

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
I. Puget Has A Duty To Provide Adequate, Efficient, And Reasonable Interruptible Service	2
II. Puget Breached Its Duty To Provide Adequate, Efficient and Reasonable Service	4
A. Puget Unreasonably Failed To Resume Interruptible Service Between December 25 and December 28, 1998	4
B. Puget's Unwillingness To Call Out Meter Readers For Duty Over The Holidays Was Not A Valid Reason To Extend the Curtailment Until December 28, 1998	7
III. Puget Unreasonably Failed To End The Curtailment When It Was Possible To Restore Interruptible Service.	11
A. The Evidence In The Record Indicates That Puget's Distribution System Capacity Was Adequate To Serve All Firm And Interruptible Customers Between December 25 And December 28, 1998.	11
1. Distribution System Pressures Returned To Pre-Curtailment Levels Between December 25 and December 28, 1998	12
a. SCADA Data	12
b. Pen Graph Data	14
2. Temperatures	15
3. Weather Forecasts	15
4. Customer Service Calls	17
5. Send-Out	18
6. Price And Availability Of Puget's Gas Supply	18
B. Puget's Stoner Model Exhibits Do Not Justify Puget's Failure To Resume Interruptible Service Between December 25 And December 28, 1998	19
C. Puget's Distribution System Performed Satisfactorily Between December 25 and December 28, 1998, Even Though Kimberly-Clark And Other Interruptible Customers Were On-Line	21

PRESTON GATES & ELLIS
LLP
701 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 5000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-
7078
TELEPHONE: (206) 623-7580
FACSIMILE: (206) 623-7022

D.	Puget Could Have Imposed A Limited Curtailment If There Were Concerns About The Performance Of The Distribution System During The Morning Peak Hours On December 28, 1998	22
IV.	Kimberly-Clark’s Actions Do Not Excuse Puget’s Failure To Provide Interruptible Transportation Service Between December 25 And December 28.	23
A.	The Failure Of Kimberly-Clark’s Back-Up Fuel Supply Does Not Excuse Puget’s Negligence.	23
1.	Kimberly-Clark Has A Reasonable Fuel Strategy.	24
2.	The Failure of Kimberly-Clark’s Back-Up Fuel Supply On December 24 Was Unforeseeable	25
3.	Puget’s Charge That Kimberly-Clark’s Arrangements For Firm Transportation Is Insufficient Is Neither True Nor Relevant	27
B.	Gas Deliveries To Kimberly-Clark Benefited Puget’s Sales Customers By Permitting Puget To Avoid Incremental Purchases During The Cold Spell.	29
	CONCLUSION	31

PRESTON GATES & ELLIS
LLP
701 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 5000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-
7078
TELEPHONE: (206) 623-7580
FACSIMILE: (206) 623-7022