are our issues, |
| 13 | different options? | 13 | here are the minimum requirements - |
| 14 | A Yes. | 14 | Q And how many bids were there? |
| 15 | Q And tell me briefly -- and I don't need you to | 15 | A 16. |
| 16 | go into detail about what everything is. But please | 16 | Q 16? |
| 17 | tell me briefly what were the various privatization | 17 | A 17. One came in late. |
| 18 | options that were considered in the nontraditional | 18 | Q And one was a concession? |
| 19 | utility response. | 19 | A Yes. I think - well, I don't know -- l'd |
| 20 | A A co-op or a community ownership where you | 20 | have to - I don't know if the -- one of the remaining 9 |
| 21 | transferred ownership to the customers directly. An | 21 | that did reply was a concession. |
| 22 | IPO, where you would do a float of the equity in a | 22 | Q Were the rest of them other than that one |
| 23 | publicly traded market. And the one structure of IPO | 23 | offers regarding the sale of some or all of JEA's |
| 24 | that we contemplated was giving priority to customers as | 24 | assets? |
| 25 | well as having a portion of it relained by the City. | 25 | A Yes. |
|  | Page 86 |  | Page 88 |
| 1 | And then the balance of it would be a | 1 | We found it interesting that public power |
| 2 | strategic partnership -- you know, strategic | 2 | didn't bid. We thought they would have been an |
| 3 | relationship. So whether that's infra-funds or private | 3 | interesting -- you know, a large public power entity to |
| 4 | equity or call it, you know, the traditional utilities, | 4 | create a co-op or something like that together. |
| 5 | the IOU models that already exist. | 5 | MR. GRANAT: So then I think you were asking |
| 6 | And then the last was a concession, which | 6 | for this a minute ago. |
| 7 | would be a public-private partnership, which actually we | 7 | Are we up to 8,1 believe? |
| 8 | got a bid on. | 8 | (Exhibit Number 8 was marked for |
| 9 | Q So what's an ITN? And how does that fit into | 9 | identification.) |
| 10 | the nontraditional utility response? | 10 | BY MR. GRANAT: |
| 11 | A So the invitation to negotiate, as I | 11 | Q Exhibit 8 is the June 2019 board meeting, and |
| 12 | understand it, is a procurement method under the | 12 | it's -- and in this meeting, if you look on Page 2, |
| 13 | statutes of Florida -- and I don't know the number - | 13 | there's a bold note at the bottom. It says, "April |
| 14 | that -- we, as a management team, with our bankers and | 14 | Green noted at May board meeting SLT presented what was |
| 15 | attomeys and OGC, we were able to analyze a co-op. We | 15 | considered status quo, which is what JEA would look like |
| 16 | could analyze that ourselves, because it doesn't involve | 16 | if business continued as it is. The board challenged |
| 17 | third parties. | 17 | SLT to come up with different scenarios of how to |
| 18 | Our bankers and our capital markets divisions | 18 | respond to evidently changing trends in the industry." |
| 19 | of banks can provide analytics and analysis around how | 19 | Correct? |
| 20 | would you float and how would retail buyers buy public | 20 | And then in the June -- the June board meeting |
| 21 | shares in an IPO. | 21 | minutes reflect that then Scenario 2 was presented to |
| 22 | If you look at whether the -- in order to | 22 | the board - |
| 23 | understand what a strategic partnership with a private | 23 | A Correct. |
| 24 | equity fund, an infra-fund, an IOU utility -- we even | 24 | Q - is that right? |
| 25 | talked about technology companies like Apple and Google | 25 | A Yeah. |
|  |  |  | 22 (Pages 85 to 88) |

Q All right.
A And then subsequently $2(\mathrm{~A})$ and $2(\mathrm{~B})$ were presented in July.

Q Okay. And then if you look on Page 3 of the June board meeting, and it's under Compensation Committee, it says, "Committee Chair Johnson presented the committee report and highlighted the committee's been working with Towers Watson to put together a formal competition framework that aligns with the strategic plan."

And then on Page 4 there was a motion to approve the development of a framework and authorized staff to implement the plan and bring back to the board for final approval a compensation plan.

Is that righ?
A Yeah, actually, that was around the long-lem incentive compensation specifically, as - the discussion in that board meeting was that our base compensation - when you look at total comp, you have base, shor-tenn, and long-tem.

And the discussion in that board meeting and in prior compensation committee meetings was that base was already relatively at market. Shor-term, we didn't -- there wasn't a real need to touch, and that from a long-term perspective - and you got to remember
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where the long-term incentive came from.
When I came to JEA, I went and interviewed almost all 2,000 employees, and $I, 990$ of them didn't even know how much profit the company made. And, you know, we made $\$ 750$ million in EBITDA. Actually, many of them didn't even know what EBITDA was.

So what we were trying to do was help
employee -a all 2,000 employees understand the financial -- the impact of their work on financial results going forward.

Q Okay. I'm going to play you a clip from the June 2019 meeting, and it's going to be Camille Johnson discussing the committee report. I have several clips from different meetings that l'm going to play today. and I'm going to attach them to the transcript; however, I don't have ctips yet. I can have them made, but I don't have them present in a form that I can attach them today from this June 19th - I'm sorry, June of 2019 board meeting.

But this is - in reference, it's around the 1 hour, 43 minutes, and 30 seconds mark of the June meeting.

So just listen, and I'm just going to ask you some questions about what was said.
(Playing of video.)

MR. MULLEN: Sean, can you put that where both you and Mr. Zahn can see the screen --

MR. GRANAT: There's really nothing to see. If you want to see that (indicates).

MR. MULLEN: You just have the very small version. That's fine.

MR. GRANAT: Yeah, there's nothing really to
see.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q And just to put it in reference, I think this - - this part of the meeting happened right after the discussion of Scenario 2 and the massive number of layofis that were contemplated.
(Audio played.)
A SPEAKER: "All right. We have compensation committee report (unintelligible).

A SPEAKER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Coming off of what we just discussed, but in
the last several months, we, as a committee, have been working with Towers Watson to put together a formal compensation frumework. Just as a reference, we want to make sure that the overall the overall framework aligns with our compensation philosophy, core values, guiding principles, a lot of things that we've talked about over the last
several months, and putting in place the formal compensation policy primarily focusing on short-term and long-term incentives and making sure that aligns with creating JEA's financial value.

So we did go through all the specifics there,
certainly, again, in contrast to what we just spoke about in Status Quo 2, but really making sure that we really have a go-forward approach in creating a framework for our team members and all 2,000 employecs.

In light of that, I do - Madam Chair, I would like to entertain a motion. And if I don't do this right, but I - but l'd like to entertain a motion, I hereby motion that the JEA board and board directors in direct engagement develop a market-based compensation program as recommended by the comp committee.

The program should consist of base salary, short-lerm/long-term incentives, use the framework as developed by a third-party consultant, and the program shall align with the total compensation philosophy and policy approved by the board."
(Audio stopped.)
(Exhibit Number 9 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. GRANAT:
Q 1 just want to stop it there and just point
1
2
out, did you hear her say that part of her motion was to
use the framework developed by a third-party consultant?
A Idid.
MR. GRANAT: Okay. We'll continue. (Audio played.)
A SPEAKER: ".- for directors in January of
2019 as further reviewed in March of 2019 as well
as (unintelligible).
A SPEAKER: So, in short, you want us to
approve just the framework?
A SPEAKER: Correct."
(Audio stopped.)
(Exhibit Number 10 was marked for
identification.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q And that's all - that motion passed
unanimously; correct?
It doesn't matter. For these purposes, it
doesn't matter. It did, but -.
A Yes, it says here in the minules, Page 4.
Q So let me ask you, so at this June meeting,
you're given the direction move forward, bring us
something -- bring the board back something that shows
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this long-term incentive plan and your total
compensation plan; is that right?
A So if you go to the presentation for long -
for total compensation, and not the Willis Towers
Watson, but the one that had been reviewed by the board in the January comp committee meeting, the January board meeting, what it did was it looked at -- really, the only thing that needed to change was long-term.

Q Okay.
A And so - and then - is this the June - and then there is a discussion of $-\cdot$ in the comp committee meeting, I believe, about whether you did units that were tied to time or units that were tied to financial value, and obviously her direction was to tie it to financial value.

Q All right. And 1 stopped it and 1 asked you about the third-party consultant. Did you have a third-party consultant?

A Yes. Willis Towers Watson.
Q Okay. And what is Willis Towers Watson?
A They're an industry-icading compensation consulting firm.

Q Did you work with Willis Towers Watson to develop a framework for the long-term incentive plan?

A It was presented, and it's actually right
here.
MR. MULLEN: Why don't you refer to the page number.

THE WITNESS: Page 27 of their report talks about the framework of both the performance unit -Page 28 develops a time-based unit, and then they made a recommendation of how it would be allocated across. So the answer's yes.

## BY MR. GRANAT:

Q Okay. Mr. Zahn, let me just - let me just -tet's just take a little break here and just have a talk.

This is a very imporiant interview for JEA as well as for yourself, and so I'm not - I'm going to give you the opportunity to say whatever you'd like. I'm not going to cut you short. But it's already 12.00 , and I - for example, the question I just asked you, did you work with Willis Towers Watson on a long-term incentive plan, to me is a yes or no question -

A I'm sorry.
Q - and not a reference. And I only say that to suggest that maybe, you know, some of the answers to my questions could be yes or no. If you feel that you need to dive in and explain, I'm certainly not going to cut you off.

【 just want to point out that I think a lot of your answers are going into things that really aren't responsive to my questions.

A I apologize. I was just trying to be -cooperate --

Q I understand that.
A - and give you as much information as possible.

Q 1 just wanted to point that out, because just for the sake of time, that's all I wanted to know is, did you work with Willis Towers Watson to develop a framework for the long-term incentive plan?

A Yes. I and the entire team worked with them.
Q Who were some of the people that you worked with with Willis Towers Watson?

A I actually don't remember their names.
Q Was David one of them? You don't remember?
A I literally don't remember the names. I think
I had - I participated in maybe one or two meetings.
Q And what did you understand that to mean, the direction to use the framework of the third-party consultant for the LTI? What does that mean?

A To take the June - the material provided to the board in June and come back with a formal plan documented - reflecting that formal plan.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q Okay. | 1 | am not here to just implement the traditional |
| 2 | A That was tied to financial value. | 2 | utility response. I belicve it's -- there's a lot |
| 3 | Q Earlier I asked you to just explain the | 3 | of exciting opportunities if we just gain some |
| 4 | different seenarios, and one was status quo. Scenario | 4 | alignment with our entire community." |
| 5 | 2, I know you talked about having to do some | 5 | (Audio stopped.) |
| 6 | cost-cutting, getting rid of debt, and then you had the | 6 | BYMR. GRANAT: |
| 7 | $2(A)$ and $2(B)$, some charter changes. | 7 | Q So you made the comment to the board in |
| 8 | Was there any element of Scenario 2 that | 8 | June of 2019 that you're not there to implement the |
| 9 | involved any type of privatization? | 9 | traditional utility response. Why did you say that? |
| 10 | A No. | 10 | A To "just." So I don't know why I said it, |
| 11 | Q Okay. And so Scenario 3, the nontraditional | 11 | but, you know, we had been talking with all the |
| 12 | utility approach, is the one that contained elements of | 12 | employees about all the exciting opportunities that are |
| 13 | privatization; is that right? | 13 | in front of JEA. And, you know -- was that the June |
| 14 | A Yes. | 14 | board meeting? |
| 15 | Q Okay. I'm going to play another clip from the | 15 | Q Was the June board meeting. |
| 16 | June 2019 board meeting, and again, this is around the 1 | 16 | A Yeah. And so, actually, we came back in July |
| 17 | hour and 43 minute mark of the meeting. | 17 | and said, look, there's some other growth opportunities |
| 18 | (Audio played.) | 18 | as a government entity that if we can do charter changes |
| 19 | A SPEAKER: "That was not fun. | 19 | and things like that, we could do. |
| 20 | A SPEAKER: At all. | 20 | So I was -I think the answer is I was there |
| 21 | A SPEAKER: We tried to end that on a bright | 21 | to try and solve, you know, the major problems of JEA, |
| 22 | note, but --" | 22 | from Vogte to debs limits to, you know, growth |
| 23 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 23 | initiatives. So when I say "just," I mean, there to do |
| 24 | Q And let me just -- I've listened to this | 24 | a whole bunch of things, right? To try and really |
| 25 | several times. This was right after Scenario 2 was | 25 | deliver the best services for the community and be able |
|  | Page 98 |  | Page 100 |
| 1 | presented, and someone, I think Aprit Green, said, "that | 1 | to maintain the financial position of the business. |
| 2 | was not fum." Mr. Howard said "at all." and then I | 2 | Q Okay. And the exciting opportunities you were |
| 3 | believe what you said is, "We tried to end that on a | 3 | talking about were Scenario 3, the privatization? |
| 4 | bright note." So I'tl play that again. | 4 | A No. The exciting opportunities were looking |
| 5 | A What came before that? | 5 | at electrification of on and off road. The exciting |
| 6 | Q Scenario 2. | 6 | opportunities were distributed commercial, industrial, |
| 7 | A No, I know, but that - that comment can't be | 7 | and residential solar. The exciting opportunities were |
| 8 | referencing Scenario 2. What came right before, you | 8 | purified water for altemative water sources for |
| 9 | know -- | 9 | Northeast Florida. The exciting opportunities were |
| 10 | Q "That was not fun"? | 10 | septic tank phase-out, which we had initiated a research |
| 11 | A There had to be something that that comment of | 11 | and development program. |
| 12 | that bright note was referencing. | 12 | I mean, they were business initiatives that |
| 13 | Q Well, I was just stating. That's not what my | 13 | you go off after and do. |
| 14 | question is going to be about anyway. | 14 | Q They're not part of the unditional utility |
| 15 | A Oh, okay. | 15 | response? |
| 16 | Q It's not insignificant, but I'm just setting | 16 | A Again, I said "I'm not here just to do that." |
| 17 | the context of this was after Scenario 2. | 17 | which, you know, 1 guess as 1-thar's really making a |
| 18 | (Audio played.) | 18 | comment about just cutting overhead. You know, |
| 19 | A SPEAKER: "Thank you. | 19 | obviously you have to cut overhead in order to maintain |
| 20 | A SPEAKER: Thank you. | 20 | financial position, but it was a comment about, you |
| 21 | A SPEAKER: Thank you. | 21 | know, there are a lot of interesting opportunities ahead |
| 22 | A SPEAKER: That was not fun. | 22 | of JEA, and we had been discussing with -- at leadership |
| 23 | A SPEAKER: At all. | 23 | meetings every month all of them. |
| 24 | A SPEAKER: We tried to end that on a bright | 24 | Q All right. I'm going to take you back to the |
| 25 | note. But, you know, as l've told the employess, I | 25 | January 154h, 2019, compensation committee meeting. |

A Which one?
Q The January 15th, 2019, compensation committee meeting.

A Yes.
Q Okay. In January of '19. And you can find the materials I'm going to ask you about in Exhibit 7 on Page JEA 498.

MR. MULLEN: It's Tab 32.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q And although the front page is 498 , it's dated January of 2018 on the front page.

A I guess it's a typo.
Q That was an error; right?
A Yeah.
Q Would you agree that this material --it's Pages JEA 498 through 518 - was the material from the January 2019 comp committee meeting?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And is this when you first brought up a long-term incentive plan to the JEA board?

A In the board meeting, but not individually.
Q Sure. Okay. Excuse me.
On Page 509, JEA 509, we have a slide that's
JEA Policy 2.7 that was adopled by the board in 2014; comect?
so be competitive and -- actually, to drive all the behaviors that we were looking at on Page JEA 0500; organization, culture, employee engagement and behavior, retaining and attracting talent, aligning the company to the employee goals, strategy in driving the business.

But one of the main things that we discovered as the interim is that employees were disenfranchised. No one felt aligned to the top. Everyone was just there to kind of do their job and go home. There was no long-term, you know, pursuit of a value. And so the idea was to create an incentive plan - or incentive total comp plan.

Q 1 understand.
The changes that are reflected on Page 512, are these changes that you advocated for and agreed with?

A They are absolutely changes that 1 agreed with individual board members, then put into -- and put in a board package.

Q And one of the things, if we look on Page 509, that was changed, the old policy says, "The CEO will not promote a compensation philosophy that is contradictory to JEA's philosophy of providing a total rewards package that encompasses salary, wages, retirement benefits,

A (No audible response.)
Then if we look --
(Reporter clarification.)
BYMR. GRANAT:
Q Is that correct?
A It is my understanding. I wasn't there in 2014, but yes, we pulled this out of the manual.

Q Well, that's what it says.
A Yeah.
Q Okay. Well, let me rephrase that, then. 509 shows -
A This is a policy from the board from the manual.

Q The board manual as it was January of 2019?
A Correct
Q All right. And then on Page 512, there's some suggested changes?

A Yep.
Q And are these changes you were suggesting with your management team?

A Actually, I worked on this with Alan Howard. I worked on it with -- who was on the board at that time? April. I solicited input on kind of how would you change this total compensation policy to starn to incentivize employees -- number one, be at market 50 th.
incentives, and a health and welfare benefits."
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## Right?

A Where are you?
Q It says, "Accordingly, the CEO will not."
A Yes.
Q And that language is changed in your proposal on 512 -

A Again, collective - or a collaboratively
developed proposal.
Q -- to the, "CEO shall promote compensation philosophy."

Correct?
A Correct.
Q So my question is, why that specific change? How were you constrained by the old policy that required that new change?

A So interestingly, I don't recall which board member, but one of the board members actually said what we ought to have is a policy that tells you what to do, not what not to do.

And so 1 think it was viewed as kind of -
Q That was a board member's idea?
A From my recollection, I remember it - they
were having a conversation that they were trying to make the language more concise and they were trying to make it a "we will do Uhis" and "we will go forward" as
opposed to "we will do this and not do this" and trying to make it a -

Q Well, can you tell the whar, in the changes made on Page 512, allows you to implement a long-term incentive plan that you couldn't have done under the old language of the policy?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
You can answer.
A I'm not sure I have an answer to that question. One of the things that I discussed at length during my interview as the CEO was the need to have total compensation philosophy of the business for all 2,000 employees aligned.

And so the board had this policy, and we worked to create a new policy that reflected the guiding principles and the strategic framework that was approved by the board in 2018, because they approved those four measures of value.

And so we were trying to design -- and this was -- you know, we were trying to design a total comp that basically lined up with the new strategic framework and measures of value and guiding principles of the business. Because at the same board meeting, the guiding principles, which was the vision, mission, and
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all that was approved.
Q Okay. But under the old language on Page 509, would a long-term incentive plan have been prohibited?

A I don't know. It's not specifically called out.

Q It is specifically put into the new -- the new language on Page 512; right?

A Yeah.
Q Okay. On Page - if you look at Page 510, do I read this chart correctly to say that JEA does not have a long-term incentive? The pink boxes there under long-term incentive, there's a zero for JEA --

A Correct.
Q - is that right?
And then underneath that, under 50th percentile, it's 5.5. I'm assuming that's million; is that right?

A Yes.
Q So does that mean that the 50 th percentile has long-term incentives that value $\$ 5.5$ million on average?

A Correct.
Q Per year?
A 1 believe this would be annually, yes.
Q Okay. The 50 th percentile of what? Do you know what the slide is referring to?

A I did not put this slide together.
Q Do we know if that - is it municipal utilities? Is it just in general businesses over around the country?

A I did not put this slide together.
Q So you don't know?
A This would have been put logether by the VP of HR.

Q Okay. So you don't know what --
A Yeah.
Q - the 50th percentile was?
A Because JEA maintains its own internal comps, you know, for all of the employees, or market comps.

Q Out of the 50 th percentile that was referenced here that spent about 5.5 million on average on an LTI plan, do you know who within those companies participates in the LTI?

A Mostly executives.
Q Okay.
A And that came from the Willis Towers Watson report.

Q Do you know out of this 50th percentile that's referenced here whether any of the companies in this 50th percentile had an LTI where all employees participated?
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A I am not a market compensation specialist, but when I reviewed the Willis Towers Watson report, it clearly slowed that front line was not included.

Q And you've stated, I think, throughout all your meetings that your goal was to bring JEA to the 50th percentile in total compensation package; is that fair?

A That was the board's goal, and I shared it.
Q Okay. And so was your goal in creating a long-tem incentive plan to bring JEA to the 50 th percentile of $L T$, about $\$ 5$ and a half million a year?

A At this point in time -- this is January this isn't intended to say what is a target. This is intended to say how do we stack up relative to the market. From here, the board then finalized the total comp philosophy and then directed us to go hire a compensation to actually figure out --

Q Okay.
A -- one -- because that number, if you -- you know, isn't -- yeah, I don't know where it came from. But -

Q Okay.
A - it was an internally generated number, as I understand it , and not one provided by an expert.

Q But was your goal to have a long-term
incentive plan that applied to all JEA employees?
A Always.
Q Not just the executives?
A Correct. My belief is -. and I did that numerous times on other matters, like the retention agreements, the pension issue. Always tried to -- you know, my belief is you need 2,000 people all running in the same direction in order to have --

Q Okay.
A -- true financial success.
Q All right. I'm going to ask you now some questions about some law firms, some outside counsel, and -- first Pillsbury.

Pillsbury did some work on the Vogile situation; is that correct?

A On the Vogle situation?
MR. GRANAT: Has Pillsbury been doing any -THE WITNESS: They did analysis around
regulatory and other kind of structural issues, yeah.

## BYMR. GRANAT:

Q Let me ask you this. Do you know when Pillsbury was first retained by JEA?

A Yeah, we were looking at delegations of authority, if I believe.
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A Correct.
Q And not before?
A Correct.
Q Did Pilisbury work on anything eise regarding Scenario 3 other than the ITN, to your knowledge?
A Law firms were managed by my CAO and the CLO,
so --
Q CAO?
A Herschel Vinyard.
Q Herschel Vinyard and Lynne Rhode?
A Yeah.
Q Okay.
A And presumably - I know Jason Gabriel and Lawsikia Hodges were oflentimes included in those conversations 100 .

Q Okay. So are you not sure whether Pillsbury worked on -

A Not to my knowledge.
Q -an IPO?
A Oh, on the IPO? Yes .-
Q They did?
A -they did. Ycah.
Q When was that? Just general time frame.
A Affer the July board meeting. We started
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fiushing out the IPO and the co-op and -- as well as in parallel running the ITN,

Q Now, do you know if when Pillsbury was engaged for its work on the ITN whether a success fee was discussed?

A Yes.
Q And who had discussions regarding a success fee for Pillsbury?

A Myseif, Jason Gabriel, Lynne Rhode, Herschel Vinyard, Ryan Wannemacher, Melissa Dykes, and then Stephen Amdur, who was negotiating for Pillisbury.

Q Was there ever a written agreement for a success fec?

A There was a draft that was produced and --
Q By who?
A 1 believe Lynne and Steve produced -- you know, produced the draft, and then Lynne provided it to Lawsikia and Jason.

Q What is a success fec?
A So the -- it's a standard market -o when you're looking at deals like this, you're trying to minimize your legal expenses. And so the idea was that Pillsbury, who had a billing rate of $\$ 800$ or more an hour and, you know - which, by the way, every single law firm that was interviewed by OGC - Skadden and

Latham - were similar. They were agreeing to have a retainer of $\$ 250,000$ a month, and then in the event that there was a recapitalization, they would have a success fee that would be a - you know, a larger number.

But in the event that where we are today, where privatization is dead, they would take their bills and discount it by 40 or 50 percent, thereby saving the company money.

Q Was a success fee ultimately entered with Pillsbury?

A No.
Q Why not?
A Because Jason Gabriel and Lawsikia Hodges ended up not wanting to do it.

Q The law firm of Foley also did some work regarding the PUP; is that right - or the LTI?

A Yes. So Kevin Hyde was the specialty counsel that worked with JEA a lot on collective bargaining, the performance units, and they were Florida specialty counsel.

Q And do you know when Foley started its work on the LTI?

A It would have to be after the June board meeting.

Q Okay. And did Foley work on the ITN as well?
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A I believe that's when they actually were engaged, but I don't have the engagement - I think they were engaged -

Q I don't have the engagement letter. Okay.
A I don't think they were even engaged until after the June board meeting.

Q Okay. Morgan Stanley was involved with the ITN, is that correct?

A Correct.
Q When was Morgan Stanley engaged?
A Not until after the July board meeting.
Q And what was their scope of work? What were they supposed to do?

A They're a broker dealer. They, you know, help solicit - run and solicit interest from the market.

Q Were they exclusively working on the ITN portion of Scenario 3?

A No. They also - well, they also did a lot of - their capital markets group is one of the leading IPO capital markets group, and so they did a vast majority of the work on the IPO as well.

Q What about J.P. Morgan, were they involved with the ITN?

A Yes.
Q What work did they do?

A So they did the analysis around the co-op structure as well as they're a broker dealer as well and helped solicit interest in - you know, from around the world.

And what -- when the ITN was issued, Morgan Stanley and J.P. Morgan divided -- actually, it was a list of maybe hundreds of firms -- of entities that they would reach out to to solicit -- to ensure that JEA got the best and most varied responses to the ITN. That's what they did on the ITN.

Q Was Willis Towers Wasson involved with the ITN at all?

A No.
Q They just provided consultation regarding the long-term incentive plan and the comp plan?

A Running total market comp.
Q Okay. So the long-term incentive plan kind of became what was known as the performance unit plan --

A Yeah.
Q -which I'll reference as the PUP?
A Yeah.
Q So we know that Pillsbury and Foley law firms both dedicated some time towards the PUP?

A And OGC.
Q And OGC. Who at OGC worked on the PUP?
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A Youdid.
Q I'm sorry. Tell me how I worked on the PUP.
A Well, there's a - 1 had a letter from
June 17h from you to Lynne Rhode.
Q Sure. I can get you to that.
A At least -1 mean asking - or answering
questions, I think.
Q Okay. Yeah, we'll actually get there.
A Okay.
Q Who else at OGC, to your knowledge, worked on the PUP?

A I only know what I've seen in documents .-
Q Okay.
A -- in terms -- it was Kort -
Q Kon Parde?
A She was on that memo.
Q Okay.
A J know Jason Gabricl worked on it.
Jon, you were in a number of meetings at JEA.
I walked in on the one meeting that you were having with Herschel, Lynne, Lawsikia, Jason, and Jon was in that.

MR. MULLEN: Referring to Jon Phillips?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. PHILLIPS: That was one meeting, and it
was in August, or it might have been October.
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THE WITNESS: l'm just answering the question. My understanding was it was widely worked on. BYMR. GRANAT:

Q Okay.
A But I don't - I can only point you to the, you know, meetings and docurnents I've seen.

Q And who at OGC worked on the PUP before July 23rd, to your knowledge?

A Well, the memo 1 saw from you and Kont was in June, so I would imagine you and Kort. And then I know Jason Gabriel was informed about it and Lawsikia Hodges. And that was because of -- well, my understanding is they all were part of it.
(Discussion off the record.)
(Recess taken from 12:22 p.m. to 1:25 p.m.) BY MR. GRANAT:

Q Before we broke for lunch, we were talking about the PUP and contractors or atlomeys who may have worked on it, and we were discussing OGC.

And I just want to be clear, to your knowiedge, which OGC attomeys worked on the PUP prior 10 July 23rd, 2019?

A To my knowledge, you, Jon Phillips,
Jason Gabriel, Lawsikia Hodges, Lymne Rhode. I don't know of any -
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Q Prior to July 23rd, 2019 -
A Oh, Kort Parde, because -- but I was -- 1 mean, I - the only reason I can - you know, maybe -oh, I'm sorry. Jon Phillips. He clarified that was in August, I guess.

But I know Jason, Lawsikia. Well, and I saw that you guys were answering questions on long-term incentives and performance units, so that would be Kon Parde and you.

Q Are you aware, Mr. Zahn, that -
A Imean --
Q - Jason Gabriel and Lawsikia Hodges had a conversation with Herschel Vinyard and Lynne Rhode in which Jason and Lawsikia told him OGC had not vetted the PUP, we were not approving it, and we were going to look at it in the future before it was officially implemented? Did you know that?

A I did not know that. I do know that once the board approved it that we, as an entire leam and including myself, did not view that as go implement it. We viewed that as continue doing diligence and issue the formal opinion to the Attomey General and go issue the formal opinion request to the State Ethics office and make sure that we were doing everything appropriately. And doing all -- and checking every single legal and
ethical standard to make sure that the plan was in accordance with all codes and standards and --

Q Sure.
A -- laws.
So I knew that we were going to continue doing that, but I didn't -- wasn't aware of that conversation.

Q Were you aware, though, that after
July 23rd, 2019, after all diligence was done, you, as the CEO, were authorized to implement the plan without going back to the board?

A No, I was not.
Q You're not aware of --
A The way I read the plan is the plan
administrators are authorized to implement the plan.
Q All right. Let me rephrase it.
Do you understand that after July 23rd, 2019,
when the board passed the PUP-related resolution, that the PUP could start without going back to the board?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A There are actually specific parameters in the resolution where if things changed, you had to come back to the board. It allowed for - I believe the resolution allowed for, you know, working with OGC, making sure all the -- but I don't think at any time had
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we goten -- the Attomey General came back and said, this needs to change dramatically, or State Ethics came back and said, this needs to change, or OGC, for that matter, who you guys were reviewing or special counsel who was reviewing, if -- if it had gone through all of those checks and balances with all of those teams of, you know, 50 -plus people and remained the same, then the plan administrator had the ability to allocate and administer the plan.

But I don't - we never got there, and it became pretty clear that we were -- you know, through OGC and all the different reviews that -- you know, my guess is we probably would have had to go back to the board.

Q Had the OGC and the Attomey General and all the lawyers told you the plan's legal, the plan could have been implemented without returning to the JEA board; correct?

A If it was legal and ethical, yes.
Q Okay. Who else - what other firms worked on the PUP besides Pillsbury, Foley, and what you --

A And OGC.
Q OGC to the extent that we've already discussed?

A To my knowledge, I'm not aware of others.

Q What about Nixon Peabody? Do you know that firm?

A Yeah. Our bond counsel.
Q Okay. Did they do any work on the PUP?
A I seem to recall Foley or -- at one point in time, it was thought that the performance unit might be some form of debt instrument. And so because they were our bond counsel, I think Ryan and the team would have asked them, you know, hey, do you have any opinion on that? So I imagine they probably would have done some work.

Q To your knowledge, did Nixon Peabody do any work regarding any other kind of long-term incentive plan?

A Not to my knowledge. Not that I recall.
Q So the PUP, the performance unit plan, when was that idea first conceived?

A In the Willis Towers Watson report, they came back with the performance units as one of the main ways to have a long-term incentive plan.

Q Is that something Willis Towers Watson recommended as a solution?

A I don't view - I don't sit there - yeah, they did. They - well, in their report on Page 0328, they had performance units and time-based units.
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And then on 0329, they outlined how
performance units would work over - how performance units would work over a three-year period of time.

Q Okay. So the Willis Towers Watson - did they come up with the idea?

A So performance units aren't a novelty.
They're - you know, they gave us a myriad of options.
The board's directive from January was to find - if you
go to Page - they were trying to find a long-term unit that ties to financial and value and profitability.

Willis Towers Watson made some recommendations of, well, you can do it in all cash. You can do it in debt - and I don't have the more - their first version, but their first version, they gave seven different options, of which the perfomance unit was one, and then started narrowing down, I want to say, May, June, maybe.

Q So how was the actual PUP plan decided as the option that you would go with?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A From my understanding, the board. Because they came back in the June - the quote you -o the quote you played me was Camille Johnson and the board talking about, hey, this was the framework that was provided to
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Q Okay. So at the June compensation mecting, June 2019--

A Yeah.
Q - the compensation committee was who?
Camille Lee-Johnson and who else? April Green?
A April Green and Alan Howard.
Q Did you make a presentation to the compensation committee or any suggestions?

A Do you have the minutes? I think - I think we - the minutes would reflect what happened.

MR. GRANAT: I'm sure I do.
THE WITNESS: Do you have the minutes?
MR. MULLEN: Uh-huh. (tenders.)
THE WITNESS: Myself and Herschel Vinyard.
MR. MULLEN: Sean, the record will reflect
Mr. Zahn is referring to the minutes of the compensation comunittee meeting on June 18, 2019, unless you have -

MR. GRANAT: Let me give you a marked copy, okay? Call it Exhibit II.
(Exhibit Number II was marked for identification.)

THE WITNESS: Agenda Item II, Jon Kendrick presented the Willis Towers Watson report. And so Il(B), with the Willis Towers Watson report versus
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industry compensation, which is the document l've been referencing that has performance units and time-based units and other things like that.

And then II(C) was Herschel and I talking about, well, if - you know, if the compensation committee desires to continue moving forward on this, then can you give us some instruction to move forward and design a framework? And then that's what then was brought to the June board meeting. BY MR. GRANAT:

Q Right. And under C, it says, "Mr. Zahn advised the committee that if they commissioned JEA leadership to move forward, the team would work to develop an appropriate plan."

Is that right?
A Sure, in accordance with the Willis Towers Watson -

Q And then so between -- from that point, June 18th, 2019, am I correct that you and JEA leadership developed the PUP plan?

A And OGC and Pillsbury and Foley.
Q And when you say OGC, you're referring to me?
A So all 1 have -- I'm assume - 1 have the documents - you and I didn't talk, but I have the documents where you were being included as part of the
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A So I think he's the one that actually had
the -- the -- ended up coming up with the formula that would go into the exhibit.

Q What input did Melissa Dykes have regarding formation of the PUP?

A So there was - I remember there was a bunch of collective meetings talking about, well, is it deferred compensation? How do you make sure all employees would want to participate?

So, you know -- and by the way, all -everybody I just mentioned would have -- when I say input, they would have reviewed all the documents. They probably would have given Jessica lots of edits. It was --

Q Yeah. My question was what input did Melissa Dykes give on the PUP?

A Again, she would have deall directly with Jessica Lutrin, so ...

Q Do you know what inpus Herschel Vinyard gave regarding the PUP?

A So he was spending more time with Foley on making sure that you had compliance with all laws, compliance with all ethics standards. I remember 215, Florida Statute 215 being a big issue.

I know that Foley was talking about, well, do
you make it just an award where people just get, you
know, basically a free unit or do they have to buy it?
So that would have been a lot of the discussion that I think Herschel would have had.

Q Okay. Do you recall a meeting on
November 5th --
A Yes.
Q - with Jason Gabriel?
A Uh-huh.
Q And did Jason Gabriel tell you that you couldn't proceed with the PUP on that date?

A No.
Q He didn't tell you?
A No. Actually, the meeting was at Foley. It had -- and I was asked to come to - 1 was asked to come to the meeting by Herschel Vinyard, because Herschel and Lynne had been dealing with OGC and Foley and going round and round, and the exasperation leve! was getting pretty high between all the entities, as I understand it.

And Herschel said I needed to come to that meeting to be able to figure out whether we move forward or not. I sat at one end of the table. Jason sat at the other end. You had Kevin Hyde, Lymne, Herschel, and Lawsikia.

Lawsikia and Lynne were going back and forth pretty heavily about different arguments. And Kevin Hyde was taking his - stating his legal arguments.

It was about 30 minutes in or so that I kind of came to the realization that the internal team that had been working on all of these - on the performance units since the board's approval in July had a substantial number of disagreements.

And so I pulled Jason out of the meeting and said, Jason, if this -- if there's this many issues with this unit, then let's kill this plan.

To which he said, well, you know, I'm not saying -- I'm not saying we're there yet. I'm just telling you that we have substantial concems.

And I said, okay, if you have substantial concerns, are they substantial enough where we need to just kill it? Because, as I've been telling you before, let's just be done with this if there's an issue.

To which then we went back in. I listened for about five or ten minules. I departed the meeting. Apparenuly the meeting continued for about another hour or two.

Then I came back to JEA and saw Herschel. Herschel informed me at that point in time that there's some substantial issues that OGC wasn't probably going
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## to get around.

To which then I called Jason and said, hey, let's sit down and talk, because if we need to kill this plan, let's do it now. We had the Attorney General opinion out. We were getting ready to issue the State Ethics Commission opinion. So let's just be done with this.

And that was the impetus between our letter exchange on November 12 th.

Q All right. Tum for me, please, to Page 440 and 441. And that's Jason Gabriel's letter --

A 440?
Q - to meno.
440 of Exhibit 7.
A Tab?
MR. MULLEN: Tab 16.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorty.

## Ycp.

BY MR. GRANAT:
Q All right. You've read this memo before, haven't you?

A Yeah, this is Jason's response to my letter where I killed -- where I - I asked whether or not I could kill the plan, and I was informed by Lynne that I could not because I didn't have the authority.

So 1 postponed it and then talked to the Chair about killing it at the next available board meeting.

Q Well, if you look at Page 441, the second page of Jason's letter, he recaps the November 5th meeting. Do you see that?

A Okay.
Q And in the second paragraph [sic], he says, "On that date, the following concems were brought up by OGC and discussed with JEA."

Then he goes on: "Upon our review, the PUP is seemingly akin to an employee stock option plan, and for size" -- "and for similar size private multi-billion-dollar corporations, employees [sic] like the PUP may be the norm. However, the PUP would be unique to the public sector and founded on the fundamental principle that a govemment entity, such as JEA, may underwrite and offer for sale a portion of JEA's value as an investment product pursuant to Section 112.215 Florida Statutes. This fundamental PUP principle is not only a novel concept to our consolidated govermment but is also novel to government concepts and principles in general. Further, in addition to more fundamental issues associated with the PUP, there were other issues cited, including allowing non-JEA employees in the plan and various potential
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adverse tax consequences."
Were those issues brought up to you at this meeting?

A So, again, I was only there for the beginning of the meeting, to which then I departed to get on a conference call. So if all of this was fully -1 there were a number of issues that were being debated between Lynne and Lawsikia.

I departed. I didn't get a list of all these issues until November 12th, but candidly, it didn's really matter, because between November 5th and November 12th, I had already told Jason, look, it seems like this plan is more headache than it's worth. Let's just be done with it.

And that was why I - as this letter says, on November 12th, the letter - the CEO sent me a -informing me -- a letter informing me that officially JEA was going to postpone indefinitely the PUP. Because he and I had a number of back-and-forths between the 5 th and the 12 th .

Q The third paragraph, the second full paragraph on this page of Jason Gabriel's Ietter, says, "Accordingly, we advise that the current plan should be officially dissolved."

Are you debating that?

|  | Page 133 |  | Page 135 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A That's what the letter says on the 12th. | 1 | Jason Gabriel on November 12th? |
| 2 | Q No, it's not on the 12th. That's still pant | 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | of the November 5th recap of the meeting. | 3 | Q Okay. And in your letter -- would you read |
| 4 | A Written on the 12th. | 4 | the last paragraph - the first sentence of the last |
| 5 | Q Correct. | 5 | paragraph? |
| 6 | A Yeah. | 6 | A "The decision not to implement the plan is |
| 7 | Q Did Jason Gabriel advise you -- | 7 | based on the incongruity of the plan's long-term nature |
| 8 | A Not to my knowledge. Again, I wasn't in the | 8 | of the very real potential structure and |
| 9 | whole meeting. I lef. So if be did, then I wasn't | 9 | implications" - |
| 10 | part of that -- part of the meeting. | 10 | (Reporter clarification.) |
| 11 | Q I see. | 11 | THE WITNESS: .- "long-term nature and the |
| 12 | A That being said, after the November 5th - | 12 | very real potential short-term implications of |
| 13 | because of -- you know, I went and checked in with Lynne | 13 | JEA's strategic planning process. As such, the |
| 14 | and Herschel, and their feedback was that, you know, | 14 | Chair plans" -- |
| 15 | Jason and Lawsikia and OGC still had a number of | 15 | BY MR. GRANAT: |
| 16 | outstanding issues and that - and so I said, well, then | 16 | Q Just that. I mean, I just wanted the first |
| 17 | let's just be done with this. | 17 | sentence. |
| 18 | Q Was Lawsikia Hodges in that November 5th | 18 | A Okay. |
| 19 | meeting? | 19 | Q Because I want to ask you about that. |
| 20 | A Yeah. | 20 | Just in layman's terms, explain to me what |
| 21 | Q She was? Okay. | 21 | your reason for canceling the PUP was. |
| 22 | And then under the paragraph "Accordingly" -- | 22 | A I got advice from counsel, OGC, that they had |
| 23 | and there's a list of six items that Jason says must be | 23 | outstanding legal issues. |
| 24 | met as a minimum for sort of long-term investment | 24 | Q Okay. |
| 25 | incentive? | 25 | A Number two, began to realize the very real |
|  | Page 134 |  | Page 136 |
| 1 | A Okay. | 1 | potential financial impact that recapitalization might |
| 2 | Q Were those six items discussed with you and | 2 | have on the plan, and the plan was never intended to be |
| 3 | recommended by OGC? | 3 | a - you know, while we ended up working |
| 4 | A So where I left the meeling would have been | 4 | recapitalization into the documents, it was -- when we |
| 5 | around, actually, where they were talking about issues | 5 | started the plan, it was intended to be a rolling |
| 6 | with - conflicting with charter. And then -- and then | 6 | three-year long-term plan. |
| 7 | investment product, I do recall. I was not part of the | 7 | And so, as I've said in public meetings, you |
| 8 | meeting, I don't believe, on the IRS tax issues, liems | 8 | know, it was a reatization that after July 23rd I really |
| 9 | $3,4,5$. Well, 6 is a catchall. | 9 | didn't have much in the way of discussion on the plan, |
| 10 | Q Okay. At this November 5th meeting, do you | 10 | because Herschel, Lynne, OGC, Foley, and Pillsbury were |
| 11 | recall Jason Gabriel asking what the projected value of | 11 | all working through the legal side. |
| 12 | the PUP units would be? | 12 | You had the Attomey General stuff going on |
| 13 | A No. | 13 | one side. And I was waiting on all those checks and |
| 14 | Q You don't remember him asking that? | 14 | balances to be done. And then on November 5th, it was |
| 15 | A No. That was asked in a board meeting. | 15 | kind of an "aha" moment of this is -- we need to be done |
| 16 | Q Well, I'm just talking about the November 5th | 16 | with this. |
| 17 | meeting | 17 | Q So I'm just a tort and employment lawyer. I |
| 18 | A Okay. | 18 | don't -- I'm not in the business worid, and a CEO, |
| 19 | MR. GRANAT: And just for reference -- are we | 19 | speaks the business language. Can you just simplify and |
| 20 | up to number - | 20 | explain for me what you mean incongruity of the |
| 21 | (Exhibit Number 12 was marked for | 21 | long-lerm nature of the plan versus the very real |
| 22 | identification.) | 22 | potential shor-term implications? |
| 23 | BY MR, GRANAT: | 23 | A Yeah. |
| 24 | Q Exhibit 12 will be -- is this Exhibit 12 the | 24 | Q Simply, what does that mean? |
| 25 | letter that you were referring to that you sent to | 25 | A That recapitalization could have an impact on |

the value of the plan.
Q Okay.
A And that was one of the main reasons of saying this doesn't work.

Q The incongruity meant that -- what? That the plan is really meant for -- if the business -if JEA was going to continue maybe under Scenario 1 or 2 ? A No. Again, this is -- so when the plan -when the long-term incentive planning started, it was because we were realizing that 2,000 employees were not cognizant of the profitability and financial value of the business. That was in December of ' 18 , moving into January.

And so what you have is this very progressive and involved discussions with the board and consulants and attorneys to where you end up by November 5th with me, as the CEO, going, oh, man, this just doesn't work.
And so that's what incongruity means.
Q Okay.
A This is very real business. It happens all the time. You develop things and then you figure out it's not going to work, and then you'll be done.

Q Well, the plan's long-term nature, 1 guess, given because it's called a long-temn incentive -

A Right, it was intended to incentivize behavior
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of employees towards long-term financial value.
Q And what is that term? Is it three years?
A Yes, it was a three --
Q A three-year plan.
A Well, it was a rolling three-year plan.
Q Righ. And so the very real potential short-term implications, what were the short-term implications you're talking about?

A That the recapitalization could have a very real impact on the value of the plan.

Q Okay. And how -- what kind of impact would a shor-term - what kind of impact would the recap have on the plan?

A It stopped -- so if you want it in layman, it was -- or do you want me to reference the board document that -- where it was presented to the board? It basically stops the -- it stops the measurement period.

Q Okay.
A And so if a recap happened and you netted
3 billion, then would it be zero. It could -- you don't know. You know, you could have --

Q It could be a lot of money?
A It could be a lot of money, yeah. And which
is one of the - why it's no longer - it's in
incongruent with kind of incentivizing long-tern
financial employee --
Q Well, was the long-term incentive plan -a as intended to be a long-term incentive plan, was it not contemplated that that could be worth a lot of money?

A I'm not sure -
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand that
question.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Okay. Sure.
If I'm hearing what you're saying, you saw that, hey, a recap could happen and the plan could make this PUP worth a lot of money; right?

A And OGC still has outstanding legal concerns, and the Attomey General hadn't done its review, and ethics -- all of those things, yeah.

Q My question is, if the long-term incentive plan occurred without a recapitalization occurring, did you believe that that long-term incentive plan could still be worth a lot of moncy?

A Actually, I went back to the board meeting in
June - or in July, and one of the - one of the hypotheses .- or one of the scenarios that was played out was the value of the long-term performance unit plan
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under Scenario 2, and that was about $\mathbf{\$ 3 0}$ million, because you had substantially decreased costs and improved the book value and then able to increase the value of the plan.

So the idea was that if you're going to cut overhead by 500 people or 400 people, the balance of the people needed to work harder and needed to be incentivized to drive the performance of the business.

Q Is that what was explained to the board --
A Yeah.
Q -t that that plan was under a Scenario 2
involving a reduction in force?
A No. It was actually - the documents and the plan say it was under all scenarios -

Q Okay.
A -in July.
Q Okay.
A Because, again, we tried -- what was happening
was the team was trying to contemplate every potential future alternative.

Q All right. And just for reference, if you'd look at Exhibit 442, which is at Tab 17 of Exhibit 7.
This is actually Jason Gabriel's response to your November 12th --

A Oh, okay. This is the one that I saw.

Q And I think that what we were referring to earlier --

A That's the memo to file.
Q -- was the memo to file.
A Yeah, which I didn't see until I was given it by Chris Holme (phonetic).

Q Okay.
A And that would have been late November, because it was actually given - this memo to file was given to JEA through to you.

Q Okay.
(Discussion off the record.)
(Recess taken from 1:55 p.m. to $1: 59$ p.m.)
THE WITNESS: By the way, there would be an
email where I got that memo to file from
Kerri Stewart, because she was the one that got it
from OGC or Gina Kyle.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Let me ask you -- and that memo we're talking about, it's in Exhibit 7, Page 440, Jason Gabriel's memo to file.

A Yeah.
Q And I'm going to ask you to take a look at it, and I want you to tell me if there's anything you disagree with in this memo.
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MR. MULLEN: And, Sean, with that caveat, as Mr. Zahn already testified, he was only there for a portion of the meeting that's discussed in this memo, for the record.

THE WITNESS: No, I don't disagree with anything in the memo. I just wasn't there for the whole thing.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Okay. That's fair.
A And as 1 remember - and then 1 did follow up with Jason, and it was after this meeting. And that's when, between the 5 th and the 12 th , we decided collectively between the two of us that it was best to just be done with it.

Q Okay. Now, you have referenced my memo. I want to talk about that for just a minute.

A Okay.
Q And if you look on Exhibit 7, it's Page JEA 290. It's Tab 3.

A Okay.
Q Is this the memo you were referring to when you said I was involved in the PUP?

A Yes. You know, as well as I think -- because of the public records request, there were emails and other things like that, so I just assumed that you were
part of the discussion.
Q Now, did you read this memo? It starts on Page 290.

A 1 have not read it in totality.
Q You have not read it?
A No.
Q Were you aware that neither 1 nor Kort Parde, who wrote this with me, were never told about the PUP or JEA's plans for a long-term incentive when we were asked to write this memo?

A I am not aware of that.
Q Were you aware that we were asked to write a general memo on whether JEA can establish a long-term incentive program?

A I'm not aware of that.
Q And do you know that this addresses -- merely addresses Florida Statute 215.425?

A That would on the front page. Again, 1--
Q Because you didn't read it?
A I haven't read the whole memo. I got this well after the plan was killed.

Q Are you aware that the PUP, as it was designed, does not comply with Florida Statute 215?

A I am not aware of that. 1 thought that was part of the $A G$ request.

Q Are you not aware of what the Attomey General was actually asked?

A No. I left that to Herschel Vinyard and OGC and Jason Gabriel to -- and Foley to craft that formal opinion request and to submit it.

Q So are you aware of what Section 215.425 is and what it says?

A Not specific, no.
Q Okay. Well, if you look on the front page of my memo -

A I'm sorry. $4 .$.
Q 290. I'm sorry. The first page of my memo, which is 290 .

A Okay.
Q It lists four factors that are required for a bonus plan to be lawful for a public entity. Right? It has to be based on work performance, have a predetermined performance standards and evaluation process, provide notice to the program of all JEA employees prior to its commencement, and be available to all JEA employees.

Are you aware that all of your legal counsel had determined that the PUP does not comply with 215 , and the request of the Attomey General was to make sure that it wasn't within 215?

|  | Page 145 |  | Page 147 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A My understanding was Foley and -- had a very | 1 | Junce 2019 board meeting. |
| 2 | specific difference of that opinion. | 2 | (Audio played.) |
| 3 | Q So you weren't aware that the PUP -- | 3 | A SPEAKER: "It will be interesting, |
| 4 | A 1 know Foley thought it was completely in | 4 | especially with the -- in the middle of what we're |
| 5 | accordance with all the statutes. | 5 | doing right now, to have to talk about the |
| 6 | Q With 215? | 6 | compensation structure, as much as it's needed, |
| 7 | A I wouldn't have imagined Folcy would want to | 7 | when we talk about the potential of losing |
| 8 | continue -- | 8 | employes as well as our senior management and |
| 9 | Q Did you ever hear the PUP described as a | 9 | retention and long-term compensation - |
| 10 | deferred comp plan rather than a bonus plan? | 10 | A SPEAKER: At the same time (unintelligible). |
| 11 | A Yes. | 11 | A SPEAKER: I think it's important for people |
| 12 | Q Okay. So that's taking it from 215 bonus to a | 12 | to understand that the framework that was proposed |
| 13 | Section 112 Florida Statute -- | 13 | and discussed within the compensation committee |
| 14 | A That's your expertise, not mine. | 14 | would effectively render a long-term incentive |
| 15 | Q -- deferred comp -- you don't have any -- you | 15 | compensation that would be worthless in the |
| 16 | don't have knowledge of that? | 16 | event -- in the face of traditional utility |
| 17 | A No. I acknowledge that I heard it referred to | 17 | response. |
| 18 | as a deferred comp plan. | 18 | A SPEAKER: Соrrect. |
| 19 | Q Okay. | 19 | A SPEAKER: So ultimately what it is is |
| 20 | A And the reason I acknowledge that is Foley, I | 20 | incentivizing growth -- a growth trajectory. So I |
| 21 | believe, had talked about that in terms of being able to | 21 | think that's an imporant distinction that everyone |
| 22 | make it eligible for collectively bargained employees. | 22 | understand. |
| 23 | But as to your -- the specifics of where it | 23 | A SPEAKER: Okay." |
| 24 | falls -- | 24 | (Audio stopped.) |
| 25 | Q Okay. You don't understand the mechanics? | 25 | (Exhibit Number 13 was marked for |
|  | Page 146 |  | Page 148 |
| 1 | A li's not that 1 don't understand. I just | 1 | identification.) |
| 2 | haven't ever investigated those statutes myself. | 2 | BY MR. GRANAT: |
| 3 | Q Do you know when the decision was made to stop | 3 | Q That comment was made after Camille |
| 4 | considering the PUP under 215 and start considering it a | 4 | Lee-Johnson's motion to pass the long-term incentive |
| 5 | deferred comp under 112? | 5 | plan -- |
| 6 | A No. | 6 | A Yeah. |
| 7 | Q Do you know who made that decision? | 7 | Q -- charging you to come back with a plan in |
| 8 | A No. | 8 | July? |
| 9 | You had teams of people working on this, so I | 9 | A In hindsight, that's a misstatement. |
| 10 | would imagine it would be, as with most things at JEA, | 10 | Q Okay. |
| 11 | you know, you investigate, you do a whole bunch of | 11 | A Because, actually, if you-if you run the |
| 12 | investigation until such time if you find that your | 12 | numbers on the traditional utility response, which was |
| 13 | investigation says that you can't move forward, you | 13 | corrected in July, the plan would have been worth |
| 14 | stop. | 14 | \$30 million. |
| 15 | Q Okay. Do you have any other evidence of my | 15 | Q So let's -- let me ask you flat out. Was the |
| 16 | involvement with the PUP other than this June 17th very | 16 | PUP created for the purpose of a successful ITN? |
| 17 | basic memo on Statute 215? | 17 | A No. |
| 18 | A Just emails that 1 saw when reviewing stuff. | 18 | Q No? |
| 19 | But I don't .- | 19 | A No. |
| 20 | Sean, I'm not trying to -- no, I don't have | 20 | Q It was legitimately considered for continuing |
| 21 | specific evidence that -- other than what has been | 21 | JEA under a Scenario 1 or 2 situation? |
| 22 | provided to me in public records. | 22 | A It started under -- it started as a long-tern |
| 23 | Q Well -- okay. | 23 | incentive for all employees back in December, before |
| 24 | Let me - let's go to another clip. I'm going | 24 | there was ever any contemplation or even I knew the |
| 25 | to ask you about something. And this is a clip from the | 25 | words ITN. And then progressively it developed. |


|  | Page 149 |  | Page 151 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | And in June and July, when we got to the | 1 | right? |
| 2 | strategic planning process of conternplating | 2 | A That's absolutely right. And that's one of |
| 3 | recapitalization to solve the constraints, we did what | 3 | the reasons why we got to where on November 12th I said |
| 4 | humans do. We said, okay, we now have this plan. We've | 4 | this is incongruous and we need -- we need to be done |
| 5 | been working on it for seven months. Lel's incorporate | 5 | with it. |
| 6 | recapitalization. Because you need to contemplate every | 6 | Q And potentially under an ITN situation, the |
| 7 | single potential outcome in terms of, you know, how this | 7 | PUP could have been worth hundreds of millions of |
| 8 | would work. | 8 | dollars; do you agre? |
| 9 | After that, the board approved it. I asked my | 9 | A Jagree. |
| 10 | CAO, my legal counsel, my CFO, my HR to do all the work | 10 | Q Do you remember telling members of your |
| 11 | necessary to make sure that it was, you know, in | 11 | short - of your senior leadership team that if a |
| 12 | accordance with all laws, statutes, and ethics codes, to | 12 | recapitalization occurred, there would be a large amount |
| 13 | the point where at -- and then got to November 5th, when | 13 | of money that could be used to fund the PUP? |
| 14 | the ieams were so consternated and frustrated where | 14 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the |
| 15 | Jason and I talked about just killing it, and we killed | 15 | question. |
| 16 | it. | 16 | You can answer. |
| 17 | Q But in June of '19 when you made that | 17 | A Do I recall - the senior leadership team, I |
| 18 | statement in the clip we just played that an LTI would | 18 | don't recall being the one that told them that. But it |
| 19 | be worthless under a traditional response, that was a | 19 | was at one point discussed that, hey, if an ITN ended up |
| 20 | misstatement? | 20 | being successful, then you would have a pocket of |
| 21 | A As I just said, yeah, it was a misstatement. | 21 | capital to be able to perform - to fund debt and all |
| 22 | Q Okay. | 22 | the performance units and other things like that. I |
| 23 | A Because ultimately, when you look at the - in | 23 | mean, everything, right? So -- |
| 24 | July, we corrected that. | 24 | Q Was that conversation before July 23rd, 2019? |
| 25 | Q is it true that under an ITN scenario, the PUP | 25 | A I don't think so. |
|  | Page 150 |  | Page 152 |
| 1 | value would be directly tied to the sale price of JEA? | 1 | Q Now, let me ask you specifically, you had a |
| 2 | A As it -- as it was designed, yes. | 2 | number of off-site meetings with your senior leadership |
| 3 | Q Intentionally designed? | 3 | team; right? |
| 4 | A No. Weil -- I don't understand. | 4 | A We did, yeah. |
| 5 | "Intentionally designed," what does that mean? | 5 | Q And prior to July 23rd, 2019, at any of these |
| 6 | Q Was it intentionally designed to be tied to a | 6 | off-site meetings, did you ever make a statement to |
| 7 | sale price? | 7 | members of your senior leadership team that if there was |
| 8 | A No. It was designed to be tied to the | 8 | a recapitalization, there would be a large sum of money |
| 9 | financial value of JEA, which was the book value, the | 9 | that could be used to fund the PUPs? |
| 10 | contribution to the City, and distributions to | 20 | A Not to my recollection, but ... |
| 11 | customers. | 11 | Q If others recall you saying that, is it |
| 12 | Q Okay. | 12 | possible that you said it? |
| 13 | A Which if you - the book value is the | 13 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the |
| 14 | accounting book value of the business. Contribution is | 14 | question. |
| 15 | the equivalent of a dividend. And then basically -- | 15 | A You're asking me to speculate on -- |
| 16 | what did you call it - rebates to customers or the | 16 | Q I'm asking, do you doubt - do you doubt it |
| 17 | equivalent of a dividend. | 17 | and say it's not true, or - I'm telling you other |
| 18 | Q Did you know that the value of the PUP was | 18 | people have said that you have said that. |
| 19 | tied to the financial value of JEA when it was passed on | 19 | A Okay. |
| 20 | July 23rd? | 20 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the |
| 21 | A Everyone did. | 21 | question. |
| 22 | Q Everyone did? | 22 | THE WITNESS: Then it's entirely possible, but |
| 23 | A Yeah. It's actually in the board doc. | 23 | it was part of what we were reviewing in between -- |
| 24 | Q In relation to an ITN, the higher the sale | 24 | what would that be? July? June, July, whatever. |
| 25 | price of JEA, the more valuable the PUP units would be; | 25 | I don't know, when -- when did they say I said it? |


|  | Page 153 |  | Page 155 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 1 | the pool. |
| 2 | Q At a meeting prior to July 23rd. | 2 | Q When did you know that? When did you |
| 3 | A Okay. But when? Where? | 3 | understand that that's how it would work under a |
| 4 | Q You don't recall ever saying that? | 4 | recapitalization? |
| 5 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the | 5 | A When the plan documents were being developed |
| 6 | question. | 6 | in July. |
| 7 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 7 | Q And so let's call -- just for purposes of this |
| 8 | Q You remember or you don't. | 8 | conversation, let's call 10 percent of anything over 3.4 |
| 9 | A No, I don't remember. | 9 | billion netted to the City -- |
| 10 | Q Okay. | 10 | A Yeah. |
| 11 | A But if sombbody -- you know, if you have a | 11 | Q - the formula. Okny? |
| 12 | bunch of people that -- | 12 | A Sure. |
| 13 | Q Tell me what would have happened if the PUP | 13 | Q Did you know of the formula before |
| 14 | passed and there was a recapitalization. What would | 14 | July 23rd, 2019? |
| 15 | have happened -- | 15 | A Yeah, because that's what was actually |
| 16 | MR. MULLLEN: Object to -- | 16 | presented to the board. |
| 17 | Q -- to the PUP? | 17 | Q That formula was presented to the board? |
| 18 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the | 18 | A Yes. That's what's in the board package |
| 19 | question. | 19 | online on JEA.com. |
| 20 | A So, number one, in order for the | 20 | Q Is that in the July 23rd board package |
| 21 | recapitalization to occur, you would have had to have a | 21 | materials? |
| 22 | board vote. And I do remember this being a discussion | 22 | A Yeah. Now, it's - you know, that formula is |
| 23 | with legal counsel that performance units were not a | 23 | written in a way that I think the leam, Foley, you know, |
| 24 | mean - were not within the control of semior | 24 | and the finance group ended up -- it's in Exhibit A, I |
| 25 | management, because you had to have a board vote. You | 25 | think, of the plan. And I don't know where it is. Does |
|  | Page 154 |  | Page 156 |
| 1 | had to have a City Council vote. You had to have a | 1 | anybody? |
| 2 | referendum, and then you had to have regulatory approval | 2 | (Discussion off the record.) |
| 3 | and a financial closing in order for the | 3 | MR. MULLEN: For the record there, Sean, 1 |
| 4 | recapitalization event definition to trigger. | 4 | think you skipped 9 and 10, unless those were meant |
| 5 | And 50, you know -- | 5 | to be the video clips. |
| 6 | Q Well, I think I've already answered it, and I | 6 | MR. GRANAT: Those, I think, what we're |
| 7 | think you agreed that if a recapitalization did occur | 7 | considering the clips. |
| 8 | and there was -- | 8 | MR. MULLEN: All right, And then your last |
| 9 | A Yeah. | 9 | video clip that you played, that would be 12, but |
| 10 | Q -- an amount of moncy over, 1 think, 3.4 | 10 | you didn't designate -- |
| 11 | billion netted to the City, 10 percent would have gone | 11 | MR. POWELL: That would be 13. I'm sorry. |
| 12 | to fund the PUP, right? | 12 | 12 - |
| 13 | A Correct. And that was part of -- that was | 13 | MR. MULLEN: So the video would be 12? |
| 14 | part of the plan documents from the time that the board | 14 | MR. POWELL: The video - this last audio |
| 15 | approved it. | 15 | would be 13. |
| 16 | Q All right. Did you ever calculate what the | 16 | MR. GRANAT: Right. So we had an 11 and 12. |
| 17 | potential payouts of the PUP might be? | 17 | So this is 14. |
| 18 | A Yes. Actually, a lot of people did. | 18 | (Exhibit Number 14 was marked for |
| 19 | Q Who calculated what the payouts may have been? | 19 | identification.) |
| 20 | A I know that I heard of people in the finance | 20 | BY MR. GRANAT: |
| 21 | department calculating it. Senior leadership team | 21 | Q Mr. Zahn, I'm going to give you a copy of the |
| 22 | members calculated it. It's a pretty easy calculation. | 22 | board materials for July 23rd, and I have Bates stamped |
| 23 | Q Explain the calculation to me. | 23 | these. Okay? They're - with your name Zahn, 1 through |
| 24 | A lt's, in your own words, anything over 3.4 | 24 | 352. |
| 25 | billion, you take 10 percent, and that's the value of | 25 | MR. MULLEN: And this is the entire board |

package for the July 23, 2019, board meeting? MR. GRANAT: It is.
And it's - we said this is 14 .
THE WITNESS: So go to Page Zahn 279.
"Employec PUP pool equal to 10 percent of value created in excess of challenge target."

Employees must increase value of JEA by at least $\$ 300$ million to benefit -- the calculated value is the sum of the net position, the City contribution, and any refunds to customers. BY MR. GRANAT:

Q Okay. So -- okay.
I see where it says, "Employee PUP pool equals 10 percent of value created in excess of the challenge target value."

Right?
A And then above it, the challenge target value is 3.39 billion, which is a 300 million increase over forecasted, because at that point the audit hadn't been completed. And then it says this is how it works.

I mean, that was the -- that was the layman -and I remember - I went back and watched the video, and around this, this is where Ryan Wannemacher said, so, for example, if you had a $\$ 600$ million increase in the value of JEA, then that would be 300 million over the
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challenge target, so 10 percent of that 300 million is 30 million. It's on the board package.

Q Is that what Mr. Wannemacher said?
A On television in the board meeting.
Q Okay.
A Yeah.
Q And so is this -
A And I confirmed with board members afterwards that they understood that.

Q Page 279, Zahn 279, this is how you communicated to the board what the formula would be in the event of a recapitalization --

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
Q -- this slide?
MR. MULLEN: You can answer.
A No. There's the totality of the entire presentation, and then there's actually - where's the resolution -

MR. MULLEN: From the meeting?
THE WITNESS: The resolution from the meeting had a more robust - so Zahn $347,348,349,350$, this was drafted by OGC. The resolutions were drafled by OGC.

And this would have been reviewed by senior
leadership as well as everybody through the typical board approval process. And, again, as is normal course, I would have had conversations with all the board members ahead of the July board meeting, walking them through each of the different items of the board package.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q So are you telling me that you sat down with each of the board members and explained to them that if there was a recapitalization, the PUP would be funded with 10 percent of anything over 3.4 billion that was netted to the City?

A Not in those exact words, but actually, if you watch the board meeting, Alan Howard actually asked that exact question. He said, what happens in the event of a recapitalization? How does this work? Does the performance unit have value? And the answers were yes.

Q Let's do this. At the time that this PUP plan was passed on July 23rd, 2019, you were aware, then, right, that if JEA was -- there was an ITN and there was some sort of sale and the City netted $\$ 4.4$ billion, then 10 percent of $\$ 1$ billion would have funded the PUP -

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
Q - is that right?
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A Yes, that's what it - I mean, that's what all the documents and public records say.

Q Okay. I'masking you --
A So of course I was aware.
Q So on July 23rd, 2019, you were aware that if the City netted $\$ 1$ billion out of the sale of JEA that the PUP would be funded with $\$ 100$ million?

A That the City would have to net 4.4 billion.
Q Okay. Let me restate that, because I want a clean question here. I want to make sure there's no misunderstanding.

On July 23rd, 2019, when the PUP was passed, were you aware that if the City netted $\$ 4.4$ billion out of the sale of JEA that the PUP would have been funded with $\$ 100$ million?

A Yes.
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: And again, that was well - that was well defined by - that was well understood by everyone. I mean -I mean ...
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q My question, though, is did you, as CEO --
A Yes, I've answered.
Q - of JEA understand that?

A Yes.
Q Did you tell that to the JEA board?
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A Yeah, we talked about it - I talked about it with the Chair. We talked about it in individual mectings. Yeah, we --

And then actually Alan Howard even asked how does this -- now, he didn't use your hypothetical, but Ryan Wannemacher used a hypothetical of 600 million increase and not a billion. You used a billion; he used 600 million, right?
Q Well, when this PUP passed, you were aware that a sale of JEA could result in hundreds of millions of dollars going to the PUP?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Depending on the sale price?
MR. MULLEN: Same objection.
A Everyone was aware.
Q And you were aware?
A And I was aware. Iam-- yes.
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Q And knowing that, you allowed the PUP to be
passed by the board?
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
A I can't allow the board to pass anything. The
board passes whatever they want to pass. lt's their prerogative.

Q You presented the PUP to the board for passage with that knowledge --

A With OGCs - with OGC's sign-off from
July 22nd, which I would never have taken for the PUP if I hadn't gotten the letter from Jason, Lawsikia and -and that is the reason why I asked for that letter, because 1 wanted to make sure that everything in the ITN, everything in the performance units, everything in the employment agreements, everything that was being presented had been reviewed by counsel and the board had the proper authority and the proper reviews of -- the entire mechanism of consolidated government had reviewed this.

Q And so you feel - or let me rephrase that.
Do you feel that you advised the board of this
10 percent over the target value would be -
A lt's in writing.
Q - the funding of the PUP?

A It's in writing on Page --
Q I understand it's in writing. I'm asking you, as CEO of JEA, do you feel that you advised the board that that was the formula?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
A Yes, it's in writing in a presentation provided to the board.

Q And you're relying on it just being in writing and the presentation that we can all watch --

A On television.
Q $\quad$ - on television; is that right?
A That's the whole --
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I also, you know, sat down
with - and my team sat down with the board members and talked to them about everything in the July
board package.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q All right. Did you talk to the board specifically about the potential large size of value that these PUPs might result in?
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A Well, at that point in time, we didn't actually know - it was a hypothetical. Does that make sense?

So we didn't actually know what the real value of JEA was until actually right around when we killed the plan, because that's when it became pretty evident how big the plan would be. We got the revised replies November 6th, I want to say.

Q And what was the greatest bid?
A So $I$ understand this is going to be a public record. Are you sure you want me to answer that question?

MR. GRANAT: Is it still confidential?
MR. PHILLIPS: I don't --
THE WITNESS: I believe it is.
MR. MULLEN: As I recall, the bid information
has not been made public, because I think some of
the bidders objected to the public records request
and asked for the numbers to be -
MR. GRANAT: That might have been resolved.
MR. MULLEN: -- redacted.
(Reporter clarification.)
MR. PHILLIPS: We can redact the transcript.
MR. POWELL: That's true, we can always
redact -

|  | Page 165 |  | Page 167 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. GRANAT: If it's not a public record, it's | 1 | it and that it was public. |
| 2 | not a public record. | 2 | Q Did you sit down with Andy Allen and talk |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: So, again, that was around the | 3 | about the formula and potential payouts? |
| 4 | time that we decided - 1, myself, Jason, the | 4 | A Again, I don't recall - I don't recall the |
| 5 | team -- said we need to be done with this plan. | 5 | meeting with him, as I said earlier, in July, but I'm |
| 6 | BYMR. GRANAT: | 6 | sure - that's why I asked for my calendar so I |
| 7 | Q And what was the largest bid? | 7 | could... |
| 8 | A | 8 | Q Did you sit down with Alan Howard and discuss |
| 9 | Q | 9 | the formula and potential payout? |
| 10 | And do you know if that had gone through what | 10 | A Absolutely. And actually, I've reconfirmed |
| 11 | the net to the City would have been? | 11 | that with him even subsequently. |
| 12 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the | 12 | Q When did you reconfirm that with him? |
| 13 | question. Objection. It's a hypothetical. | 13 | A In December |
| 14 | A Not off the top of my head. It would be | 14 | Q In person or on the phone? |
| 15 | something over probably. | 15 | A On the phone. |
| 16 | Q And that would have resulted in | 16 | Q And what exactly did you reconfirm with |
| 17 | to fund the PUP; right? | 17 | Alan Howard? |
| 18 | A So if the value of JEA went from $\$ 3$ billion to | 18 | A I said, you know, it's clear that April Green |
| 19 | so the value of JEA increased | 19 | is trying to go back on a number of resolutions that her |
| 20 | and the City had -- was able to obtrin - and actuaily, | 20 | signature's on. What do you -- what the heek is going |
| 21 | the City was able to ger times the contribution, | 21 | on and what kind of politics are being played? Wasn't |
| 22 | which is basically only worth 5 , then the value | 22 | it really clear that it was 10 pereent oves a threshold? |
| 23 | of the performance unit would have increased, yes. But | 23 | And he said yes. I said, I thought it was |
| 24 | again, we killed the plan. | 24 | pretty clear to everybody. |
| 25 | Q Yeah, I'm aware of that. | 25 | Q Did you tell -- did you sit down with |
|  | Page 166 |  | Page 168 |
| 1 | So did you ever sit down with April Green and | 1 | Kelly Flanagan and discuss this formula with her? |
| 2 | talk about the formula and the potential payout numbers | 2 | A Most of my board reviews work with her were in |
| 3 | of the PUP? | 3 | conference calls, because she was flying back and forth |
| 4 | A Yes. | 4 | to London. So sit down, I don't know. But we would |
| 5 | Q When was that? | 5 | have talked about the performance units. She was on the |
| 6 | A It would have been before the July board | 6 | finance and audit comunittee. |
| 7 | meeting. I sat down with each of the board members. | 7 | Q So did you talk to Kelly Flanagan about this |
| 8 | Q And you specifically talked about the | 8 | PUP formula? |
| 9 | potential value of the PUP -- | 9 | A Yes. About the whole performance unit plan. |
| 10 | A Absolutely. | 10 | And I believe other members of my senior leadership team |
| 11 | Q You sat down with Camille Johnson and told her | 11 | did. |
| 12 | the potential payouts and the formula? | 12 | Q So are you - are you saying that on July 23rd |
| 13 | A Actually, more than that, because she was the | 13 | when the PUP was passed, knowing the formula, you never |
| 14 | plan administrator, and we talked about how it would be | 14 | considered that a recapitalization might involve \$4 or |
| 15 | administered and all that. | 15 | \$5 billion? |
| 16 | Q Did you sit down with Fred Newbill and tell | 16 | A I considered a lot of hypotheticais but didn't |
| 17 | him about the formula that we've agreed on and the | 17 | know. |
| 18 | potential payout numbers? | 18 | Q So as the CEO of JEA, didn't it occur to you |
| 19 | A Again, you're -- so you're - you're saying | 19 | that maybe you should discuss some potential sale values |
| 20 | potential payout numbers. | 20 | of JEA with your board before they passed a plan like |
| 21 | Q Yes. | 21 | this? |
| 22 | A So we walked through the formulas. I wasn't | 22 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the |
| 23 | going to sit around and hypothesize on, you know, | 23 | question. |
| 24 | transaction values. We did review it in public board | 24 | You can answer. |
| 25 | meetings on television so that people could understand | 25 | A So actually, as the CEO of JEA, in individua! |
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meetings with board members, after the 2017 privatization, board members and I talked -- and Melissa Dykes and Ryan Wannemacher and a whole bunch of people talked about, you know, the value of JEA and what it might be worth or might not be worth.

And there was a lot of - there was a lot of variability to that principally because of Vogtle and it being a $\$ 4$-and-a-half-billion contract and not knowing how that ever would be handied.

So, you know -- while the was a bid for -- and by the way, there's a whole bunch of bids somewhere in there - was a bid for JEA Electric and Water, it didn't take into account escrow -- one of the things - and this has been misreported in the media -said that Vogtle is going to be left behind for the City to pay, and the reality was, no, that wasn't the structure.

One of the things they contemplated was


Q So on July 23 rd , ' 19 , when this PUP passed, you had not considered it necessary to have a discussion with the board members about the value of the PUP if a recap occurred in the range of 4 or $\$ 5$ billion?
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it to my attention at the end of October, and -- because I think it was a line of questioning from OGC, was asking a whole bunch of questions about, you know, this needs to be a capped liability.

And so one of the things that I talked to Herschel and Lynne about was, well, why don't we just consider a cap.

Q When did you become aware there was no cap?
A When did I become aware?
It would have been somewhere between September and October. But, you know, again, the legal team was doing all of their review, and as I understand it, that was one of the major questions of OGC, and so -- and I lefl this to Herschel, Lynne, Ryan, Melissa, our HR team to figure out how they would implement it in terms of, you know, all the protocols and implementations, that kind of stuff. And we did start talking about a cap. We never -- it never got redrafted.

Q Okay.
A But because - it never got drafted in, but more because we were dealing with the more major structural issues of charter and AG. And -- and when I say "we," the team and OGC and special counsel.

Q Okay. I want to back up. I asked you if you recalled making a statement in an off-site meeting. And
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let me just - I'm going to rephrase and see if you remember making a statement along these lines.

Did you ever say that upon recapitalization or change of control of JEA that there's a large sum of money being transferred and a small portion could be used to fund an incentive plan for employees?

A Did I use those exact words, or did I make that statement?

Q Did you say that or something along those lines? Do you recall that?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A Again, the whole senior leadership team would have been at that meeting, so - and again, I don't know when that meeting would have occurred.

Q Do you ever recall if you made - anybody reacting negatively to any statement that you made like that?

A No. Definitely not.
So, in fact, there were a number of low-level employees that would actually - after the July 23nd said, thanks for including all employees in the performance unit plan. I was -- I think this could be a great plan for all of our employees.

In fact, I even discussed it with union
leaders after the July 23 rd meeting and talked to them about how it would be extended to their membership.

Q Who besides JEA employees was going to be considered to participate in the PUP?

A Dedicated OGC attomeys.
Q Which was Lymne Rhode and Miriam --
A Yes.
Q -- Hill?
Why were they going to be included?
A Because the intent was to -- and that became a pretty hotly debated topic, as I understand $i t$, between Lawsikia and Lynne, that OGC attomeys would be included. And the rationale around it was that you would have all dedicated full-time employees .professionals included in the plan.

Q Whose idea was that?
A Mine.
Q Did you contemplate anyone other than Lynne Rhode and --

A No.
Q -- Miriam Hill who weren't JEA employees?

## A No.

I was always a CEO that wanted to take care of all my full-time employees.

Q So before the PUP was passed, you understood
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that if there was a recap, part of the sale proceeds would fund the PUP; right?

A That's exactly what it says in the documents, and I understood that.

Q And what made you feel like you and JEA employees would be entitled to those proceeds of the sale?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

## You can answer.

A l'm not sure how to answer that question. How do we feel entitled? That would have, you know -number one, you know, the board -- it was the board's prerogative to implement the plan.

Number two, if that sale were to go through, you would have had to have the approval of the board, 19 City Council members, a million-plus voters, regulatory approval. So the plan would have gone through the scrutiny of a number of policymakers that had no benefit to it plus the entire voting public.

Q Tell me what was it in November that led you to this realization that, gosh, that the recap would be too much, we need to kill --

A That wasn't actually it. What led me to kill it was Lawsikia and Lynne having a very heated debate at

Foley and -about whether it's chart - you know, ruled by the charier and all the different legal arguments that, as I understand it, you guys were having between July and that meeting.

And, you know $\sim$ and that's the one meeting, Jon, I was referencing when Jon Phillips and - you know, I would get updates, but there were a lot of different debates going on between -- with counsel having opposing opinions, which would have ultimately, as I understand it, been resolved on how the AG weighed in.

Q So you're saying you didn't kill the PUP because of potential value?

A I'm saying it was the amalgamation of the November 5th meeting, recognition that it was -- that it - that it could have a substantial - you know, that the ITN's values were going to - could be substantial. There's a number of reasons.

Q So when was it that you had this realization that the ITN numbers could be substantial?

A On November 6th when the revised replies came in.

Q So you referenced the July 23rd presentation that Ryan Wannemacher gave.

A Yeah, and Jon Kendrick.
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(Discussion off the record.)
(Recess taken from 2:47 p.m. to $2: 54$ p.m.)
THE WITNESS: Sean, I was thinking about
something. You said a number of times, you know,
that the performance unit could have been hundreds
of million dollars plan. Recognize that you also
had the pension plan that could have been - was a couple hundred million dollars, the retention plans that were a component.

I openly acknowledge that the policy decision around this performance unit ended up being widely unpopular, and I get it. But it was widely discussed and presented. I mean, I undersland the point, though.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q The question, though, is, was the board properly and adequately advised?

A I believe so.
MR. GRANAT: And you believe so. Okny.

## That's fair.

I want to play a portion of the July 23 rd
board meeting. And this is going to be Exhibit 14.
The clip itself is labeled Number 3, just for the record.

MR. MULLEN: I think you want to call it

Exhibit 15, because the board package was 14.
(Exhibit Number 15 was marked for identification.)
(Audio played.)
A SPEAKER: "I will turn it over to
Mr . Wannemacher to explain how the performance units work.

A SPEAKER: So what we're proposing is the adoption of a performance unit plan which would be a new benefit program to enable employces to participate in both the upside and the downside as the business changes.

So employees will be eligible to purchase performance units for $\$ 10$ per unit, and the unis will increase or decrease in value based on the financial performance of JEA over a three-year period.

Employees will be required to remain employed through the end of that performance period to receive any benefit from any (unintelligible). The first performance period would be fiscal years 2020 to 2022, and it's recommended that 30,000 performance units be made available for purchase.

In your packet, you'll find a full summary of the details of this program, but I wanted to walk
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through the board - walk the board through some of the mechanics of how this would work for the first performance period

So the performance units would increase or decrease in value based upon the financial performance of JEA. And before employees would see any benefit from this program, JEA would be required to exceed a challenge target for value over the course of the performance period.

So for the first period -- for the first performance period, the three-year period, employees would need to increase the value of JEA by at least $\$ 300$ million before they would receive any benefit. So between now and 2022, they'd have to exceed $\$ 300$ million in increased value.

If they increase value by more than that $\$ 300$ million, they would be eligible to receive 10 percent of the value that's generated above 300 million. So, for example, if employees increase the value of JEA by $\$ 600$ million, which would represent a substantial increase of over 20 percent in the value of JEA over that three-year period, these performance units would be eligible for 5 percent of the $\$ 600$ million in value that was created. This would equal $\$ 30$ million, or an
average of about $\$ 10$ million per year over that performance period. To put that in perspective, it represents a little more than 6 percent of our total annual payroll.

On the flip side, if the value of JEA was less
than it is today at the end of the performance period, the value of the performance units would decline in value, and employees would experience a loss at the end of the performance period.

In the event that the employees increase the value of JEA but it does not exceed the $\$ 300$ million chailenge, then they would receive no gain -- experience no gain or loss and would simply receive their money back at the end of the performance period."
(Audio stopped.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q So let me ask you some questions about what Mr . Wannemacher said.

He gave an example and said that if the value of JEA increased by $\$ 600$ million, right, that was his example?

A Uhhuh.
Q He said that was a substantial increase, 20 percent increase.

Q And then he kind of put that in perspective and said that's a littie more than 6 percent of total annual payroll; righ?

A That's what he said.
Q Let me ask you, can the value of JEA increase independently of employee performance?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A Independent of employee performance?
Q No? You can't just raise rates and increase the value of JEA?

A You still need employees to perform their duties. I mean, you still need -. and that's a board decision of who has no vested interest in raising rates just to increase the value of a performance unit.

Q I'm just asking, is the value of JEA
completely dependent on employees improving their performance?

A The financial value of any company is predicated on a number of employee performance, market factors, a whole bunch of things that go into the, you know - I mean, that's business. Business is predicated on sales. It's predicated on employee performance. It's predicated on your customers continuing to consume your product. Like-

That's a very large increase, would you agree, in the value of JEA?

A Yeah.
Q Okay. But then he said the PUPs would be eligible for 5 percent of the 600 million; right?

A Right.
Q He didn't use the 10 percent -
A Well, he used the 10 percent earlier to say
10 percent of the overage in the challenge target was 300 million. So what he was doing is simple math -- he was doing simple math, right?

Q Then he said 5 out of the 600 , where he could have said 10 percent of the 300 ; right?

A I'm sure he could have said a lot of things.
Q A litle confusing?
A Not to me.
Q That's not confusing to you?
A And 30 million is - when he - he further clarified that it was 30 million, which would be 10 percent of 300 million.

Q And then he said that would break down to about 10 million a year?
A Yeah, because that was the -- the iden of the performance unit was that it was a three-year measurement period.
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Q But can you just answer the question? Aren't there factors, things that could occur that increase the value of JEA that aren't dependent on improved employee performance?

A We could have a nuclear war and that would have a pretty substantial impact on the value of JEA. I mean, we could have a hurricane and sales would go off dramatically, and that would have an impact on the performance of JEA. So --

Q The things that could happen to increase the value of JEA that aren't dependent on increased employee -

A But what I'm telling you is there are equally a number - there are an equal number of things that have financial impacts on a business that go up and down and that the financial - the employees' performance is one very major factor of that.

Q But it's not the only factor?
A It is not the only factor.
Q You're aware, right, that the - that Ryan
Wannemacher, during his presentation, told the board that the board packet contains a full summary of the plan? Did you hear him say that?

A I believe I heard him say that,
Q And it's true; right? There's a full summary
of the plan and lots of documents that describe the plan in the board materials; right?

A Yeah. Actually, in the July board meeting, we were very specific to include all of the materials on total compensation from beginning of conception through end so that the board had a comprehensive set of documents relative to that.

Q And is it reasonable to expect that the board is going to rely on the materials that you give them in their packets?

MR, MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

You can answer.

## BY MR. GRANAT:

Q Don't you expect the board members to read and understand the materials you give them in the board packet?

A As a board member, 1 always read and understand the materials that I'm asked to vote on.

Q Wetl, as CEO, when you presented the July 23rd
board materials to the board at that time, did you expect that they would read and understand those materials?

A Yeah.
Q You're aware that there's reference in the
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board materials that says that the PUP plan cost would be 3.4 million a year?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A That's in the Willis Towers Watson analysis.
Q Right. And it's in the board packet; right?
A And it was specifically - conflicts with Ryan
Wannemacher's exact statement at the board meeting. So
I'm aware that the number's there. I've seen it.
Q Yeah. Let me point you to it in JEA
Exhibit - it's Exhibit 7, Page 305. Would you turn to it, please?

MR. MULLEN: It's under Tab 4, Page 305.
THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

## BY MR. GRANAT:

Q And this is a slide from the
Willis Towers Watson anulysis; is that right?
A Yes.
Q And it says estimated cost of the performance units to all employees based on current incumbent base salaries is 3.4 million?

A That's based on their recommendation. Their recommendation also only recommended giving it to executives and directors.

Q Did you -

A Which is on Page 306.
Q Well, that's interesting. Did you have a discussion with the board about that?

A That was presented in the June comp committee meeting, and we talked about including all employees.

Q Did you tell the board specifically that the Willis Towers Watson material in the July 23 rd board packet only contemplated executives participating in the PUP?

A Yeah, we reviewed this actual -- we reviewed the presentation in the minutes. If you look at the June comp committee meeting -

Q No. I'm asking you in the July 23rd board meeting. At the time of the July 23 rd board meeting -

A No, we didn't - because this was -- this was historical material provided as additional reference for all board members on top of what was being presented, so it went all the way back to January.

Q So why did you include this. Willis Towers Watson document in the July 23 rd board meeting if it contained information that wasn't applicable to the PUP you were presenting?

A 1 wanted to be complete and comprehensive in providing every single document, including minutes, around total compensation from inception to the time the
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board was going to take an action.
Q Are you aware that board members on July 23 rd reviewed this Willis Towers Watson document and relied on it and relied on the 3.4 million representation of cost?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A I'm not aware of that, but it would seem in the presentation that you got a - you got a number that was tenfold that.

Q If it's the case that board members relied on this Willis Towers Watson number of 3.4 million, would you agree that the board wasn't well advised on what they were passing?

MR, MULLEN: Object to the form of the question. Object to the hypothetical.
A I can'l speak for board members.
Q 1 mean, did you point out to the boasd on
July 23 rd that information that you included in this packet contained a Willis Towers Watson compensation strategy document that was inapplicable, and the figures and numbers in here didn't contemplate the whole company participating?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

A That had been reviewed at the June comp committee meeting and - when the Willis Towers Watson report was reviewed by Jon Kendrick and -- where Towers Watson analysis of JEA versus -- and Jon Kendrick interim, you know, provided the committee with an overview as well as was asked questions related to the Towers Watson presentation. This item was presented for information to the committee.

So I hear you zeroing in on that, but I also provided the total comp philosophy presentation from January's comp committee, the total package and minutes, you know, from that. It was -- everything was produced.

## Q Well --

A To be complete and comprehensive.
Q What would your response be if I told you that the majority of board members who passed the PUP on July 23 rd believed that the cost would be $\mathbf{\$ 3 . 4}$ million as referenced by Willis Towers Watson?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question. Asking the witness for his understanding of other people's perspective.
A I heard the statement in the December 17th board meeting and also in the City Council meeting by Kelly Flanagan to that same effect.

Q And I'm asking you, what is your response to
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that?
We'll use Kelly Flanagan as an example. She believed when she passed that, based on the materials that she reviewed, that the cost would be 3.4 million.

A Again, I also point to that actual board package, the presentation that was presented at the board meeting that said it was 10 percent of the overage, that it gave an example that was tenfold that. So, you know, I understand the conilict. I'm not - I'm not disputing that.

Q Would you agree, then, that she was not well informed of the PUP plan on July 23rd?

A I think I did --
MR. MULLLEN: Object to the form.
A -- my duty 10 inform her.
Q You think that you did your duty even given the fact that she understood the value to be 3.4 million?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A Again, I can't speak to what she believed.
Q Do you think you could have done a better job advising the board of --

MR. MULLEN: Object to the --
Q -- the specifics of the PUP plan?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A I think I followed the advice of OGC in terms of them drafting the resolution. I followed the advice of an entire team. I had - 1 had an entire team review this entire board package before I came to review and approve it.

It was reviewed with the board members one-on-one, and I'm sure my calendar will reflect those meetings.

Q You said that OGC drafled the resolution. Is that Lymne Rhode? Who drafted it? You don't know?

A You know, as I - and I don't know if Lynne reviewed resolutions with, you know -- well, actually, I do know that those resolutions were reviewed by Jason Gabriel and Lawsikia Hodges, because the letter we received on July 22nd stated as much.

Q The Willis Towers Watson document on Page 305 also reflected that there was a cap, a maximum payout?

A As we taiked about earlier, it sounds like that was a drafting error. And it was actually part of OGC's ~ and OGC's review from August to October. As I understand it, that was one of the major points that OGC said needed to be corrected.

Q And let me ask you, the board materials from Page 192

July 23rd, did they contain the actual PUP document or just the summary?

A I don't know the answer to that.
Q Would it have been important to have a copy of the actual PUP plan in the board materials?

A So they contained a very detailed summary which calls out all the major facets of the performance unit. That is atached to Resolution 2019-10. And in the recitals of 2019-10, it says the board has reviewed a summary of the terms and has reviewed all the applicable analysis.

And, in fact, actually, April Green makes a statement ahead of this in that board meeting that she personally wants to assure the public that every board member has had a chance to review all the materials.

Q Right. And so my question is, did the materiais that you provided to the board contain a copy of the actual PUP plan?

A In this board package?
Q The July 23 rd package.
A Apparently not, but I would imagine that the board members - from my recollection, the board members got a copy of the plan or reviewed it.

Q Why isn't it in the board packet materials, though?

|  | Page 193 |  | Page 195 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A I carit answer that question. | 1 | the board about the PUP? |
| 2 | Q Now, you -- | 2 | MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the |
| 3 | A Again, but, you know, the important part about | 3 | question. |
| 4 | the performance unit plan is, okay -- so it was approved | 4 | A 1 feel 1 did my duty to inform the board |
| 5 | on July 23 rd. As the CEO, I took the appropriate | 5 | adequately. It is easy four or five months later, after |
| 6 | measures to make sure that the system of checks and | 6 | a massive political blow-up, to have a different |
| 7 | balances were followed, and at the end of the day, once | 7 | perspective. |
| 8 | there's an issue that was identified, killed it. | 8 | Q Let's look at the next -- |
| 9 | Q You gave testimony at Councilman Diamond's | 9 | A And I think that's being quite clearly played |
| 10 | hearing -- | 10 | out by, you know, one of the board members. |
| 11 | A Yes. | 11 | MR. GRANAT: This will be Exhibit 17, and it's |
| 12 | Q - on December 16th, right? | 12 | labeled as Clip 5. |
| 13 | A 1 did. | 13 | (Exhibit Number 17 was marked for |
| 14 | Q You weren't swom in then, but did you tell | 14 | identification.) |
| 15 | the truth? | 15 | MR, GRANAT: We talked about Ms. Flanagan and |
| 16 | A Yes. | 16 | what she said, so let's hear exactly what she said. |
| 17 | MR. GRANAT: I'm going to play -- because | 17 | (Audio played.) |
| 18 | we've been discussing it and so there's no question | 18 | A SPEAKER: "And since Ms. Flanagan is here, |
| 19 | about it, I want to play another clip from the | 19 | would you like to speak about your contemporaneous |
| 20 | Diamond meeting. And this will be Exhibit 16, but | 20 | thoughts at the time of this board meeting? It's |
| 21 | for the record, the clip is labeled Number 4. | 21 | up to you. |
| 22 | MR. MULLEN: Do you have a time stamp? | 22 | MS. FLANAGAN: All right. |
| 23 | MR. GRANAT: I do, and I can provide that. I | 23 | A SPEAKER: Okay. Do you have a microphone |
| 24 | don't have it right now. | 24 | there? |
| 25 | MR. MULLEN: Okay. | 25 | (Unintelligible.) |
|  | Page 194 |  | Page 196 |
| 1 | MR, GRANAT: But I do have times for these | 1 | A SPEAKER: We'll get you a spot. Here we go. |
| 2 | clips. | 2 | If you'll just state your name for the record. |
| 3 | (Exhibit Number 16 was marked for | 3 | MR. FLANAGAN: Kelly Flanagan, JEA board |
| 4 | identification.) | 4 | member. |
| 5 | (Audio played.) | 5 | A SPEAKER: Thank you, Ms. Flanagan. |
| 6 | A SPEAKER: "Ms. Rhode, l've heard from | 6 | And let me ask you just some generic |
| 7 | multiple board members there were two reasons why | 7 | questions, and I'll give you a chance to speak. |
| 8 | they voted for this plan. That comment, "yes, | 8 | What did you think the cost of the PUP plan |
| 9 | sir", you - you said OGC had approved the plan and | 9 | was at the July meeting when you approved it ? |
| 10 | the $\$ 3.4$ million. | 10 | MS. FLANAGAN: At the time of the vote, I |
| 11 | So that comment caused multiple board members | 11 | believed it to be $\$ 3.4$ mitlion per the |
| 12 | that I spoke to to vote in favor of the plan. So | 12 | Willis Watson report that was within the |
| 13 | if there were - 1 agree with -- well, and | 13 | compensation committee materials included in the |
| 14 | Councilman Diamond. Well, let -" | 14 | board package. |
| 15 | (Audio stopped.) | 15 | A SPEAKER: Is that what you based your |
| 16 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 16 | understanding on, the materials? |
| 17 | Q So that was Councilman Salem, and he had | 17 | MS. FLANAGAN: It is what I based my |
| 18 | heard - and we're going to talk about that later, | 18 | understanding on. |
| 19 | Lynne Rhode answering "yes, sir" to whether OGC approved | 19 | A SPEAKER: Were you briefed on the PUP plan |
| 20 | the plan, and we talked about that a litte bit eartier. | 20 | prior to this meeting? |
| 21 | But the part about the $\$ 3.4$ million, you heard | 21 | MS. FLANAGAN: As I reviewed my calendar and |
| 22 | Councilman Salem doing his diligence. The board members | 22 | diary for the week, I believe that on either Monday |
| 23 | believed that was the cost. | 23 | or Tuesday prior to the board packages being |
| 24 | So I'm just going to ask you, based on that, | 24 | received on Friday was my standing meeting with |
| 25 | do you feel that you did a satisfactory job informing | 25 | Mr. Zahn, and I do not recall the PUP being |

discussed during that meeting.
As you know, this was a three-hour board meeting for which the predominant material that was being discussed in that meeting was the strategic planning.

A SPEAKER: And what was your impression of OGC's role at this point? Did you feel it had been vetted yet by OGC?

MS. FLANAGAN: In the course of delegating
responsibilities to management, I would not have been -- it would not have been unusual for there to be subsequent follow-up required. And as I read the materials that have been produced for this meeting, it does nol surprise me that there was further work to be done between OGC and management. But one of the primary rationales and reasons for voting in favor of this was confirmation during that meeting that it was within the legal realm of the organization so pursue."
(Audio stopped)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Ms. Flanagan is a very smart woman. Would you agrec?

A I think all my board members are very smart people.
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Q Ms. Flanagan is a CPA and a high-level CFO --
A Yes.
Q - right?
Given her, I guess, ultimate misunderstanding of the plan, do you feel the PUP was clearly prosented to her?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
A I feel I fulfilled my duties to provide all the adequate information for boand members to make their own informed decision.

I would also point you to Ryan Wannemacher's direct statements contrary to exactly that 3.4 that are in the mecting right before the vote with a factor of 10 over that 3.4 number?

Q So that would be information contrary to what's in the board packet; right?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A We've already discussed the conflict.
Q And so why wasn't that discussed or brought out?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

BY MR GRANAT:
Q You don't know?
We'll play another clip -
A Again, you know, we're focusing on the performance units. But remember, you also had similar plans like retention and pension, all of which had different impacts on differem employees.

And pension, for example, I was not a very -was a very small beneficiary of that plan. That benefited all - mostly front line and long-iem employees and had very comparable values in terms of dollars, in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars. And, you know -

Q That's a good point, Mr. Zahn. Let's talk about the retention. The retention agreements were given to all employees, and that said in the event of a recapitalization, every employee would receive a bonus of one year's salary over three years.

A In order to retain them at the company, correct.

Q Correct. But that's what it said, right?
A Yeah.
Q But the value of their salary was locked in as of July 23rd, 2019; right?

A I don't think so. I think the retention was
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at the -- it was comparable - no. That was the three-year comparable comp.

I don't know what the - I'd have to read the retention. I don't know if it was locked in. I think it might have included wage increases. So it was at the time of recapitalization.

Q Okay. Well --
A We'd have to go look at the document again.
Q The document would say.
But I guess my question is, the value -- or the cost to JEA of the retention bonus program could be calculated, and it was known how much it would cost JEA; right?

A As with the long-term incentive. You can calculate what it is under a number of different scenarios.

Q My question is the retention bonus program. It was a calculable number that was presented to the board? It was a known number; right?

A It was a known -. it was a number presented as one times the employees' -

Q Current payroll; right?
A At the time of recapitalization.
Q Okay. That's your recollection or if -
A Or whatever --

Q - it was -
A Yeah, we didn't - we'll go look at it. 1 mean, we can go look at -

Q Okay. But it was a known number, right, that you could tell the board, this is how much this plan will cost?

A And pension isn't a known number. Pension, we had a -- we had an actuary do an analysis. But as we all know, actuarial analysis has changed dramatically, and that actuarial analysis for the pension legislation would have been done at recapitalization as well and -which would have gone - maybe two, three years later, that would dramatically shift.

Q But there was a - but there was a large payment contemplated from JEA to the pension fund at recapitalization; correct?

A Specifically for JEA employees.
Q Right. And if the -- if the calculations that were done were wrong for the pension, that was going to be the City's liability in the future to have to pick up those extra payments; right?

A Well, the pension is always the City's liability. It's never been JEA's.

Q Okay. So if the actuarial was off, that was a liability that was going to be on the City --
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A Yeah. But again, so all three of those programs, retention, pension, and performance units -as I said, one of the great degrees of comfon that I drew beyond the systems of checks and balances that were followed after the July 23rd - because if you remember, pension and retention had to be collectively bargained and go through City Council -- was that we had full due diligence, as Ms. Flanagan pointed out, continuing going on. We had the Attomey General going on.

And even on the performance units, in order for them ever to have value, it would have been very widely known at the time of a proposed transaction, because the board would review it and get an opportunity to see exactly what that number is.

To your point, that number would be fixed in a transaction, and the boand would review that number. Then City Council would have the ability to review that number and opine on it and whether they approved it or not. And then a referendum and then regulatory approval and closing before that payment could ever be made for the performance units. And that's exactly the same for the retention and the pension.

Q Well, 1 don't -- 1 don't know that that's accurate, but let me ask you. Let me get back to my question.

|  | Page 202 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A Yeah. But again, so all three of those |
| 2 | programs, retention, pension, and performance units -- |
| 3 | as I said, one of the great degrees of comfort that I |
| 4 | drew beyond the systems of checks and balances that were |
| 5 | followed after the July 23rd -- because if you remember, |
| 6 | pension and retention had to be collectively bargained |
| 7 | and go through City Council -- was that we had full due |
| 8 | diligence, as Ms. Flanagan pointed out, continuing going |
| 9 | on. We had the Attomey General going on. |
| 10 | And even on the performance units, in order |
| 11 | for them ever to have value, it would have been very |
| 12 | widely known at the time of a proposed transaction, |
| 13 | because the board would review it and get an opportunity |
| 14 | to see exactly what that number is. |
| 15 | To your point, that number would be fixed in a |
| 16 | transaction, and the boand would review that number. |
| 17 | Then City Council would have the ability to review that |
| 18 | number and opine on it and whether they approved it or |
| 19 | not. And then a referendum and then regulatory approval |
| 20 | and closing before that payment could ever be made for |
| 21 | the performance units. And that's exactly the same for |
| 22 | the retention and the pension. |
| 23 | Q Well, 1 don't - 1 don't know that that's |
| 24 | accurate, but let me ask you. Let me get back to my |
| 25 | question. |

Why wasn't there a number of scenarios or a worksheet or something provided to the board to show different scenarios of what the PUP might be worth? If it was such easy math, why was there only one example given by Mr. Wannemacher at the board meeting that happened to be inconsistent with the material in the packet that was given?

A So I can't hypothesize as to why
Mr . Wannemacher didn't give multiple scenarios. I can say you might have securities law issues. If you all of a sudden start forecasting the value after you've approved an ITN, you could potentially have procurement law issues. And I'm not a procurement expert. You could have securities law issues. You could have all sorts of issues if you started trying to say - like forecast values out on a public meeting.

That being said, it was discussed with the board members internally as to potential values of JEA. And they were wide ranges.

Q Explain that to me, what you just said. It was - ITN values were discussed with board members?

A No. Prior to the ITN, you had -- you had the PFM report. That was from 2017. That had a number of values in it. You had the council suditor's analysis. That was a public document. That had a number of values
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in it.
So those were public documents that, you know, actually were reviewed at board meetings on - in public.

So there were wide ranges of values, and a lot of them accounted for - you know, could have taken into account - but no one really knew.

Q During the July 23rd presentation to the board before they passed the PUP, why didn't someone from your management leam bring up what would happen under an ITN?

A Actually, Alan Howard asked the question, and it was answered.

Q I understand that. A board member asked the question. But why wasn't that pant of the presentation? And why wasn't it directly addressed?

A Ithink it was directly addressed.
Q You mean the question was answered?
A Yeah.
Q So if that question hadn't have been answered - the question hadn't been asked, then there would have been no mention of what would happen to the PUP-

A 1 can'l rewrite history. There could have
been a whole -- if that question hadn't been answered,
there could have been a whole bunch of other

## questions .-

Q I'm asking you, why wasn't an ITN scenario part of the PUP presentation to the board on that day?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A I think it was. It was discussed. I mean, in the board materials it even talks about recapitalization and impacts of recapitalization on - in the summary, it says -- which would be the direct result of an ITN or and an IPO or a co-op.

Q As the CEO of JEA, did you not believe that it was worthy of a discussion brought up by the management team to the board about what would happen to the PUP in the case of an ITN?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
A We did talk about it one-on-one. You can appreciate not wanting to forecast values right in front of a procurement as well as potential -- and I don't know all the SECs, but 1 can tell you that very rarely would a board or anybody ever want to forecast a value before they ever thought about that type of transaction.

Q So are you telling me that the - the effects of an ITN on the PUP was not discussed openly, brought up by management, in the June 23 rd meeting
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## strategically?

A No, that's not what I said.
Q Well, I'm asking you why it wasn't verbally brought up by your management team for discussion with the boand.

A I didn'1 give the presentation. But I can
tell you management did answer the question as to what recapitalization - and that's not just the ITN. That's IPO. That's everything.

Q And I guess that - my last question on this is -- you're right, it wasn't brought up by your managemert team in their presentation.

A It was answered.
Q As the CEO, before questions were -- it was opened up for questions, did you not feel that it was important to bring up, that it should have been brought up by you or your management team?

A Ifeel--
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A I feel I did my duty to inform board members both one-on-one as well as in board meetings.

And 1 also view my board members, as you already articulated, as quite sophisticated individuals able to formulate their own opinions and ask informed
questions.

> Q Okay.

I'm going to play the next clip. And it was actually a conversation between you and Rory Diamond just before -- it was after a break just before the session started.
(Audio played.)
(Audio played was unintelligible.)
(Audio stopped.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Okay. Can you agree you said, "Rory, look at Tab 0850 on Tab 66."

A Correct. And that references a transcript of the July board meeting where the $\$ 30$ million was pointed out. Because at that point in time, I was just getting very publicly, you know, humiliated for, you know, and charged with the same $\$ 3$-and-a-half-million thing that you've been talking about, and I was pointing him to the transcript where the number was actually tenfold that.

Q And you were referring him to a transcript of the elip we heard earlier of Mr . Wannemacher talking about the $\$ 10$ million .-

A Yeah. So this package was only provided to me for the first time at that meeting.

Q Okay.
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A And I-so I was quickly - you know, my recollection of the July board meeting was that it had been discussed that the number -- you know, that there was - that the 3 and a half million wasn't the number. And then - and I had not watched that clip. I have subsequently since December. But I went really quickly and tried to find, you know --

MR. GRANAT: Okay. Now, I didn't finish playing the clip, because I just wanted to define it.

And what number are we on? Did I -
MR. POWELL: This would be 18.
MR. GRANAT: This is 18. And just for the record, it's -- on the digital file, it's called Number 6.
(Exhibit Number 18 was marked for identification.)

MR. GRANAT: So let me just finish playing the clip of your conversation with Mr. Diamond. (Audio played.)
A SPEAKER: "The description of it all, it talks about 30 million.

A SPEAKER: Yeah.
A SPEAKER: Like so there was discussion, but to your point, not a full vetting, I acknowledge
that. ${ }^{n}$
(Audio stopped.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q So you said there was discussion - you said, there was 30 million. Said "there was discussion, but to your point, not a full vetting, I acknowledge that."

A Okay.
Q Did you say that to Mr. Diamond?
A It's on the recording.
Q And do you agree with that, that there wasn't a full vetting of the PUP at the July 23rd, 2019, meeting?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A No, I do not. In that meeting at the City Council, I was trying to be very conciliatory and trying to take responsibility and -- for a plan that had grown widely unpopular as well as also basically be able to answer questions. And again, I'll remind you it's the same plan that, in consultation with $O G C$, we decided to kill.

All the checks and balances, every single duty of care as a CEO was taken to make sure that this plan was handled accordingly and managed appropriately, and we ended up in the right place.
recapitalization, and your response to me on what the math is is "I haven't done the math yel."

A SPEAKER: $\$ 4$ billion, the threshold value, 1 believe, for 2019 would have been 3.4 billion. And so it would have been 10 percent of $\$ 600$ million, so $\$ 60$ million, I believe, in that instance.

A SPEAKER: Okay. At -"
(Audio stopped.)
BYMR. GRANAT:
Q Now, Mr. Zahn, was that known on July 23rd? MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
A Sure. The PFM report was out. Everybody had the information that was publicly, you know -

Q Did you hear how precise Mr. Wannemacher was able to state that to Mr. Diamond?

A I'll point you back to the page that I pointed you to earlier, which said that the value of the pool is worth 10 percent over the challenge target. I think that's really clear. It's the same math.

Q My question is, did you hear how clear Mr. Wannemacher explained that in one sentence?

A You got to remember, this is three or four months later after a massive political blow-up, and you're in front of City Council in a very contentious Page 212
Q So do you believe there was a full veting of the PUP at the July 23 rd meeting?

A As I've gone back and reviewed the tape, it's far more clear to me. I had not reviewed the July 23 rd board meeting prior to that December 16th meeting.

Q Okay.
A 1 can understand how you can take some -- one or two statements of mine out of context.

Q So you think that statement was taken out of context now?

A As people, we oftentimes try and appease and --

MR. GRANAT: Okay.
I'll play another clip. And this is, again,
from the Diamond hearing. And we'll call this Clip 19?

MR. POWELL: Yes, 19.
MR. GRANAT: And for the record, this one on the digital file is called Number 2.
(Exhibit Number 19 was marked for identification.)
(Audio played.)
A SPEAKER: "Got this right. You're the CFO
of JEA. We're at a hearing to talk about the
enormously expensive plan and the problem with
place. 1 mean -
Q Will you answer the question?
A lam, I think. I hear - I hear it's concise. MR. GRANAT: Lel's continue. I rewound it a litule bit.
(Audio played.)
A SPEAKER: "The threshold value, I believe,
for 2019 would have been 3.4 billion, and so it
would have been 10 percent of $\$ 600$ million, so $\$ 60$ million, I believe, in that instance. A SPEAKER: Okay . At least 60 million? A SPEAKER: So -- yes, that's correct. Now, again, not having - this is all off the top of my head. So .. that's why I want to be careful in the context of the record. But that's the general broad map.

A SPEAKER: Sure. And as we go up a billion dollars more cleared to the City, it goes up pretty enomously to the point where Councilman Salem puts the number up $\$ 1.6$ billion with sufficient amount - not an unreasonable amount cleared to the City; isn't that correct?

A SPEAKER: Again, that was in -- that was reflective of all 100,000 units being allocated. A SPEAKER: Okay. So 1.6 billion divided by
3.

A SPEAKER: By 3.3, ycah.
A SPEAKER: You can do that math,
A SPEAKER: Yeah.
A SPEAKER: It's a lot of money; righ?
A SPEAKER: Understood.
A SPEAKER: Okay. So you're looking at the equation.

A SPEAKER: (Unimelligible.)
A SPEAKER: Please.
We're looking at the equation. You're the CFO of JEA. Lawyers for JEA are saying the equation is spitting out 100 much money and we're having problems. You're making edits to the equation, and you still haven't done the math, that this is going to cost us $\$ 300$ million if we get the sales price right?

A SPEAKER: I don't think there's a record of that.

A SPEAKER: Okny. I don't think there is, either.

Did you ever do this math prior to, say, August of 2019 of what the cost to the City would be if there's a recapitalization event and say we cleared $\$ 4$ billion?
completed. And actually, I believe the audit was done by early December.

Q What audit?
A Our E\&Y financial audit --
Q Okay.
A -- by independent audiors.
Q Okay. The meeting on July 23 rd was a very important meeting. Would you agree with me?

A Yes.
Q There were -- you were asking the board to do a number of significant things that day; right?

A Correct.
Q You're asking them to pass a new compensation
plan?
A Which one?
Q In general, you're asking them to pass a new compensation plan that included an LTI?

A And employment agreements and retention -Q Right.
A -- and pension.
So remember, there's substantial discussion about all of these employee programs being necessary to provide comfort and security to employees to endure -

Q I understand that.
A - pretty substantial, you know -

A SPEAKER: It was -- it was very clear that it was intended to be 10 percent of whatever the amount above the challenge target was, so --

A SPEAKER: Yeah -
A SPEAKER: -- correct.
A SPEAKER: - 1 get -- 1 get the equation, but did you ever plug the numbers in to see that this was a lot of money?

A SPEAKER: It's pretty easy math. And so in the context of the conversation, it's 10 percent of whatever the number is minus 3.4 billion. I -A SPEAKER: Okay. I mean, that's fine --" (Audio stopped.)

## BY MR. GRANAT:

Q So the 3.4 billion is a pretty significant number regarding recapitalization, right, in relation to the PUP?

A Well, it would be almost 50 -plus percent more value to the City than the current contribution. 3.4 billion would a lot of moncy.

Q Right. But it was known to you and Ryan Wannemacher on July 23rd --

A No. The 3.4 billion was deternined by the audit at the end of the year, which would have been September 30th, and that's when the audit started to be
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Q But let me just -
A - disruption to their daily life. That's
normal business. You always do that for your employees.
Q Let's just review that. All that was being
asked of the board on the 23rd was the compensation
plan, your employment contract, SLT members' employment
contracts, changes to the pension; right? All those
things?
A And the ITN.
Q And authorizing pursuit of Scenario 3; right?
A And -- or authorizing pursuit of Scenario 2 .
Q Right. Lots of decisions for this board io
make, would you agree?
A Yeah, and which -- those were all very
rational things to have contemporaneously contemplated.
Q And would you agree that that day, July 23 rd,
was -- and the decisions that the board was going to
make were very, very important?
A And we stressed that to them ahead of the
July 23 rd board meeting. They knew that very well.
Q Now, let me ask you, when were the board
members given the board materials?
A I don't recall. I think they -- they were
given them in different parts and pieces. You have a
document?
document?

A lot of times board members were given paper copies, by the way, for their review, just like I was given paper copies for my review.

Q Okay.
(Exhibit Number 20 was marked for
identification.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Are you saying that because you're anticipating an email that I'm about to show you?

A No. I'm just telling you that very frequently we would provide board members paper copies ahead of time for them to review.

Q Okay. Let me ask you to look at Exhibit 20, which is an email from you to Lynne Rhode, Melissa Dykes, Kerri Stewart, and some others.

A Sure.
Q And it's daled Saturdny, July 20th, 2019-
A Yep.
Q - at 7:17 a.m.
A Yep.
Q And the subject is Full Board Package.
A Right, which would be the full board package. So every single agenda item compiled in the exact order in terms of how it would go out, be distributed to the public.
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Q So it looks like earlier on the 19th there's a message from you that says, "I need to review. Can we plan to send tomorrow? ${ }^{n}$

And then Melissa Dykes responds, ${ }^{\text {n }}$ Copying
Kerri so she can have someone on standby to post tomorrow."

Right?
A Public post
Q And then another email on the 19th from Lymne Rhode that says, "The version of the memo regarding bond counsel is old and needs to be replaced with a final version. I can assist Madricka, or whomever, tomorow with making sure the right document is uploaded."

A Sure.
Q And then your final -- would you read your final response on Saturday, July 20th?

A "Approved once Lynne's comment is addressed. When does team want to get together to finalize board docs for Tuesday? Have those been printed and laid out in my office for review?"

Q Was it normal for the boand materials to be laid out in your office for you to review before they're finalized?

A It was normal for the board package - so
oftentimes pieces of the board package would be distributed well in advance of the actual full board package. Then what would occur is that l'd get an -I'd get an accordion folder ljke that that literally had this document laid out in this exact format that I could literally page-flip to make sure that it had every single document in the right order so -- for my final approval perspective.

Q So reading this cmail, Exhibit 20, on Saturday, July 20th, you're asking when the team wants to get together to finalize the board documents for Tuesday; is that right?

A Correct. To finalize the board package, the full package.

Q So that would mean the boand package wasn't finalized at least as of Saturday, July 201h, at 7:17 a.m.?

A The full public package that would go out to everyone on JEA.com, correct.

Q Oh, so are you saying that the board was given their packages before this?

A I believe so.
Q So the board is given their packets before they're finalized?

A No. They're given - they're given different
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materials that, to your point, we had a lot of very important materials to discuss, and we reviewed those with them.

Q So the board's given the packets in pieces over time?

A Similar to, for example -- great example per our earlier conversation. My employment agreement, sat in my office and went through my employment agreement with April Green and regotiated that with her. We talked about all the major issues of that. She was given a paper copy or emailed it, I don't know.

But, you know, that would be a great example of how you would take a major element of the board package, review with an individual board member to get their insights so that what was eventually finalized and published publicly was something that had, you know, different input from board members and where we could answer their specific questions.

Q So what's your normal practice? To give the board the board package materials in pieces over time or in one concise package?

A Both.
Q And so .-
A And actually, one of my public records requests was for the standardized board preparation
process that the EAs followed.
Q Why wasn't the board packet finalized three days before such an important board meeting?

A Well, one thing is I was waiting on the letter from OGC from Jason Gabriel and Lawsikia and Lynne saying that they'd done their final review before ever issuing a public document.

Q And, again, we talked about --
A I got that on July 29nd.
Again, there were oftentimes where you would have a board package and then an agenda item would get pulled, you know, last minute.

Q Okay.
A That was not uncommon.
Q Again, we discussed earlier that - and $I$ don't remember whether you said you were aware or not -that Jason Gabriel told Herschel Vinyard and Lynne Rhode that OGC had not signed off on the PUP and was going to consider what Pilisbury and Foley had done and were going look at it over time over the next few months.

A And we did that.
Q Right?
A My interpretation of the letter I received was not that, though. So when I read that letter, I read it differently.
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Q Oh.
A That being said, it doesn't matter, because
afler the - after the board approved it, we did work
with general counsel to go through all those reviews we
talked about.
Q Did Herschel Vinyand or Lyme Rhode -
A No.
Q - ever tell you that Jason had said we - OGC had not signed off on the PUP?

A No. Actually, they gave me the letter with his signature on it that referenced the exact resolution for the performance units.

Q With the caveat and the footnote that we aiready discussed, right?

A We did. And $I$ think to your point, that caveat and footnote was part of the impetus, probably, for having done all the thorough review we did with OGC and special counsel and all the formal opinion requests and continuing to do the work, which is what you do in business.

Q So what involvement did Willis Towers Watson have with the final PUP product?

A The legal document?
Q Yes.
A Idon't know.
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And actually, Jon Phillips and Lawsikia, who are here, can attest that I actually dropped into a meeting where Lynne, Herschel, Jason, Lawsikia, and Jon were talking about it in August. I said, guys, if this doesn't have every J and every T dotted and crossed, then just tell me and let's kill it.

Q What was the rush with cramming the PUP through?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
You can answer.
A I reject the premise of that question. I don't see it as cramming the PUP through.

Q Why -- so you don't think the PUP was rushed?
A Clearly not. We issued a -- we issued a formal opinion request to the Attorney General that who knows how long that could have taken.

Q So why pass the resolution before you had that answer?

A Because it was part of the total compensation plan.

Q So why pass the total compensation plan until you have that answer? What was the rush to get that done if you didn'l even know if --

A The board issued .-

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: The board passed an approval to build a new building without having a final lease. It happens all the time. I mean, there's a lot of things where the board approves a policy decision and then asks the CEO to work with appropriate staff consulants and advisers to implement. And if staff finds that there's a problem, they come back to their board and say, hey, we have a problem, which is what I did on November 12th. And April Green confinmed on November 19th.
(Discussion off the record.)
(Recess was taken from 3:47 p.m. to 3:58 p.m.)
MR. GRANAT: A housekeeping matter, we're going to conclude at 5:00, because this has gone way, way slower than I anticipated, and --

MR. MULLEN: How much time do you think you need tomorrow?

MR. GRANAT: - should be way into - I don't know. That's dependent on the responses.

So I can tell you that we've been asked to investigate by the board, and they're taking this very seriously, and we're going to take the time that we need. We're not unnecessarily dragging
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this out. I want you-all to understand that. It's not my intent, so ...

MR. MULLEN: Okay. Can you advise if you have other interviews to conduct after Mr. Zahn's? If you can tell me.

MR. GRANAT: I don't know.
MR. POWELL: For the record, let me just
confirm that we've fully executed the Garrity
statement, and it will be placed at the front of
the transcript, not an exhibit to the - to the proceedings.
(Discussion off the record.)

## BY MR. GRANAT:

Q All right. I'm going to play another clip. This will be 21, Exhibit 21. And for the record, it's labeled Clip 7. And again, this is from - this is from the July 23rd, 2019, meeting.
(Audio played.)
A SPEAKER: "All right. 1 think I understand how it works. And then there's accelerated (unintelligible).

A SPEAKER: Correct.
A SPEAKER; I thought I saw somewhere where it said there were 100,000 units. Is it 30,000 per performance period?

Q At the time that that question was asked, were
A SPEAKER: So the plan document contemplates a program. However, the 30,000 is all that would be authorized under the current fiscal year performance period."
(Audio stopped.)
(Exhibit Number 21 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q And so that was Alan Howard asking if there was acceleration under a recap, and Mr. Wannemacher said, "yes, sir"?

A Yes.
Q And that's the extent of the discussion at the July 23 rd board meeting on the effect of a recap -

## A Idon't know.

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BYMR. GRANAT:
Q If that was all, do you feel that that was sufficient discussion of a recap effect on the PUP? MR. MULLEN: Object to the form.
A It's the board's prerogative what they want to discuss in a public meeting.
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you aware that if a recap occurred, the value of the PUP could be over $\$ 100$ million?

A It could also be negative.
Q Let me ask the question again. At the time that that statement, Clip 7 that we just played, was asked -

A We hadn't -- we hadn't revised -- we hadn't received bids.

Q Let me ask my question. At the time that Mr. Howard asked his question about recap and the effect of a PUP, were you aware that the value of the PUP could have been over $\$ 100$ million?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A If every single hypothetical scenario could exist under the world, then sure, the PUP could be worth $\$ 100$ million. But at the time of that -- how am 1 to -. how am 1 to forecast what the market's really going to bid? I can't - I don't know the value of a security until such time as I know the value of the security.

Q And so you hadn'l considered various scenarios?

A I considered a lot of scenarios, just like any professional investor would.

Q Are you a professional investor or a CEO of

JEA?
A l've been a professional investor in my past life.

Q Okay.
A And so, you know, when you're contemplating any sort of future event, you think, well, it could
be - it's the -- that's why you run scenarios. I mean, there are multiple scenarios, right?

Q So is it wise to run multiple scenarios before you make a business decision?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A Yes.
Q Why weren't multiple scenarios given to the JEA board of directors before they made a decision on this PUP?

MR. MULLEN: Same objection.
A They were.
Q What multiple scenarios were they provided with?

A Which page?
Ryan said if the value went up, it would -they would increase by 10 percent. He said if the value went down, it would be -- it would decrease in value. If the value stayed the same at $3.3-3$ to 3.4 -- 1

Page 230
mean, a number of different scenarios were provided by Ryan during that presentation.

Q All right. Other than --
A That's at least three.
Q Okay. Those are just --
A And then he gave a $\$ 600$ million -. you know,
he gave $a-$ what would that be - a $\$ 4$ billion scenario under that. He also gave that one too.

Q When did he give that? That was in the Diamond hearing?

A Oh, the 600 million. I'm sorry. You're right. The Diamond hearing, was that when he gave the 3.6 billion or -

Q You think he should have given the billion dollar scenario in the July 23 rd meeting, though?

MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A I think we fulfilled our duty of care, and the board members are savvy enough to be able to understand what 10 percent means and see the documents and make informed decisions, and if not, ask appropriate questions, just as Mr. Howard was doing.

MR. GRANAT: All right. That's your position?
Okay. Play another clip. This is -- this is from the Diamond hearing, and it's going to be

Exhibit 22 for us, but the clip itself is labeled Number 8.
(Exhibit Number 22 was marked for identification.)
(Audio played.)
A SPEAKER: "So we have a plan that slarts in March. It's created by management and Willis Towers Watson. It's presented to the board at the end of the meeting. It's unclear to at least one board member that this is not a $\$ 3.4$ million plan, but potentially
hundreds-of-miltions-of-dollar plan in the event of recapitalization. We're looking at the option, and no one at that board meeting in staff at any point discusses the impact of recapitalization on the value of the PUP; is that correct?

A SPEAKER: I think the - just looking here, I think that the answer to the question about recapitalization was something about --

A SPEAKER: If it happens in 30 days, you pay off; right?

A SPEAKER: Actually, on 0853 (unintelligible).

A SPEAKER: lt's paid off at the time if it occurs.
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A SPEAKER: That it would end the performance period.

A SPEAKER: Yeah.
A SPEAKER: Yeah.
A SPEAKER: But that was it.
A SPEAKER: So, you know, at that point in time, you know, again, we -- we had no idea whether or not, you know, recapitalization would ever be pursued. As you might imagine -- and I don't know, Kevin, you can maybe speak to this -- but I think in the drafting of this, it was basically trying to concentrate all potential future options, and that's basically how recapitalization became part of this."
(Audio stopped.)

## BYMR. GRANAT:

Q So Councilman Diamond, in the hearing, basically asked you the same question I did, why wasn't part of the management presentation addressing the recap?

And you said that at the time, meaning
July 23 rd, you had no idea whether recap would be pursued?

A Remember one of the options on the table for the board was basically to -- and when I say pursued,
that would be whether the board -- at the end of the day, the board would have had a choice to make at the end of strategic planning as to whether or not to pursue the status quo, the traditional response, an IPO, a co-op, and that decision wasn't going to be made for, you know - well, it would have been nine months from that date.

Q So did you mean pursued as in a final decision to actually recap?

A Sure.
Q Because at the time, on July 23rd, 2019, recapitalization was certainly being pursued by JEA?

A No. We issued an ITN to understand what the market might bid. We issued -- I'm sure there a lot of bids that get issued in government where government issues a bid, they get a bunch of responses, and they say we're not going to do anything.

Q In your mind, that's not pursuing an ITN, starting the ITN process?

A In my mind, that's getting information from the market. Just like an - you know, just like evaluating your IPO, just like evaluating your co-op.

And at the end of the day, you had 7 policymakers on a board, plus 19 policymakers on the City Council who had to make a decision to actually
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pursue, you know, recapitalization. And candidly, you had 7 board members that had to choose one of those five scenarios, four of which - well, two of which were govemment and three of which had some form of recapitalization.

But one of - the co-op more than likely would have lost -- would have dramatically decreased the value of the performance units. IPO, who knows?

Q How much work had been done on Scenario 3 before the June 23 rd board meeting?

A Substantial discussion with the board members around the minimum requirements for the ITN and initial drafting of the ITN, because we wanted to be in a place where if the board -- no matter whether the board chose Scenario 2 at the July board meeting, we had enough work done that we could start implementing.

And if we had Scenario 3, we could basically start issuing engagements and execute -- and get the ITN out the door and slart -- because that's a public meeting teiling the world that you're about to issue an ITN. And in Florida, the moment you do that, you're going to get nailed with a whole bunch of public records requests, to which you don't want any bidder to get a competitive advantage by getting more information sooner.

So we did -- we did all the work on all the material presented in this board package so that we were prepared which - whichever way the board decided to go.

Q But you did all that work, and the board on July 23 rd may not have given you the go-ahead; right?

A Yeah, that's right.
Q So how much money was spent on the Scenario 3
prior to it being approved on July 23rd?
A Idon't know that answer.
Q Millions?
A What?
Q Millions of doilars?
A I doubt it. You had -- only would be the law firms engaged by OGC, because the -- McKinsey hadn't done any work on it.

Q McKinsey hadn't done any work on what?
A Scenario 3, or recapitalization.
Q Before July 23rd?
A 1 don't think so.
Q You had a meeting at, I think it's called
Club Continental?
A Yes.
Q It was July 10 th through 12 th?
A Uh-huh.
Q What was the purpose of that meeting?
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A The purpose of that meeting was that we had Morgan Stanley, J.P. Morgan, Pillsbury, OGC, communications teams, to basically have a planning session and start thinking about how -- we had to work - we had a mandate from the board in June to come back with all these different scenarios. We had to frame up all the different potential scenarios, $3(\mathrm{~A})$ to (F).

We had to think about how would we execute on that. We had to work on retention, because we were instructed to have employee protection programs.

So it was -- it was a preparation meeting for a lot of the stuff that needed to be done before the July board meeting.

Q Why was it at Club Continental?
A Because you have - we had some 40,50 people.
Q Was that the only place you could find to fit
40, 50 people?
A I don't schedule venues --
Q You didn't choose Club Continental?
A I did not.
Q Did you approve it?
A I don't know. A lot of times my EAs would just handle venue scheduling.

Q Club Continental is a pretty nice, upscale
place, isn't it?
A I'm not going to make that statement.
Q No? You don't think it's a fancy place?
A I don't consider it fancy, but ...
Q What was the cost of the meeting at
Club Continental?
A I do not know the answer to that.
Q Should you?
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the question.
A As the CEO of a multi-billion-dollar company tracking the individual costs of venues? No. I mean, that's not - that's something that was managed by EAs. There's a whole financial team that reviews expenses to make sure they're appropriate --
Q When you say EAs, you mean executive assistants?

A Uh-huh.
Q So at JEA, a public company, the executive assistants decide where we're going to hold meetings?

A A lot of times they'll do the research to find the venues, yeah.
Q Okay. And was this Club Continental meeting catered, breakfast and lunches?

A Yes.
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Q And you don't have any idea what the cost of that was?

A No.
Q You're not concerned with cost? MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question.
A I'm always concerned with costs. That's why 1
have a track record while at JEA of cutting substantia!
costs out of the business, to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars of interest expense and being very cognizant of the profitability of the business.

Q There was a question in the July 23 rd board meeting by Mr. Howard about whether OGC has approved the PUP. Do you recall that?

A l've since watched the tape.
MR. GRANAT: Okay. And just for the record,
let's -- I have that clip. It will be clip 20 --
Exhibit 23, but it's labeled here as Clip 9 on the digital file.
(Exhibit Number 23 was marked for
identification.)
(Audio played.)
A SPEAKER: "This is + you know, absent the
conversation today, this is really a continuation
of the conversation the board of directors has been
having since January of 2019. And so it's a
follow-up, presenting a plan that would have effectively lived in perpetuity on an annual basis, just as other --

A SPEAKER: Sure.
A SPEAKER: 【assume that this - this has been passed by OGC. I know we've got some legal constraints over statutory plans?

A SPEAKER: Yes.
A SPEAKER: Yes, sir.
A SPEAKER: (Unintelligible.)
A SPEAKER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
A SPEAKER: You're welcome."
(Audio stopped.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q So it was kind of a compound question by Mr. Howard, and Lynne Rhode answered, "yes, sir"; right?

A Uh-huh.
Q And we talked about before, and you said you were not aware that Jason Gabriej, before July 23rd, had told Herschel Vinyard and Lynne Rhode that OGC has not reviewed the PUP and has not approved $\mathfrak{i t}$; is that right?

A Again, absolutely in contrary, f'll point to
the July 29nd memo, which my -- when I read it was an approval, to take the appropriate step in that board
meeting but not go through full implementation, which is exactly what we did. We followed the -- we followed all the steps and procedures to diligence and reviewed the matcrials.

Q Well, if --
A That's what I was -- that is the extent of
what I knew was the -.
Q Okay.
A -writen document I received.
Q And I understand that's what you knew.
Let me ask you, as the CEO, if Jason Gabriel had told Lynne Rhode and Herschel Vinyard that he has OGC has not reviewed the PUP and is going to conduct its own legal analysis going forward, do you think that cither Herschel Vinyard or Lynne Rhode should have stated that in this meeting in response to Mr. Howard's question?

A Again, I have no knowledge of what Jason Gabriel said. So you're asking me to opine on a hypothetical.

Q I am asking you a bypothetical.
MR. MULLEN: Object to the form of the
question and to the hypothetical.
A If Lynne and Herschel had specific knowledge
to something to the contrary, then I would expect them
to tell me and anybody else.
Q Should they have spoken up at this meeting?
A I would expect them to tell all the appropriate people.

But again, the writen letter with the signature on it was pretty clear to me and - which is one of the reasons why I didn't question that answer. You know, I read the written letter to be very concisc, which is that the board had the proper authority to move forward.

Q All right.
A Now, to your point, there's a footnote that says you have to go do all this other analysis, and we did exactly that. We followed all the checks and balances.

MR. GRANAT: In the Dianord-Salem hearing, Councilman Salem asked you a question. He was asking you about how the board members were briefed. And I want to play that clip and then ask you a follow-up question. So this will be Exhibit 24, and it's going to be Clip 12 on the digital file. (Exhibit Number 24 was marked for identification.)
(Audio played.)
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A SPEAKER: "Do you know when the board packet for this particular meeting was completed?

A SPEAKER: 1 don't know.
A SPEAKER: Okay. I've spoken to several board members who have reached out to me.

A SPEAKER: Okay.
A SPEAKER: They tell me they got it late
Friday prior to the Tuesday meeting.
Do you -- do you know if the board members were briefed on the PUP plan prior to the meeting?

A SPEAKER: Yes. It's a practice to talk to individual board members and make them apprised of significant elements that are coming up in board meetings.
A SPEAKER: No, I understand that's the practice, and I was told that normaily occurs. For this meeting, though, l'm talking about.

A SPEAKER: My recollection, yes.
A SPEAKER: Okay.
A SPEAKER: I haven't -- don't recall deviating from that practice.

A SPEAKER: Okay. Well, I have -- 1 understand from board members that they got the packet late Friday and were not briefed. So if you could provide any information to suggest they were,

I would be interested in that.
A SPEAKER: Okay."
(Audio stopped.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q So he invited you to produce information that suggests that you did brief the board. Did you do that, or do you have that?

A I've done a public records request for my
calendar over 14 days ago, 1 think --
Q Okay.
A -- to try and get the calendars of when all the briefings would have occurred.

Q So the briefings with the board members would be on your calendar?

A Yeah.
Q Okay.
A Actually, correct the record. John Mullen of Phelps Dunbar did the public records request. I did not.

MR. MULLEN: That's correcl.
MR. GRANAT: Is that one of the items that you requested expedition on? I don't remember if it was emails --

MR. MULLEN: I think the emails was requested for expediting. The calendar may not have been.
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MR. GRANAT: Okay. We can sort that out.
MR. MULLEN: But if you would, Sean, since
we're talking about it, it would be good to
expedite that. It should be obtainable from your
folks. Usually the calendar and the emails are part of a Microsoft inbox.

THE WITNESS: I'm surprised at how long it's
taken to just fill that, because I know how fast
JEA is with public records on -- for everybody.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Okay. What's your understanding of how the PUP units were going to be allocated?

A So that was a decision to be made by Camille Lee-Johnson. Certainly, again, we never got around to allocation. I know 1 had a number of employees ask, you know, certainly as they started doing - as they stanted kind of calculating, I had employecs say that they wanted as many performance units as they possibly could get.

I did think about -- you know, the Willis Towers Watson, which is what you're -- what you're pulling up, recommends just executives and directors. As discussed, you know, that was very contrary to my philosophical belief and that it was going to be to 100 percent of employees.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I had thought through scenarios where they } \\
& \text { would be ratably distributed across all employees } \\
& \text { equally. I thought about scenarios where there were } \\
& \text { different grades, you know, based on the grade of the } \\
& \text { employee. } \\
& \text { So, you know, there was a number of, call it } \\
& \text { scenarios that got played out in my head, but we never } \\
& \text { got to a place where I discussed anything with Camille } \\
& \text { about formal allocation. } \\
& \text { Q So you never got to a place where you had a } \\
& \text { recommendation for her -- } \\
& \text { A No. } \\
& \text { Q -- as to how it should happen? } \\
& \text { A Correct. } \\
& \text { Q Well, l'm going to -- I'm going to ask you } \\
& \text { about what's Exhibit } 14 \text {, the July } 23 \text { rd board packet on } \\
& \text { Page -- and the Bates stamp is Zahn } 339 . \\
& \text { MR. MULLEN: That's in there. } \\
& \text { Did you say } 339 \text { ? } \\
& \text { MR. GRANAT: } 339 \text {, right. } \\
& \text { BY MR. GRANAT: } \\
& \text { Q Yeah. And before I ask about this, you had } \\
& \text { said that some employees had mentioned to you they want } \\
& \text { as many units as they could get. } \\
& \text { A Yeah. }
\end{aligned}
$$
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Q Who are those employees who said that to you?
A Oh, I'd say, you know, a lot of my senior leadership team, a lot of directors. I would oftentimes - you know, we actually, after the July 23rd board meeting, had a leadership meeting with 400 people where we just talked about how a total comp would have been approved and --

Q Can you name me any specific people you recall who said they wanted as many units as they could get?

A So there would be people whose names I don't even recall that said, you know, they were interested in the performance units. But my entire senior leadership. You know, directors -

Q What are their names?
A So you've got Melissa Dykes, Ryan Wannemacher, Herschel Vinyard, Kerri Stewart, Steve McInall, you know - keep just rattle them off, I mean ...

Q Do you remember - do you recall any non-senior leadership team members expressing to you that they would want as many units as they could get?

A Yes.
Q Who were they?
A Different people in the finance and accounting department, but I don't recall their names, because I had a hard time tracking 2,000 --

Union leaders. Actually, I remember we talked about them with union leaders, and a couple of the union jeaders, Valerie and -- what are their names?

Q Which union -
A Well, that's IBW.
Q Right.
A We talked about it with them, and they were very interested.

And remember, this is on the heels of nine months of conversation with -- in a lot of town halls about trying to get employees financially vested in the financial success of the business. So people were, you know -- they were interested in it.

Q You said you had a meeting with 400 employees. Was that to discuss the PUP?

A No. We did board downloads. So afler each board meeting, we would have a board - a leadership meeting at the library, where we'd go through, here's what was discussed at the - you know, at the board meeting, here's the results, here's these kinds of things.

And then after that we would have a meeting with the union leaders to inform the union leaders so that they could inform their members, and we would cover the same things.
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Q And where was the union leader meeting?
A That was on the 16 th floor in one of our conference rooms.

Q And that was after July 23rd?
A Correct.
Q And is that the 400 -person meeting?
A No. That's the union leaders. The union leaders are 15.

Q Okay.
A It's the union business managers and a couple of their stewards, right?

Q So the 400-person meeting, was that -- which meeting was that?

A That's the leadership meeting.
Q The leadership meeting.
A And that is all managers and above, all appointed.

Q And that was at the library?
A Uh-huh.
Q And at that library meeting, the leadership meeting, would that have been in July?

A Don't know. It would be on my calendar.
Q It would be after July 23rd?
A It would be after July 23 rd.
Q Did you discuss the PUP at that leadership

|  | Page 249 |  | Page 251 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | meeting? | 1 | A Yes. |
| 2 | A I'm sure. We discussed everything that would | 2 | Q And then the next column says Market, and |
| 3 | happen at the board meeting. Any actions that were | 3 | under Executive, it says 40 percent; Director 8 percent? |
| 4 | taken, we would -- | 4 | A Yep. |
| 5 | Q What did you tell the leadership about the PUP | 5 | Q And so what does that mean? |
| 6 | in that July meeting -- or the post -- | 6 | A That means that the market says that |
| 7 | A I don't recall. | 7 | executives typically get 40 percent of the LTI |
| 8 | Q -- 23rd meeting? | 8 | opportunity and directors get 8 percent. And, you know, |
| 9 | You don't know? | 9 | LTI is a percent of salary is how that -- if you read |
| 10 | A No. | 10 | the second bullet. |
| 11 | Q Are those meetings recorded? | 11 | Q So would that mean that the executives would |
| 12 | A I don't know. | 12 | have the opportunity to eam 40 percent of their salary |
| 13 | MR. MULLEN: Did you say "I don't know"? | 13 | through an LTI? |
| 14 | THE WITNESS: I don't know. | 14 | A That would mean that the market -- so, you |
| 15 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 15 | know, public utilities, comparable companies, lOUs, |
| 16 | Q Okay. So - | 16 | everybody would have the opportunity to earn 40 percent |
| 17 | A And those would be typically presented by | 17 | of their salary annually in a long-term -- |
| 18 | different senior leadership that -- you know, relative | 18 | Q Okay. |
| 19 | to what was going on. So HR would present, safety would | 19 | A - program. |
| 20 | present, and he presented a whole bunch of stuff, and | 20 | Q And when you say IOUs, that's an |
| 21 | then after the board meetings, he'd also present, here's | 21 | investment-owned utility? |
| 22 | what happened -- here's what happened at the board | 22 | A Investor-owned. |
| 23 | meeting, here's major actions, this is what you need to | 23 | Q Investor-owned. |
| 24 | be aware of so that as your members -- as your people | 24 | And does that mean it's a private company? |
| 25 | ask questions, you can be informed. | 25 | A Yes. But I .. Willis Towers Watson included |
|  | Page 250 |  | Page 252 |
| 1 | Q Were you at the leadership meetings? | 1 | government entities as well. |
| 2 | A Yes. | 2 | Q Okay. İ understand. I just wanted to be |
| 3 | Q Was your entire senior leadership team at | 3 | clear on what an IOU is. |
| 4 | these leadership meetings? | 4 | Okay. So then the second part of this, it |
| 5 | A Unless they were on leave, | 5 | says Directors, then - across to Market have an |
| 6 | Q Okay. | 6 | opportunity to eam 8 percent of their annual salary |
| 7 | A And so were all the directors and managers of | 7 | through an LT] program -- |
| 8 | the company. 400 people. | 8 | A Correct. |
| 9 | Q So back to Exhibit 14, which is the July 23rd | 9 | Q -- is that right? |
| 10 | board packet. I referred you to Page Zahn 339. This is | 10 | So - and then the third column under the |
| 11 | a product from Willis Towers Watson; is that right? | 11 | third charl is what was being proposed for the LTI plan? |
| 12 | A Correct. | 12 | A That's what Willis Towers Watson proposed. |
| 13 | Q And I want to make sure I'm understanding | 13 | Q Okay. And so Willis Towers Watson proposed |
| 14 | this. I'm looking at the chart, and there's - I guess | 14 | the executives would have an opportunity to carn equal |
| 15 | there's three -- there's four charts, and I'm looking at | 15 | to the market 40 percent of their salary? |
| 16 | the third one that says LTI Opportunity Percentage. | 16 | A That's correct. |
| 17 | A Uh-huh. | 17 | Q And directors would be - it was proposed they |
| 18 | Q And there's a Current and -- with all dashes, | 18 | could eam 5 percent of their salary; right? |
| 19 | and there's - I guess the columns are Executive, | 19 | A Correct. |
| 20 | Director, Manager, Individual Contributor, and | 20 | Q But that's under market? |
| 21 | Bargaining Units. | 21 | A Correct. |
| 22 | A Uh-huh. | 22 | Q Why would that be? |
| 23 | Q And so am I correct that this third column, | 23 | A I don't know. You'd have to ask Willis Towers |
| 24 | LTI Opportunity Percentage, Current, is what does JEA | 24 | Watson. |
| 25 | currently have regarding an LTI ; is that right? | 25 | Q Did you not ask Willis Towers Watson about |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | this? | 1 | or -- |
| 2 | A This was a work product that I - I had maybe | 2 | A No. Just -- |
| 3 | one or two meetings to talk about general direction. | 3 | Q -. just what we were talking about? |
| 4 | Q I see. And then they had proposed 3-up to | 4 | A Just what we were talking about. 1 |
| 5 | 3 percent for the managers? | 5 | philosophically, just as an individual and a CEO, don't |
| 6 | A Yes. | 6 | believe that that's the way you should skew long-tern |
| 7 | Q And then 1 percent - 3 percent for individual | 7 | incentive. |
| 8 | contributors? | 8 | Q Okay. Now - |
| 9 | A Yes. | 9 | A Now, at the end of the day, that wasn't going |
| 10 | Q What is an individual contributor? What would | 10 | to be my call, so ... |
| 11 | that mean? | 11 | Q So we're talking about Zahn 339; right? |
| 12 | A An appointed individual that isn't a manager | 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | of people that contributes individually. | 13 | Q And this was material that was provided to the |
| 14 | Q And then bargaining units, it was proposed | 14 | board? |
| 15 | that they could earn up 1 percent of their salary; | 15 | A Uh-huh. |
| 16 | right? | 16 | Q Did you inform the board members that there |
| 17 | A That's what Willis Towers Watson - | 37 | were portions of the materials here that you were not in |
| 18 | Q And that would be all the union members? | 18 | agreement with? |
| 19 | A Correct. | 19 | A Yeah, specifically my 50 th percentile |
| 20 | Q That's the majority of JEA? | 20 | salaries, would be a great example of that. Another |
| 21 | A 1,600 people. | 21 | good example would be the 50th percentile compensation |
| 22 | Q As opposed to 400 in management and appointed? | 22 | for senior executives, which is $\mathbf{4 2}$ percent below market. |
| 23 | A Correct. | 23 | 1 didn't favor raising all of their salaries to be at |
| 24 | Q And so if you were to look at this chart, that | 24 | the .- |
| 25 | would suggest that the PUP would be distributed or | 25 | Q Okay. Other than salaries, though, did you |
|  | Page 254 |  | Page 256 |
| 1 | allocated in a proportion that favored executives? | 1 | inform them that you didn't agree with other things? |
| 2 | A That's what Willis Towers Watson recommended. | 2 | A Yeah. |
| 3 | Q Okay. And this is information that you -- | 3 | Q What else? |
| 4 | were you not aecepting that, or did you -- | 4 | A We talked about short-term programs which |
| 5 | A No. | 5 | we're under market on. So JEA is below market on that. |
| 6 | Q You weren't? | 6 | And we chose not to touch the short-ierm pay for |
| 7 | A So I'll take you to Zahn 322, which is CEO | 7 | performance program. Instead, what we chose to do - |
| 8 | Competitive Market Pricing, where the average base | 8 | because, again, the principal thing -- and the quote in |
| 9 | salary is, you know, of combined market group, is | 9 | that that you played, references exactly that - it was |
| 10 | \$800,000. The target bonus was 100 percent, so the | 10 | a seven- or eight-month period of time where we were |
| 11 | average total compensation in a year was $\mathbf{\$ 1 . 2}$ million. | 11 | trying to get all of our employees financially vested in |
| 12 | The employment agreement I negotiated for | 12 | the health and financial success and long-term value of |
| 13 | myself was well off the 50th percentile of what was | 13 | the business. So if you had union people that only got |
| 14 | recommended by Willis Towers Watson. | 14 | I percem, that doesn't do a whole lot. |
| 15 | So yeah, you get -- you get compensation | 15 | Q Okay. I'm going to ask you to look at Zahn |
| 16 | consultants that give you a whole bunch of data, but at | 16 | 333. |
| 17 | the end of the day, policy decisions are decisions that | 17 | MR. MULLEN: You got the pages out of order. |
| 18 | get made by the board, and you work to do what you think | 18 | Here it is, right here. I'll put it back in order. |
| 19 | is in the best interest of your entire company. | 19 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 20 | So yeah, 1 reject -- 1 point-blank rejected | 20 | BY MR. GRANAT: |
| 21 | this proposal, because Ithought that more of it should | 21 | Q This is part of the Willis Towers Watson chart |
| 22 | be skewed down towards the individual contributor on the | 22 | that was presented to the board on July 23rd, and under |
| 23 | front line. | 23 | the Public Power Utilities, under Prevalence, it says, |
| 24 | Q When you say you rejected this proposal, do | 24 | Long-Term Incentive Plans Are Used Selectively - |
| 25 | you mean the Willis Towers Watson proposal in total | 25 | A Uh-huh. |


|  | Page 257 |  | Page 259 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q - right? | 1 | changed. |
| 2 | Now, I know that Councilman Diamond had asked | 2 | Do you know who changed it? |
| 3 | you about a different version in the hearing, and I just | 3 | A SPEAKER: It would have to be |
| 4 | want to turn to that real quick. That's in Exhibit 7. | 4 | Willis Towers Watson. |
| 5 | The Diamond material is on Page 519 -- well, it starts | 5 | A SPEAKER: They would have done that? Why |
| 6 | on Page 519, but it's actually on Page 523. | 6 | would they change the word "uncommon" to |
| 7 | MR. MULLEN: What was the tab number, Sean? | 7 | "selectively"? |
| 8 | THE WITNESS: I got it. | 8 | A SPEAKER: So this is a dmft, and 1 know |
| 9 | MR. GRANAT: It's 523, and it's Tab - | 9 | between this draft and the fimal, they did a lot of |
| 10 | THE WITNESS: 33. | 10 | work (unintelligible). |
| 11 | MR. GRANAT: -33. | 11 | A SPEAKER: Okay. And did anyone at JEA have |
| 12 | BY MR. GRANAT: | 12 | the ability to edit these documents prior to the |
| 13 | Q And do you recall that conversation with | 13 | presentation to the board? |
| 14 | Councilman Diamond -- | 14 | A SPEAKER: Not that I'm aware of. |
| 15 | A Yeah. | 15 | A SPEAKER: Okay. All right. We can follow |
| 16 | Q -about that? | 16 | up with them." |
| 17 | A They say two different things. | 17 | (Audio stopped.) |
| 18 | Q Yeah. Let me jusi - jusi so we're on the | 18 | BY MR. GRANAT: |
| 19 | same page, let me play that. I have that clip cued up. | 19 | Q So I want to ask you, you said that |
| 20 | If's Exhibit 25, but it's going to be on the digital | 20 | Willis Towers Watson had done some more diligence -- |
| 21 | file Clip 10. | 21 | A Ycah. |
| 22 | (Exhibit Number 25 was marked for | 22 | Q -- and then made the change. |
| 23 | identification.) | 23 | Do you know if there are other public power |
| 24 | (Audio played.) | 24 | utilities who have long-term -- |
| 25 | A SPEAKER: "You want to look at JEA 0523. | 25 | A I'm not a compensation specialist. You know, |
|  | Page 258 |  | Page 260 |
| 1 | That is under Tab 33. | 1 | I pushed Willis Towers Watson. I said, look, surely |
| 2 | For your information, this is that original | 2 | there have to be some, because they gave us -- you know, |
| 3 | Willis Towers Watson draft document that you guys | 3 | a lot of compensation consultants will give you a first |
| 4 | were taking a look at. You see the chart there? | 4 | draft and they'll give you a whole bunch of stuff, and |
| 5 | You and I discussed it carlier. | 5 | you give them feedback. |
| 6 | A SPEAKER: 05 -- | 6 | Q So you're not aware of whether they found |
| 7 | A SPEAKER: Based on -- it's Number 40523. | 7 | others -- as we -- |
| 8 | A SPEAKER: Yes. | 8 | A As 1 understand, you know, it says for those |
| 9 | A SPEAKER: Okay. So when we looked at this | 9 | public power utilities with LTI plans, eligibility |
| 10 | before, we were kind of walking through the fact | 10 | typically -- |
| 11 | that long-term incentive plans are unusual in | 11 | So they must have found some plans if they can |
| 12 | public power utility companies and that they're not | 12 | make that statement. |
| 13 | unusual in investor-owned companies. And it says | 13 | Q As we sit here today -- |
| 14 | there in that Prevalence box that they are | 14 | A Yeah. |
| 15 | uncommon. | 15 | Q -- are you aware of any other public power |
| 16 | And then if you look at this document that's | 16 | utility that has an LTI plan? |
| 17 | posted behind me -- it's also in your packet - | 17 | A I'm not from the public power space, so I |
| 18 | that exact same chart is replicated to the word | 18 | don't have -- |
| 19 | except for - and you'll see - instead of saying | 19 | Q Well, you -- you're not from the public power |
| 20 | LTI plans are uncommon, it says, LTI plans are used | 20 | space? |
| 21 | selectively. | 21 | A l've always been in the private side. |
| 22 | At some point between this Watson Towers | 22 | Q But you're the CEO of JEA. |
| 23 | report that you-all paid for and when you provided | 23 | A Sure. i have been. |
| 24 | the information to the board -- and this comes | 24 | Q So you are, right, at least since -- when did |
| 25 | right out of the board members' packet -- it was | 25 | you start with JEA? |

A April of 2018.
Q Okay. I mean, so --
A And I was focused on a lot of facets of running the business as opposed to going and investigating long-term compensation plans of other public utilities. So 1 was focused on de-leveraging the business. I was focused on making rates lower. I was focused on dealing with Vogle. I was focused on a lot of other things that were higher priority to me.
Q And I'm just simply asking if you had received information about any other power -- public power utilities or if, as we sit here today -

A 1 have not.
Q -- do you know another that has such a thing?
And you do not?
A No.
Q Okay.
A As Jason Gabriel's, you know, letter on the 12th says, that this is in all context and --

Q Have you ever heard of the PUP called a unicom, described as a unicom?

A No.
Q Have you heard anybody call it that?
A No.
Q You said no?
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A No.
Q Okay.
A A unicom?
Q A unicom.
A I don't -I don't even understand that question.

Q Yeah. I'm just saying have you heard any of your senior leadership team members refer to the PUP as a unicorn or describe it as a unicom, meaning unique or --

A No.
Q -- one of a kind?
A No.
Q Or something that doesn't exist, perhaps.
Did any JEA employees ever suggest to you that they thought the PUP was a bad idea?
A No.
Q Did any JEA employees ever inform you of any concerns they had with the PUP at any time?

A No.
There was dis -- to be -- now, there was discussion around the performance units similar to the retention agreements and the pension programs about, you know, public consumption - you know, perception of it, but not as a matter of policy.
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A Well, so very frequently banks put nicknames on projects.

Q Okay. So that's common?
A l's a very common market practice.
Q Okay. So there's no element of secrecy or code name --

A No. They typically picked some idiosyncrasy of, you know, the company or whatever and then make up the name. And obviously Jacksonville --

Q Lynyrd Skynyrd ..
A Lynyrd Skynyrd.
Q -- Freebird? Okay. That makes sense.
A Just like - and I'm surprised the news never picked this up - Scampi, do you know where it comes from?

Q is it the mascot for the Jumbo Shrimp?
A Yeah.
Q Okay.
A Favorite pink mascot.
Q Okay. So did Project - when did Project
Freebird start? When J.P. Morgan starred its work on the ITN?

A Yeah, I mean, that would be-- so if they started working on kind of drafting it, that would be when they would call it -. they'd give it a nickname and
they'd -- that's how they would track it internally.
Q Was the nickname Project Freebird widely known to your senior leadership team that Freebird was the ITN?

A It got changed to Scampi really quick. So 1 want to say within a matter of weeks of the issuance of the ITN it went from Project Freebird to Project Scampi. Because I'm a Jumbo Shrimp fan, and 1 like - 1 like Scampi.

Q And so was Freebird solely ITN?
A No. Well - no. It was IPO and co-op too. It was all the work that J.P. Morgan and Morgan Stantey and Pillsbury and everybody -- so Scampi -- we would have frequent Scampi calls, and they would send around agendas for Project Scampi, and in that would have updates on, you know, Vogtle structuring, tax issues, the ITN in terms of, you know - obviously once there's drafting of the ITN, right? So that's where you get a lot of work.

But once the 1TN was drafled and issued, then that was handed off to - that was handed off to procurement, and they managed that. And then Project Scampi updates became more about IPOS and -- and kind of the mechanics of it.

MR. GRANAT: Okay. Just so we can get some
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reference of time, let me give you Exhibit 26.
(Exhibit Number 26 was marked for
identification.)
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q And this is a J.P. Morgan document; correct?
It says Project Freebird on the front. And on the
second page it says, "Meeting agenda: July 10th through 12th" -

A Sure.
Q -- which was the Club Continental meeting; right?

A Uh-huh.
Q And so if we review it on - actually, on Page 2, the printed Page 2, there's kind of a time schedule. And it says, Draft Invitation to Negotiate, which is the ITN, with a due date of July 19th. And it shows a lot of work being done prior to the July 23rd --

A Yep.
Q - board meeting. And carlier you explained why that was.

A Yeah, and banks will oflentimes do free work to try and earn business.

Q And if you look on Page 7, there's an estimated -- basically a timeline set out for -

A Sure.

Q - a lot of activities would happen resulting in a successful ITN?

A This is a very o- well, absent the ITN, this
is a -- this is a very standardized, call it, you know, scheduling process, if that makes sense.

Q Okay. And this was the rough schedule that you were going to follow; correct?

A No. This, if you recall, was the first meeting we talked about. So this probably was a draft that was presented by -- produced by J.P. Morgan for review and input.

Q Okay. That's fair.
A And ultimately, Melissa started tracking with J.P. Morgan and Morgan Stanley, as the world cominued moving forward, all - a far more detailed project schedule.

Q So why did the name change to Scampi?
A Because I'm a Jumbo Shrimp fan.
Q Just because of that fact? Because you didn't like Freebind?

A Well, I like Freebird. Don't get me wrong.
Q Okay. All right.
A My prerogative as the CEO, I wanted the pink mascot.

Q Okay. Do you know exactly when you changed to
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Scampi?
A No.
Q I have - we'll call it Exhibit 26. I have an
email here where you request the change on July 25 th.
A Okay.
MR. MULLEN: Sean, just for the record, 1
think you called the Morgan Stanley document 26.
MR. POWELL: That's 27.
MR. MULLEN: So then the new one is 27.
MR. GRANAT: Can I see that? Can I have that?
Thank you, John.
We'll call this email that's dated July 25th
from Aaron Zahn Exhibit 27.
(Exhibit Number 27 was marked for
identification.)

## BY MR. GRANAT:

Q So do you know, is that the date that it was changed? Was it earlier? Was it around then?

A This would probably be me asking them - this was the working group team, and just saying, you know, let's get all on the same page. If you're going to use a word, use it.

Q Okay.
A Now, 1 know that Freebird -- the word Freebird would track every once in a while and I'd see it, but it
wouldn't make any comments on it.
Q Okay. Are you aware of a public record request being made for docurnents relating to Project Freebind inside JEA?

A Idid not manage public records.
Q I understand that.
A I'm not aware of it.
Q So you're not aware of there being a very frequently made request for Freebird-related documents?

A The public records department is three or four rungs removed from me in the organization.

Q That's truc.
A Yeah.
Q Just for the record, you're not aware of a frequently made request --

A I did not track public records unless they were elevated to my --brought to my attention.

Q Okay.
A Generally speaking, they would pertain to me.
Q But are you aware of a frequently made request for Freebind documents at JEA?

A No, I'm not aware of that.
Q So the mame Freebird wasn't changed to Scampi to avoid a public records request?

A No.
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(Exhibit Number 28 was marked for
identification.)
BYMR. GRANAT:
Q The next exhibit is going to be 28. Let you review this. And can you tell us what is Exhibit 28 is, please.

A This is a copy and paste of text messages sent by Mike Hightower to me in the December time frame late December time frame that I decided to put into his human resource file.

Q Are there - are these the messages that Mike Hightower sent to you?

A It's a compilation. So a lot of the rambling ones are. And then, I want to say that - it's all his all the way down to the line "agreed," and then "at your convenience," and then he continues on.

Q So "agreed" and "at your convenience" are yours?

A Yeah. I tried not to respond to these. They were sent when he was extremely intoxicated.

Q Okay. So this is a full recount of -
A I think what I did was copy and paste and then send it to Angie, because we were having substantial issues with performance as well as alcohol utilization.

Q Well, I'm just asking if your responses were
included in this --
A Yes.
Q -- or were your responses removed --
A No, they're included in this.
Q Okay.
A They were one-word answers because I was very aware of what - once 1 read something about "it's time for me to exit and move on" from an employee, that, to me, signals send this to HR.

Q Okay. I have requested a number of documents through your attomey, and you've produced a large number of them, and I did not see any tex1 messages.

MR. MULLEN: I can address that, Sean.
They're actually being processed right now. But there's a limited number.

MR. GRANAT: Okay.
MR. MULLEN: And the primary reason there's a
limited number is that Mr. Zalnn's -as he looked
into this, his iPhone is set at a standard
30-day - 30 days is the life of the
text messaging. So he does not have any
text messages that are --
THE WITNESS: Personal or otherwise.
MR. MULLEN: -- more than 30 days from today, whether that's from JEA business, his family,
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whatever it might be; it's a 30 -day deletion period.
BY MR. GRANAT:
Q Is that a setting that you --
A No,
Q -- put on your phone --
A No.
Q - intentionally?
A No. I upgraded my phone, and I guess it's
like a standard setting.
Now, I did produce my phone oflentimes at JEA for them to scan for records, and they did that oflentimes, so ...

Q Well, I can tell you, Mr. Zahn, your attomey let me know that. And I checked and was told that that was done once, and it was in August of 2018.

So you believe it was done more recently than that? Because l'd certainly like to know that.

A I believe so, but --
Q Do you know who the person was with IT who did
it , who did the scanning?
A No, I don't.
Q Do you have an iPhone?
A Yes.
Q What model is it?

|  | Page 273 |  | Page 275 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A lt's an 11. | 1 | MR. MULLEN: I think it does. |
| 2 | Q And how long have you had the iPhone I1? | 2 | MR. POWELL: * as to whether or not Mr. Zahn |
| 3 | A A month, a month and a half. A little bit | 3 | had an obligation to retain his texts, which were |
| 4 | more, maybe. | 4 | public records, they dealt with JEA - |
| 5 | Q So did you -- did you purchase your iPhone 11 | 5 | MR. GRANAT: That's finc. But actually - |
| 6 | after the December 17th board meeting? | 6 | MR. MULLEN: What Mr. Granat reported is that |
| 7 | A 1 don't know. I'd have to go back and look. | 7 | there was very littic effort. There's apparently |
| 8 | Could have been. It's around that time, probably. | 8 | only one effort ever made to obtain Mr. Zahn's |
| 9 | My iPhone 10, or whatever it was, was | 9 | texts. |
| 10 | having - wasn't taking pictures of my children. It | 10 | MR. GRANAT: And I believe that was at |
| 11 | wasn't doing things right. It was having issues. And | 11 | Mr. Zahn's request. But I'm going to ask you to |
| 12 | so I was eligible for a free upgrade, and I upgraded. | 12 | let me conduct my interview, please. |
| 13 | Q Well -- so you think you've had it for about a | 13 | THE WITNESS: What I will offer to you is that |
| 14 | month, but it's been more than a month since the | 14 | we coordinated with OGC as well as IT to use |
| 15 | December 17th board meeting. | 15 | GroupMe to communicate amongst JEA senior |
| 16 | A Okay. | 16 | leadership, and that's how we --if we used |
| 17 | Q So since you've been on administrative leave, | 17 | messaging, that's what we used. And that was |
| 18 | do you recall getting a new phone? | 18 | coordinated with OGC to retain those records. |
| 19 | A It's either in or around that meeting or, you | 19 | MR. GRANAT: Okay. It's 5:00. |
| 20 | know, after or before. But again, I'd have to go look | 20 | (Sworn statement adjourned at 5:00 p.m.) |
| 21 | at the actual records. | 21 |  |
| 22 | Q And prior to getting that new phone, were your | 22 |  |
| 23 | texts saved -- | 23 |  |
| 24 | A Yes. | 24 |  |
| 25 | Q --more than 30 days? | 25 |  |
|  | Page 274 |  | Page 276 |
| 1 | A Yeah, to my knowledge. | 1 | CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER |
| 2 | Q When did you discover that your phone was set | 2 |  |
| 3 | to delete texts afler - | 3 |  |
| 4 | A When John called me and said, hey, you know, | 4 | STATE OF FLORIDA |
| 5 | we need the records from this date to this date, and I | 5 | COUNTY OF DUVAL |
| 6 | started going back and through and realized that | 6 |  |
| 7 | effectively I don't have my wife's text messages. I | 7 |  |
| 8 | don'1 have anybody's text messages. And tried -- and I | 日 | 1, HEATHER M. THOMAS, Court Reporter and |
| 9 | didn't even know it was a setting. | 9 | Notary Public, State of Florida, was authorized to |
| 10 | Q Have you checked your iCloud, or have you | 10 | and did stenographically report the foregoing |
| 11 | spoken to anyone with Apple about that? | 11 | proceedings; and that the transcript, pages 4 |
| 12 | A No. | 12 | through 276, is a true and accurate record of my |
| 13 | Q Do you realize that's a public records | 13 | stenographic notes. |
| 14 | problem? | 14 | I further certify that I am not a |
| 15 | A To the extent that there were JEA records. | 15 | relative, or cmployee, or attomey, or counsel of |
|  | A To he exten what here were JEA records. | 16 | any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected |
| 16 | But l'm not .- I never made it a standard practice of | 17 | with the action, nor am 1 financially interested in |
| 17 | using my text message to convey JEA busincss. | 18 | this action. |
| 18 | Q Okay. | 19 |  |
| 19 | MR. MULLEN: I don't know how much of a public | 20 | DATED this 27th day of January, 2020. |
| 20 | records problem it could be if during Mr. Zahn's | 21 |  |
| 21 | tenure at JEA, his phone was only taken one time to | 22 | 14 \& 14 |
| 22 | scan for texts, which is what you discovered. |  | HEdTHER M. THOMAS |
| 23 | MR. POWELL: Well, I'm going to chime in and | 23 | COURT REPORTER |
| 24 | say that has absolutely nothing to do with the | 24 |  |
| 25 | issue -- | 25 |  |
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