

ATTACHMENT 1

This is the Attachment identified in paragraphs 11, 22, 25, 26, and 29 of the foregoing complaint. This Attachment sets forth the basic facts describing each incident alleged in the complaint. A separate “Incident” number is assigned for each set of facts.

The “Ticket” number is the number PSE assigns to a specific reported leak. The “Leak Work Order” number is the number PSE gives to each inspection of a specific leak. Consequently, each work order for a specific reported leak has a different work order number, but the same ticket number.

* * * *

Incident 1. Ticket L9304341

1. **Leak Work Orders 9 & 10.** According to Leak Work Order 9, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on March 22, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 10, Pilchuck employee “R Peterson” conducted a follow-up inspection on April 16, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 10 is the same as Leak Work Order 9, and the Daily Report for Mr. Peterson for April 16, 2002 does not show Mr. Peterson in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
2. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 10 is not accurate in naming Mr. Peterson as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 2. Ticket L9305608

3. **Leak Work Orders 15 & 16.** According to Leak Work Order 15, Pilchuck employee “Greg Haugen” inspected a leak on May 6, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 16, Pilchuck employee “Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on June 4, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 16 is the same as Leak Work Order 15, and the daily report for Mr. Goodrich for June 4, 2002, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
4. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 16 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 3. Ticket L9306961

5. **Leak Work Orders 20, 21 & 23.** According to Leak Work Order 20, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on May 8, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 21, Pilchuck employee “Lynch” conducted a follow-up inspection on June 4, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 21 is the same as Leak Work Order 20, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Lynch for June 4, 2002, does not show Mr. Lynch in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
6. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 21 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.
7. According to Leak Work Order 23, Pilchuck employee “S Lynch” inspected a Phantom Leak on June 27, 2002. According to Leak Work Order 23, Pilchuck employee “S Lynch” conducted a second follow up inspection on June 27, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 23 appears to be the same as on Leak Work order 20 and 21 and there was no time sheet for S Lynch on June 27, 2002.
8. Therefore the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 23 is not accurate in naming S Lynch as the person doing the follow up inspection and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate.
9. The Commission alleges that on Leak Work Orders 21 and 23 the same person did the follow up inspections, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 4. Ticket L9502315

10. **Leak Work Orders 12 & 13.** According to Leak Work Order 12, “a Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on April 8, 2004 and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a Phantom Leak. According to Leak Work Order 13, the follow-up inspection was conducted by “Goodrich” on April 30, 2004. However, Mr. Haugen’s “tally sheet” for April 30, 2004 identifies this Ticket number, which means this work was completed by Mr. Haugen’s on that day. Moreover, Mr. Goodrich’s “Foreman’s Daily Report” for April 30, 2004 does not show that he was in that area or did leak evaluations that day.
11. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 13 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 5. Ticket L9601610

12. **Leak Work Orders 6 & 7.** According to Leak Work Order 6, a Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on June 14, 2002 and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a Phantom Leak. According to Leak Work Order 7, the follow-up inspection was conducted by “S Lynch” on July 8, 2002. However, Leak Work Order 7 is in the same handwriting as Leak Work Order 6, and Pilchuck had no timesheet for Mr. Lynch for July 8, 2002.
13. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 7 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 6. Ticket L9601995

14. **Leak Work Orders 8 & 9.** According to Leak Work Order 8, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on May 10, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 9, Pilchuck employee “S Lynch” conducted a follow-up inspection on June 4, 2002. However, Leak Work Order 9 is in the same handwriting as Leak Work Order 8. Moreover, Mr. Lynch’s “Foreman’s Daily Report” for June 4, 2002 does not show that he was in that area or did leak evaluations that day.
15. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 9 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 7. Ticket L9604014

16. **Leak Work Orders 10 & 11.** According to Leak Work Order 10, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on March 27, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 11, Pilchuck employee “B Hurlow” conducted a follow-up inspection on April 25, 2002. However, the handwriting on Work Order 11 is the same as Work Order 10, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Hurlow for April 25, 2002, does not show Mr. Hurlow in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
17. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 10 is not accurate in naming Mr. Hurlow as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 8. Ticket L9803767

18. **Leak Work Orders 6 & 8.** According to Leak Work Order 6, Pilchuck employee “S. Powe” inspected a leak on July 17, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 8, Pilchuck employee “R. Morse” conducted a follow-up inspection on August 15, 2003. However, Pilchuck had no time sheet for Mr. Morse for August 15, 2003. In addition, the date appears to have been altered to meet the required completion date.
19. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 8 is not accurate. The date is not accurate, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate.

Incident 9. Ticket L9901765

20. **Leak Work Orders 7 & 8.** According to Leak Work Order 7, Pilchuck employee “Trulson” inspected a leak on August 10, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 8, Pilchuck employee “Haugen” conducted a follow-up inspection on September 6, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 8 is the same as Leak Work Order 7, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Haugen for September 6, 2005, does not show Mr. Haugen in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day and this ticket number is in the middle of Mr. Trulson’s tally sheet for that day.
21. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 8 is not accurate in naming Mr. Haugen as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 10. Ticket M0000822

22. **Leak Work Orders 5 & 6.** According to Leak Work Order 5, Pilchuck employee “R. Morse” inspected a leak on April 29, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 6, Pilchuck employee “Banister” conducted a follow-up inspection on May 26, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 6 is the same as Leak Work Order 5, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Banister for May 26, 2004, does not show Mr. Banister in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day. It also appears that Mr. Banister’s name was written over another person’s name on Work Order 6.
23. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 6 is not accurate in naming Mr. Banister as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 11. Ticket M0000948

24. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on August 20, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “S Lynch” conducted a follow-up inspection on September 13, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Lynch for September 13, 2002, does not show Mr. Lynch in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
25. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 12. Ticket M0001217

26. **Leak Work Orders 6 & 7.** According to Leak Work Order 6, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on July 22, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 7, Pilchuck employee “S Lynch” conducted a follow-up inspection on August 15, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 7 is the same as Leak Work Order 6, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Lynch for August 15, 2002, shows Mr. Lynch performing leak evaluations several miles away on that day.
27. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 7 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 13. Ticket M0001926

28. **Leak Work Orders 5 & 6.** According to Leak Work Order 5, Pilchuck employee “Greg Haugen” inspected a leak on May 6, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 6, Pilchuck employee “Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on June 4, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 6 is the same as Leak Work Order 5, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for June 4, 2002, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
29. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 6 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 14. Ticket M0003552

30. **Leak Work Orders 3 & 4.** According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on March 26, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 4, Pilchuck employee “S. Lynch” conducted a follow-up inspection on April 17, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 4 is the same as Leak Work Order 3, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Lynch for April 17, 2002, does not show Mr. Lynch in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
31. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 4 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

NOTE: The following three Incidents (Incidents 15-17, ¶¶ 33-38) indicate follow-up inspections conducted by Bev Gordon on the same day: March 15, 2002. The facts should be read together.

Incident 15. Ticket M0004141

33. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “Hurlow” inspected a leak on February 13, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” conducted a follow-up inspection on March 15, 2002. However, the “15” in the March 15, 2002 finish date was added after the original date was erased. The Foreman’s Daily report does not show B. Gordon in the area on March 15, 2002. Furthermore, Pilchuck’s LMS report¹ indicates that this follow-up inspection was completed on March 18, 2002
34. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in stating a March 15, 2002 finish date and that the date on the document was intentionally altered in order to create an appearance of complying with time limits. The Commission further alleges that Pilchuck knew the document was altered and was not accurate.

Incident 16. Ticket M0004142

35. **Leak Work Orders 2.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Bev Gordon” inspected a leak on March 15, 2002, and found no gas reads. Leak Work Order 2 is for a reported leak located in Seattle. Bev Gordon’s time sheet indicates that with one helper, she relocated 3 services in the Kent/Federal Way area on March 15, 2002. Both employee timesheets indicate they worked 8 hours. Pilchuck Leak Work Orders indicate she performed at least 3 leak evaluations on March 15, 2002, Leak Work Order 2 is located in Seattle. .

¹ “LMS” refers to PSE’s Leak Management System.

36. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in stating a March 15, 2002 finish date and that the date on the document was intentionally altered in order to create an appearance of complying with time limits.

Incident 17. Ticket M0004144

37. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** This leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” conducted a follow-up inspection on March 15, 2002. However, the “15: in “March 15, 2002” appears to be altered, and Bev Gordon’s time sheet indicates she did not do leak evaluations on that day.
38. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in stating a March 15, 2002 finish date and that the date on the document was intentionally altered in order to create an appearance of complying with time limits.

Incident 18. Ticket M0004340

39. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Greg Haugen” inspected a leak on July 10, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “Matlock” conducted a follow-up inspection on August 8, 2002. The handwriting on each work order appears to be the same, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for August 8, 2002, shows he was working in another area that day, and it does not show he was doing leak evaluations.
40. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 19. Ticket M0100011

40. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on September 17, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “K. Matlock” conducted a follow-up inspection on October 16, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for October 16, 2002, does not show Mr. Matlock was in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
41. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 20. Ticket M0100195

42. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on April 24, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “Matlock” conducted a follow-up inspection on May 23, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for May 23, 2003, does not show Mr. Matlock in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
43. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 21. Ticket M0100208

44. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on September 20, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “K. Matlock” conducted a follow-up inspection on October 16, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for October 16, 2002, does not show Mr. Matlock in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
45. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 22. Ticket M0100506

46. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on September 20, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “K. Matlock” conducted a follow-up inspection on October 16, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for October 16, 2002, does not show Mr. Matlock working in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
47. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 23. Ticket M0101174

48. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “Greg Haugen” inspected a leak on July 10, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Matlock” conducted a follow-up inspection on August 8, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for August 8, 2002, does not show Mr. Matlock in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
49. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 24. Ticket M0101258

50. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on July 18, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Lynch” conducted a follow-up inspection on August 26, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1. Staff requested Pilchuck to provide a Daily Report for Mr. Lynch for August 26, 2002 and one was not provided.
51. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, and the follow-up inspection was not done within 30 days, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 25. Ticket M0101344

52. **Leak Work Orders 3 & 4.** According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “S. Powe” inspected a leak on January 24, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to one version of Leak Work Order 4, Pilchuck employee “S. Powe” conducted a follow-up inspection on February 19, 2003. Another version of Leak Work Order 4 shows Powe’s name deleted and the name “Banister” in its place. However, the handwriting on both versions of Leak Work Order 4 is the same as Leak Work Order 3 (with the exception of the word “Banister,” and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Banister for February 19, 2002, does not show Mr. Banister in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.

53. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 4 is not accurate in naming Mr. Banister as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 26. Ticket M0101425

54. **Leak Work Orders 3 & 4.** According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on August 31, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 4, Pilchuck employee "K. Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on September 30, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 4 is the same as Leak Work Order 3, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for September 30, 2004, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
55. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 4 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 27. Ticket M0101427

56. **Leak Work Orders 3 & 4.** According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on August 31, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 4, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on September 30, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 4 is the same as Leak Work Order 3, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for September 30, 2004, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
57. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 4 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 28. Ticket M0101607

58. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "B Gordon" inspected a leak on August 9, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "S Lynch" conducted a follow-up inspection on August 27, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Lynch for August 27, 2002, does not show Mr. Lynch in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.

59. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 29. Ticket M0102084

60. **Leak Work Orders 3 & 4.** According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee "R. Morse" inspected a leak on March 25, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 4, Pilchuck employee "Derek Layher" conducted a follow-up inspection on April 16, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 4 is the same as Leak Work Order 3, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Layher for April 16, 2004, does not show Mr. Layher in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day. Nonetheless, Mr. Layher signed Leak Work Order 4.
61. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 4 is not accurate in naming Mr. Layher as the person doing the follow-up inspection, Mr. Layher signed the document knowing it was not accurate, and Pilchuck also knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 30. Ticket M0102947

62. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Greg Haugen" inspected a leak on April 30, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on May 29, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and there was no Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for May 29, 2002.
63. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 31. Ticket M0102953

64. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "Greg Haugen" inspected a leak on April 2, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on May 1, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for May 1, 2002 does not show Mr. Goodrich was in that area or in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.

65. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 32. Ticket M0103033

66. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "Greg Haugen" inspected a leak on April 12, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "K Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on May 6, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for May 6, 2002, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
67. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 33. Ticket M0103091

68. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "Greg Haugen" inspected a leak on April 12, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "K Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on May 8, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for May 8, 2002, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
69. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 34. Ticket M0103100

70. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Greg Haugen" inspected a leak in early May, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on May 24, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for May 24, 2002, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.

71. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual. The Commission also alleges a violation of WAC 480-93-187, because Work Order 2 does not contain a specific date.

Incident 35. Ticket M0103223

72. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "R. Morse" inspected a leak on January 30, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "S. Powe" conducted a follow-up inspection on February 27, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Powe for February 27, 2003, does not show Mr. Powe in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
73. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Powe as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. Mr. Powe signed the document knowing it was not accurate, and Pilchuck also knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 36. Ticket M0103224

74. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "R. Morse" inspected a leak on January 30, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "S. Powe" conducted a follow-up inspection on February 27, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 1 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Powe for February 27, 2003, does not show Mr. Powe in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
75. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Powe as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 37. Ticket M0103318

76. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on February 12, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "K. Matlock" conducted a follow-up inspection on March 14, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for March 14, 2003, does not show

Mr. Matlock in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day and this evaluation is the first one on Mr. Haugen's March 14, 2003 tally sheet.

77. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 38. Ticket N0007348

78. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on April 4, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "K Matlock" conducted a follow-up inspection on May 1, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for May 1, 2003, does not show Mr. Matlock in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day and this ticket number appears on Mr. Haugen's Tally Sheet for May 1, 2003.

79. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 39. Ticket N0007381

80. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "R. Morse" inspected a leak on April 1, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "S. Powe" conducted a follow-up inspection on May 2, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Powe for May 2, 2003, does not show Mr. Powe in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.

81. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Powe as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 40. Ticket N0007382

82. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “R. Morse” inspected a leak on April 1, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Banister” conducted a follow-up inspection on May 1, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Banister for May 1, 2003, does not show Mr. Banister in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
83. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Banister as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 41. Ticket N0007835

84. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “R. Morse” inspected a leak on April 1, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Banister” conducted a follow-up inspection on May 1, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Banister for May 1, 2003, does not show Mr. Banister in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
85. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Banister as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 42. Ticket N0007453

86. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on April 17, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “K Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on May 14, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for May 14, 2005 does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
87. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 43. Ticket N0007458

88. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on July 18, 2002, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Lynch” conducted a follow-up inspection on August 23, 2002. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Lynch for August 23, 2002, does not show Mr. Lynch in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
89. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, and the follow-up as not conducted within 30 days, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 44. Ticket N0007513

90. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G Haugen” inspected a leak on April 21, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Matlock” conducted a follow-up inspection on May 21, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for May 21, 2003, does not show Mr. Matlock in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
91. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 45. Ticket N0007544

92. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on May 1, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Matlock” conducted a follow-up inspection on May 28, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Matlock for May 28, 2003, does not show Mr. Matlock in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day. Moreover, this follow-up inspection is on Mr. Haugen’s Tally Sheet for May 28, 2003.
93. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Matlock as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 46. Ticket N0007721

94. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on May 29, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on June 27, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for June 27, 2003, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
95. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 47. Ticket N0008111

96. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “R. Morse” inspected a leak on July 16, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Gordon” conducted a follow-up inspection on August 18, 2003. However, the Foreman’s Daily Report for Ms. Gordon for August 18, 2003, does not show Ms. Gordon in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day. Moreover, this follow-up inspection is on Mr. Morse’s Tally Sheet for August 18, 2003.
97. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Ms. Gordon as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, and the follow-up as not conducted within 30 days, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 48. Ticket N0008676

98. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on September 20, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “J. McGrath” conducted a follow-up inspection on October 18, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2.
99. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. McGrath as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 49. Ticket N0008697

100. **Leak Work Orders 4 & 5.** According to Leak Work Order 4, Pilchuck employee “Trulson” inspected a leak on August 3, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 5, Pilchuck employee “Haugen” conducted a follow-up inspection on September 2, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 5 is the same as Leak Work Order 4, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Haugen for September 2, 2005, does not show Mr. Haugen in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
101. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 5 is not accurate in naming Mr. Haugen as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 50. Ticket N0008824

102. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on October 11, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on November 4, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for November 4, 2004, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day. Moreover, Pilchuck’s LMS System shows Mr. Haugen completed Work Orders 2 and 3.
103. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 51. Ticket N0009276

104. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on October 30, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on November 19, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for November 19, 2003, does not show Mr. Goodrich was in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
105. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 52. Ticket N0010182

106. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on April 18, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “K. Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on May 14, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for May 14, 2003, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
107. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 53. Ticket N0010459

108. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on February 6, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “K. Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on March 5, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and there was no Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for March 5, 2004.
109. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 54. Ticket N0010460

110. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on February 6, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “K. Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on March 5, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and there was no Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for March 5, 2004.
111. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 55. Ticket N0010784

112. **Leak Work Order 2.** According to one version of Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Chamberlain” inspected a leak on June “20,” 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to another version of Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Chamberlain” conducted that follow-up inspection on June “23,” 2003, although the “3” in “23” is overwritten with a “0.” According to both forms, the inspection was supposed to be completed on or before June 20, 2003. The Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Chamberlain for June 20, 2003, shows he did fabricating and testing that day.
113. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 1 is not accurate in stating that Mr. Chamberlain did the inspection on June 20, 2003, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that the alteration was intentionally made to change “June 23” to “June 20” so that the date would be in compliance with the due date.

Incident 56. Ticket N0010984

114. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “R Morse” inspected a leak on January 31, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “S. Powe” conducted a follow-up inspection on February 27, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Powe for February 27, 2003, does not show Mr. Powe performing leak evaluations on that day.
115. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Powe as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 57. Ticket N0011459

116. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “R Morse” inspected a leak on August 26, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “S Powe” conducted a follow-up inspection on September 25, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Powe for September 25, 2003, does not show Mr. Powe in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
117. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Powe as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 58. Ticket N0012544

118. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3. & 5** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Trulson” inspected a leak on September 13, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “Haugen” conducted a follow-up inspection on November 10, 2005. According to Leak Work Order 5, Pilchuck employee Trulson conducted a third follow-up visit on November 10, 2005. However, the handwriting on Work Orders 2, 3 and 5 is the same and Pilchuck could not find a time sheet for Mr. Haugen for October 12, 2005.
119. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Trulson as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 59. Ticket N0012710

120. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on January 14, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on February 12, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for February 12, 2004, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day. Moreover, this ticket number is on Mr. Haugen’s Tally Sheet for February 12, 2004.
121. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 60. Ticket N0013200

122. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “R. Morse” inspected a leak on October 4, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Steve C Powe” conducted a follow-up inspection on November 1, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Powe for November 1, 2003, does not show Mr. Powe in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.

123. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Powe as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 61. Ticket N0013490

124. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "R. Morse" inspected a leak on March 31, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, a Pilchuck employee conducted a follow-up inspection on April 23, 2004. The name on Leak Work Order 2 appears to have been changed from one name to "Near." The handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and Pilchuck has no Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Near for April 23, 2004.
125. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Near as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 62. Ticket N0013584

126. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "R. Morse" inspected a leak on November 20, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee "S. Powe" conducted a follow-up inspection on December 16, 2003. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Powe for December 16, 2003, does not show Mr. Powe in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
127. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Powe as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 63. Ticket N0013743

128. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "B Gordon" inspected a leak on January 20, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "R Morse" conducted a follow-up inspection on February 10, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Morse for February 10, 2005, does not show Mr. Morse in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.

129. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Morse as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 64. Ticket N0013779

130. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "Hurlow" inspected a leak on December 12, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Lynch" conducted a follow-up inspection on January 9, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Lynch for January 9, 2004, does not show Mr. Lynch in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
131. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Lynch as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 65. Ticket N0013963

132. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "G Haugen" inspected a leak on February 24, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on March 25, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for March 25, 2005, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
133. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 66. Ticket N0014063

134. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "R. Morse" inspected a leak on June 3, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "S. Powe" conducted a follow-up inspection on July 1, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Powe for July 1, 2004, does not show Mr. Powe in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.

135. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Powe as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 67. Ticket N0014119

136. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on March 24, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on April 21, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for April 21, 2005, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
137. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 68. Ticket N0014915

138. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "R. Morse" inspected a leak on April 23, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee "Banister" conducted a follow-up inspection on May 11, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Banister for May 11, 2004, does not show Mr. Banister in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
139. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Powe as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 69. Ticket N0015002

140. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "Hurlow" inspected a leak on April 19, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Green" conducted a follow-up inspection on May 11, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Green for May 11, 2004, does not show Mr. Green performing leak evaluations on that day.

141. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Green as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 70. Ticket N0015213

142. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on July 5, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "J McGrath" conducted a follow-up inspection on August 4, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and this ticket is on Mr. Haugen's tally sheet dated August 4, 2004..
143. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. McGrath as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 71. Ticket N0015222

144. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on October 11, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on November 10, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for November 10, 2004, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
145. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 72. Ticket N0015281

146. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on October 11, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on November 10, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for November 10, 2004, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.

147. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 73. Ticket N0015287

150. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on October 12, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on November 11, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for November 11, 2004, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
151. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 74. Ticket N0015640

152. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee "G. Haugen" inspected a leak on December 12, 2004, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Goodrich" conducted a follow-up inspection on December 29, 2004. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman's Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for December 29, 2004, does not show Mr. Goodrich performing leak evaluations on that day.
153. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 75. Ticket N0015879

154. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to one version of phantom Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee "Lynch" inspected a leak on August 25, 2004, According to a second version of phantom Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee Lynch inspected a leak on August 27, 2004. Pilchuck entered August 25, 2004 into the LMS system because it was the leak inspection due date.
155. Therefore, the Commission alleges that the date on phantom Leak Work Order 2 was changed to make it comply with the inspection due date

Incident 76. Ticket N0016450

156. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on March 4, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. . According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on March 30, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for March 30, 2005, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
157. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 3 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 77. Ticket N0016451

158. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on March 7, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on April 6, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for April 6, 2005, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
159. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 78. Ticket N001417625

160. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on February 7, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “J Kapelos” conducted a follow-up inspection on March 7, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Kapelos for March 7, 2005, does not show Mr. Kapelos in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
161. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Kapelos as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 79. Ticket N0017655

162. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on February 24, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “K Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on March 25, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 3 is the same as Leak Work Order 2, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for March 25, 2005, does not show Mr. Goodrich performing leak evaluations on that day.
163. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 80. Ticket N0017664

164. **Leak Work Orders 1 & 2.** According to Leak Work Order 1, Pilchuck employee “G. Haugen” inspected a leak on January 27, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “Goodrich” conducted a follow-up inspection on February 25, 2005. However, the handwriting on Leak Work Order 2 is the same as Leak Work Order 1, and the Foreman’s Daily Report for Mr. Goodrich for February 25, 2005, does not show Mr. Goodrich in that area or performing leak evaluations on that day.
165. Therefore, the Commission alleges that Leak Work Order 2 is not accurate in naming Mr. Goodrich as the person doing the follow-up inspection, and Pilchuck knew it was not accurate. The Commission also alleges that that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 81. Ticket N0010400

166. **Leak Work Orders 2 & 3.** According to Leak Work Order 2, Pilchuck employee “B Gordon” inspected a leak on September 26, 2003, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work Order 3, Pilchuck employee “ B Gordon” conducted a follow up inspection on October 22, 2003.
167. Therefore, the Commission alleges that the same person did the follow up inspection, contrary to PSE’s manual.

Incident 82. Ticket N0011273

168. **Leak Work Orders 12 & 13.** According to Leak Work Order 12, Pilchuck employee “D. Flynn” inspected a leak on October 17, 2005, and found no gas reads, meaning no leak was detected. The leak was classified as a phantom leak. According to Leak Work

Order 13, Pilchuck employee "D. Flynn" conducted a follow-up inspection on November 11, 2005.

169. Therefore, the Commission alleges that the same person did the follow-up inspection, contrary to PSE's manual.

Incident 83. Ticket N0011408

170. **Leak Work Order 13.** According to Leak Work Order 13, Pilchuck employee "Chamberlain" conducted a leak evaluation on January 16, 2004. Leak Work Order 13 evaluation was due on January 16, 2004. The "16" in "January 16, 2004" appears altered and the LMS indicated that Leak Work Order 13 was completed on January 19, 2004.
171. The Commission alleges PSE altered the date to bring Leak Work Order 13 evaluation into compliance.

Incident 84. Ticket N0011654

172. **Leak Work Order 7.** According to Leak Work Order 7, Pilchuck employee "R Morse" inspected a leak. On the first version of Leak Work Order 7 the completion date of September 23, 2003 had the "23" marked off and "17" written below it. September 17 was the due date. On the second version of Leak Work Order 7, the September 23, 2003 date is not shown, and in its place September 17, 2003 is written.
173. The Commission alleges that PSE changed Leak Work Order 7 to bring it into Compliance with the September 17 due date.

Incident 85. Ticket M0004292

174. This incident involved a leak at 1121 N 91 Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 4 and 5. Last work order date: February 25, 2002.

Incident 86. Ticket M0102348

175. This incident involved a leak at 2905 1 Ave. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: March 13, 2002.

Incident 87. Ticket M0102349

176. This incident involved a leak at 3005 Western Ave. Staff requested PSE's file on this leak and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: March 13, 2002.

Incident 88. Ticket M0102853

177. This incident involved a leak at 321 Williams Ave S. Staff requested PSE's file on this leak and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 6 and 7. Last work order date: February 6, 2002.

Incident 89. Ticket M0103288

178. This incident involved a leak at 27510 NE 45 Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: August 29, 2002.

Incident 90. Ticket M0103341

179. This incident involved a leak at 8150 NE 121 Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 3 and 4. Last work order date: February 7, 2002.

Incident 91. Ticket M0103378

180. This incident involved a leak at 1219 NE 70th St. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 3 and 4. Last work order date: January 30, 2002.

Incident 92. Ticket M0103457

181. This incident involved a leak at 630 S. 3rd Ave. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: March 28, 2003.

Incident 93. Ticket N0007358

182. This incident involved a leak at 10131 NE 116 Place. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: March 19, 2002.

Incident 94. Ticket N0007396

183. This incident involved a leak at 5756 29 Ave NE. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: August 12, 2002.

Incident 95. Ticket N0007397

184. This incident involved a leak at 1213 SW Othello St. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: April 30, 2003.

Incident 96. Ticket N0007429

185. This incident involved a leak at 3522 S 9th Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 2 and 3. Last work order date: May 5, 2003.

Incident 97. N0008014

186. This incident involved a leak at 1906 4th Ave W. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 3 and 4. Last work order date: December 15, 2003.

Incident 98. Ticket N0008303

187. This incident involved a leak at 2109 N 37th Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 2 and 3. Last work order date: November 21, 2003.

Incident 99. Ticket N0008442

188. This incident involved a leak at 10400 56 Ave S. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: June 24, 2002.

Incident 100. Ticket N0008464

189. This incident involved a leak at 406 E 43 Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: July 12, 2002.

Incident 101. Ticket N0008849

190. This incident involved a leak at 3009 157th Place NE. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: August 27, 2002.

Incident 102. Ticket N0008952

191. This incident involved a leak at 6829 30th Ave NE. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: November 3, 2003.

Incident 103. Ticket N0010660

192. This incident involved a leak at 10011 Main St. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 2 and 3. Last work order date: April 1, 2005.

Incident 104. Ticket N0010826

193. This incident involved a leak at 1002 SW 317th Court. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Order 1. Last work order date: December 30, 2002.

Incident 105. Ticket N0011391

194. This incident involved a leak at 802 S 8th Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: June 10, 2004.

Incident 106. Ticket N0014010

195. This incident involved a leak at 8557 Interlake Ave N. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 4 and 3. Last work order date: December 30, 2004.

Incident 107. Ticket N0014712

196. This incident involved a leak at 13623 10th Ave East. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: September 29, 2004.

Incident 108. Ticket N0014930

197. This incident involved a leak at 5825 77th Ave Ct East. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: May 4, 2004.

Incident 109. N0014996

198. This incident involved a leak at 555 S Lander Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: October 14, 2004.

Incident 110. Ticket N0016114

199. This incident involved a leak at 3812 S D Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 3 and 2. Last work order date: June 22, 2005.

Incident 111. Ticket N0018278

200. This incident involved a leak at 13608 NE 202nd Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: April 27, 2005.

Incident 112. Ticket N0019239

201. This incident involved a leak at 4128 Beechwood Drive West. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 2 and 3. Last work order date: August 22, 2005.

Incident 113. Ticket N0019871

202. This incident involved a leak at 7704 29th Street West. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 3 and 2. Last work order date: September 29, 2005.

Incident 114. Ticket N0019927

203. This incident involved a leak at 5315 4th Street East. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: October 7, 2005.

Incident 115. Ticket N0020503

204. This incident involved a leak at 12021 SE 221 Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1. Last work order date: November 17, 2005.

Incident 116. Ticket N0010864

205. This incident involved a leak at 1378 Hawthorne Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1, 2 and 3. Last work order date: February 17, 2004.

Incident 117. Ticket M0103158

206. This incident involved a leak at 1522 Bigelow Ave N. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: no date.

Incident 118. Ticket M0103306

207. This incident involved a leak at 5405 SW Dash Point Rd. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 5 and 6. Last work order date: no date.

Incident 119. Ticket N0007227

208. This incident involved a leak at 2810 Wilton Lane East. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 6 and 7. Last work order date: no date.

Incident 120. Ticket N0007597

209. This incident involved a leak at 3040 18th Street SE. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 15 and 16. Last work order date: April 27, 2005.

Incident 121. Ticket N0007990

210. This incident involved a leak at 1024 S King Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 1 and 2. Last work order date: July 24, 2003.

Incident 122. Ticket N0008045

211. This incident involved a leak at 25604 120th Place SE. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 12 and 13. Last work order date: January 24, 2003.

Incident 123. Ticket N0008071

212. This incident involved a leak at 205 Strander Blvd. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 5 and 6. Last work order date: February 6, 2003.

Incident 124. Ticket N0008242

213. This incident involved a leak at 3600 NE 45th Street, Seattle. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 17 and 18. Last work order date: June 25, 2003.

Incident 125. Ticket N0009548

214. This incident involved a leak at 37 Skagit Key. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 4 and 5. Last work order date: October 10, 2004.

Incident 126. Ticket N0009552

215. This incident involved a leak at 73 Cascade Key. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 16 and 17. Last work order date: November 6, 2003.

Incident 127 Ticket N0009556

216. This incident involved a leak at 8404 NE 169th Street. Commission Staff requested PSE's file on this leak, and the Company produced only screen prints for Leak Work Orders 15 and 16. Last work order date: October 21, 2004.