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# motion for telephonic witness appearance

1. Pursuant to WAC 480-07-375(1)(b) and (d), MEI Northwest, LLC (“MEI”) moves the Commission for an order allowing Marc Aikin of Crowley Petroleum Services, Inc. (“Crowley”) to appear telephonically during the evidentiary hearing currently scheduled for January 5 and 6, 2017.

# procedural and factual background

1. On October 4, 2016, MEI submitted its direct prefiled testimony to the Commission and all parties. Arrow Launch Services, Inc. (“Arrow”) submitted its response to MEI’s testimony on November 2, 2016.
2. MEI testified in its direct testimony that a number of its customers told MEI that Arrow was underserving the region and that these customers were afraid to speak out for fear of reprisal. Arrow’s reply testimony denied the existence of such customers and called MEI’s testimony self-serving.
3. MEI filed its rebuttal to Arrow on December 5, 2016, and included a shipper support statement from Marc Aikin of Crowley in its rebuttal testimony. The shipper support statement directly rebutted Arrow’s claims that MEI could not provide evidence of shipper need and support in the Puget Sound.
4. Because this evidence refutes Arrow’s case, and because it directly rebuts Arrow’s claim that it adequately serves the region, Arrow filed a motion to strike Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (RSE-8), Crowley’s support statement, and any mention of the statement in MEI’s rebuttal testimony.
5. Arrow primarily argues that this evidence should be stricken because Arrow will suffer prejudice if the shipper support statement and related testimony are admitted into evidence. Arrow argues in its Motion to Strike that it is being deprived of its due process right to respond to Crowley’s support statement.
6. The purpose of this motion is to provide Arrow with an opportunity to cross-examine the Crowley representative who signed the shipper support statement, Mr. Aikin. If Arrow has the opportunity to cross-examine Mr. Aikin and challenge his testimony at the hearing, it cannot consistently claim that it is unfairly prejudiced by his appearance. Accordingly, the Commission should afford Arrow the opportunity to cross-examine Mr. Aikin by allowing him to appear telephonically.

# argument

1. The presiding officer in a contested proceeding has the authority to issue an order allowing witnesses to appear telephonically. *See Benton Cty. v. BNSF Railway Co.*, Order 05 Allowing Witnesses to Appear by Telephone Conference Call, Docket TR-100572 (Dec. 2010) (contested petition to construct highway-rail grade crossing).
2. MEI requests that the Commission enter an order in this case allowing Mr. Aikin to appear telephonically so that he can be subject to cross-examination by Arrow, as well as questioned by Administrative Law Judge Freidlander.
3. Mr. Aikin’s physical presence at the hearing should not be required. He is not a party to this case and is being called only as a witness to rebut inaccurate claims made by Arrow in its reply testimony. Mr. Aikin is subject to other professional obligations at the time of the hearing that prevent him from traveling to Olympia. His statement is brief and any cross-examination by Arrow should also be relatively brief. Requiring a non-party to travel to Olympia for a brief cross-examination is unnecessary and should not be required.
4. The Commission frequently grants motions for telephonic testimony—even over the objections of other parties. *See, e.g., Stevens v. Rosario Utils., LLC*, Fifth Supplemental Order, Docket No. UW-011320 (Aug. 2002) (granting motion for 4 complainant witnesses to appear telephonically over objection of respondent and intervenor). And the credibility of a witnesses can be assessed irrespective of whether he testifies in person or via telephone. *See id.* (motion for telephonic testimony granted despite argument that it is difficult to assess the credibility of a witness testifying by telephone).
5. Arrow alleges that it is unfair to permit Mr. Aikin’s testimony but to deprive Arrow of the opportunity to respond. For this reason, MEI moves the Commission to allow Mr. Aikin to testify telephonically and thereby eliminate any potential unfair prejudice to Arrow.

# conclusion

1. It is within the presiding officer’s authority to allow witnesses to appear telephonically. MEI therefore requests that Mr. Aikin be allowed to testify telephonically at the hearing so

that he can be subject to cross-examination by Arrow.
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