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 BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE

 2 UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

 WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND )

 3 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, ) DOCKET NO. UE-090704

 ) and UG-090705

 4 Complainant, ) (Consolidated)

 )

 5 vs. ) Volume IV

 ) Pages 80 to 234

 6 PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC., )

 )

 7 Respondent. )

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_)

 8

 A hearing in the above matter was held on

 9

 January 19, 2009, from 9:30 a.m to 11:50 a.m., at 1300

10

 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Room 206, Olympia,

11

 Washington, before Administrative Law Judge DENNIS MOSS

12

 and CHAIRMAN JEFFREY D. GOLTZ and Commissioner PATRICK

13

 J. OSHIE and Commissioner PHILIP B. JONES.

14

 The parties were present as follows:

15

 PUGET SOUND ENERGY, by SHEREE STROM CARSON,

16 Attorney at Law, Perkins Coie, LLP, 10885 Northeast

 Fourth Street, Suite 700, Bellevue, Washington 98004,

17 Telephone (425) 635-1400, Fax (425) 635-2400, E-Mail

 scarson@perkinscoie.com; and JASON KUZMA, Attorney at

18 Law, Perkins Coie, LLP, 10885 Northeast Fourth Street,

 Suite 700, Bellevue, Washington 98004, Telephone (425)

19 635-1416, Fax (425) 635-2416, E-Mail

 jkuzma@perkinscoie.com

20

 THE COMMISSION, by ROBERT D. CEDARBAUM,

21 Assistant Attorney General, 1400 South Evergreen Park

 Drive Southwest, Post Office Box 40128, Olympia,

22 Washington 98504-0128, Telephone (360) 664-1188, Fax

 (360) 586-5522, E-Mail bcedarba@wutc.wa.gov.

23

24 Joan E. Kinn, CCR, RPR

25 Court Reporter

0081

 1 THE PUBLIC, by SIMON J. FFITCH, Senior

 Assistant Attorney General, 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite

 2 2000, Seattle, Washington 98104-3188, Telephone (206)

 389-2055, Fax (206) 464-6451, E-Mail simonf@atg.wa.gov.

 3

 FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, by NORMAN J.

 4 FURUTA, Associate Counsel, Department of the Navy, 1455

 Market Street, Suite 1744, San Francisco, California

 5 94103-1399, Telephone (415) 503-6994, Fax (415)

 503-6688, E-Mail norman.furuta@navy.mil.

 6

 INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES,

 7 by S. BRADLEY VAN CLEVE, Attorney at Law, Davison Van

 Cleve, 333 Southwest Taylor Street, Suite 400, Portland,

 8 Oregon, 97204, Telephone (503) 241-7242, Fax (503)

 241-8160, E-Mail bvc@dvclaw.com.

 9

 NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS, by CHAD M.

10 STOKES, Attorney at Law, Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen

 & Lloyd, 1001 Southwest Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000,

11 Portland, Oregon 97204, Telephone (503) 224-3092, Fax

 (503) 224-3176, E-Mail cstokes@cablehuston.com.

12

 SEATTLE STEAM COMPANY, by ELAINE L. SPENCER,

13 Attorney at Law, Graham & Dunn, Pier 70, 2801 Alaskan

 Way, Suite 300, Seattle, Washington 98121, Telephone

14 (206) 624-8300, Fax (206) 340-9599, E-Mail

 espencer@grahamdunn.com.

15

 THE KROGER COMPANY, by KURT J. BOEHM,

16 Attorney at Law, Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry, 36 East Seventh

 Street, Suite 1510, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, Telephone

17 (513) 421-2255, Fax (513) 421-2764, E-Mail

 Kboehm@BKLlawfirm.com.

18

 NORTHWEST ENERGY COALITION, by DAVID S.

19 JOHNSON, Attorney at Law, 811 First Avenue South, Suite

 305, Seattle, Washington 98104, Telephone (206)

20 621-0094, Fax (206) 621-0097, E-Mail David@nwenergy.org.

21 NUCOR STEEL SEATTLE, INC., via bridge line by

 DAMON E. XENOPOULOS, Attorney at Law, BRICKFIELD

22 BURCHETTE RITTS & STONE, 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street

 Northwest, 8th Floor, West Tower, Washington, D.C.

23 20007, Telephone (202) 342-0800, Fax (202) 342-0807,

 E-Mail dex@bbrslaw.com.

24

25
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 1 --------------------------------------------------------

 2 INDEX OF EXAMINATION

 3 --------------------------------------------------------

 4 WITNESS: PAGE:

 5 KEVIN C. HIGGINS, JANET K. PHELPS,

 6 DONALD W. SCHOENBECK, THOMAS E.

 7 SCHOOLEY, and GLENN A. WATKINS

 8 Examination by Judge Moss 164

 9 Examination by Chairman Goltz 168

10 Examination by Mr. Cedarbaum 169

11 BERTRAND A. VALDMAN

12 Direct Examination by Ms. Carson 170

13 Cross-Examination by Mr. Cedarbaum 173

14 Cross-Examination by Mr. ffitch 174

15 Examination by Chairman Goltz 184

16 Redirect Examination by Ms. Carson 186

17 KIMBERLY J. HARRIS

18 Direct Examination by Ms. Carson 192

19 Cross-Examination by Mr. ffitch 194

20 Examination by Commissioner Jones 202

21 Redirect Examination by Ms. Carson 209

22 ROGER GARRATT

23 Direct Examination by Ms. Carson 214

24 Cross-Examination by Mr. ffitch 215

25

0083

 1 --------------------------------------------------------

 2 INDEX OF EXHIBITS

 3 --------------------------------------------------------

 4

 5 EXHIBIT: MARKED: ADMITTED:

 6 BENCH EXHIBITS

 7 B-1 107

 8 JOINT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS RE STIPULATION

 9 JT-1 163 163

10 JT-2 163 163

11 JT-3 163 163

12 JT-4 163 163

13 JEFFREY A. DUBIN

14 JAD-1T 107

15 JAD-2 107

16 JAD-3 107

17 W. JAMES ELSEA

18 WJE-1HCT 107

19 WJE-2 107

20 WJE-3 107

21 WJE-4C 107

22 WJE-5 107

23 WJE-6 107

24 WJE-7HC 107

25 WJE-8HC 107

0084

 1 WJE-9HC 108

 2 WJE-10HC 108

 3 WJE-11HC 108

 4 WJE-12 108

 5 WJE-13HC 108

 6 WJE-14HC 108

 7 WJE-15HC 108

 8 WJE-16C 108

 9 WJE-17C 108

10 WJE-18 108

11 WJE-19 108

12 WJE-20HCT 109

13 WJE-21HCT 109

14 WJE-22 109

15 WJE-23C 109

16 DONALD E. GAINES

17 DEG-1T 109

18 DEG-2 109

19 DEG-3C 109

20 DEG-4 109

21 DEG-5C 109

22 DEG-6 109

23 DEG-7 110

24 DEG-8 110

25 DEG-9T 110

0085

 1 DEG-10C 110

 2 DEG-11HCT 110

 3 DEG-12 110

 4 DEG-13 110

 5 DEG-14 110

 6 DEG-15 110

 7 DEG-16 110

 8 DEG-17 110

 9 DEG-18 110

10 DEG-19 110

11 DEG-20 111

12 DEG-21 111

13 DEG-22C 111

14 DEG-23 111

15 DEG-24C 111

16 DEG-25 111

17 DEG-26 111

18 DEG-27 111

19 DEG-28 111

20 DEG-29 111

21 DEG-30 111

22 ROGER GARRATT

23 RG-1HCT 111 215

24 RG-2 112 215

25 RG-3HC 112 215

0086

 1 RG-4HC 112 215

 2 RG-5HC 112 215

 3 RG-6HC 112 215

 4 RG-7HC 112 215

 5 RG-8 112 215

 6 RG-9C 112 215

 7 RG-10C 112 215

 8 RG-11 112 215

 9 RG-12 112 215

10 RG-13C 112 215

11 RG-14C 112 215

12 RG-15 112 215

13 RG-16 112 215

14 RG-17C 113 215

15 RG-18C 113 215

16 RG-19C 113 215

17 RG-20C 113 215

18 RG-21C 113 215

19 RG-22 113 215

20 RG-23 113 215

21 RG-24 113 215

22 RG-25C 113 215

23 RG-26 113 215

24 RG-27 113 215

25 RG-28 113 215

0087

 1 RG-29HC 113 215

 2 RG-30HC 113 215

 3 RG-31C 114 215

 4 RG-32C 114 215

 5 RG-33C 114 215

 6 RG-34C 114 215

 7 RG-35C 114 215

 8 RG-36C 114 215

 9 RG-37C 114 215

10 RG-38C 114 215

11 RG-39HC 114 215

12 RG-40 114 215

13 RG-41C 114 215

14 RG-42 114 215

15 RG-43 115 215

16 RG-44 115 215

17 RG-45C 115 215

18 RG-46C 115 215

19 RG-47C 115 215

20 RG-48C 115 215

21 RG-49 115 215

22 RG-50C 115 215

23 RG-51C 115 215

24 RG-52C 115 215

25 RG-53HCT 115 215

0088

 1 RG-54 116 215

 2 RG-55 116 215

 3 RG-56 116 215

 4 RG-57HC 116 215

 5 RG-58 116 215

 6 RG-59C 116 215

 7 RG-60 116 215

 8 RG-61 116 215

 9 RG-62 116 215

10 RG-63 116 215

11 KIMBERLY J. HARRIS

12 KJH-1CT 116 193

13 KJH-2 117 193

14 KJH-3 117 193

15 KJH-4 117 193

16 KJH-5 117 193

17 KJH-6 117 193

18 KJH-7C 117 193

19 KJH-8HCT 117 193

20 JOEY M. HENDERSON

21 JMH-1T 117

22 JMH-2 117

23 JMH-3 117

24 JMH-4 117

25 JMH-5 117

0089

 1 JMH-6 118

 2 DAVID W. HOFF adopted by JANET K. PHELPS

 3 DWY-1T 118

 4 DWH-2 118

 5 DWH-3 118

 6 DWH-4 118

 7 DWH-5 118

 8 DWH-6 118

 9 DWH-7T 118

10 DWH-8 118

11 THOMAS M. HUNT

12 TMH-1T 118

13 TMH-2 119

14 TMH-3C 119

15 TMH-4 119

16 TMH-5C 119

17 TMH-6C 119

18 TMH-7C 119

19 TMH-8 119

20 TMH-9CT 119

21 TMH-10C 119

22 TMH-11C 119

23 TMH-12C 119

24 TMH-13C 119

25 TMH-14C 119

0090

 1 TMH-15C 119

 2 TMH-16C 119

 3 TMH-17C 120

 4 TMH-18C 120

 5 TMH-19 120

 6 TMH-20 120

 7 TMH-21 120

 8 TMH-22 120

 9 TMH-23 120

10 TMH-24 120

11 TMH-25 120

12 KIM W. LANE

13 KWL-1T 120

14 KWL-2 120

15 KWL-3 120

16 MICHAEL L. JONES

17 MLJ-1T 121

18 MLJ-2 121

19 MLJ-3 121

20 MLJ-4 121

21 MLJ-5CT 121

22 MLJ-6 121

23 MLJ-7 121

24 MATTHEW R. MARCELIA

25 MRM-1T 121

0091

 1 MRM-2 121

 2 MRM-3 121

 3 MRM-4T 121

 4 MRM-5 122

 5 MRM-6 122

 6 MRM-7 122

 7 MRM-8 122

 8 MRM-9 122

 9 MRM-10 122

10 MRM-11 122

11 MRM-12 122

12 MRM-13 122

13 MRM-14 122

14 MRM-15C 122

15 MRM-16C 122

16 ERIC M. MARKELL

17 EMM-1CT 123

18 EMM-2 123

19 EMM-3C 123

20 EMM-4C 123

21 EMM-5T 123

22 EMM-6C 123

23 EMM-7C 123

24 EMM-8 123

25 EMM-9 123

0092

 1 EMM-10 123

 2 EMM-11 123

 3 EMM-12C 123

 4 EMM-13 124

 5 EMM-14 124

 6 DAVID E. MILLS

 7 DEM-1CT 124

 8 DEM-2 124

 9 DEM-3CT 124

10 DEM-4C 124

11 DEM-5 124

12 DEM-6C 124

13 DEM-7 124

14 DEM-8C 124

15 DEM-9CT 125

16 DEM-10 125

17 DEM-11C 125

18 DEM-12CT 125

19 DEM-13C 125

20 DEM-14C 125

21 DEM-15 125

22 DEM-16C 125

23 DEM-17C 125

24 DEM-18C 125

25 DEM-19 125

0093

 1 DEM-20 125

 2 DEM-21 125

 3 DEM-22C 125

 4 DEM-23 126

 5 DEM-24C 126

 6 DEM-25C 126

 7 DEM-26 126

 8 DEM-27C 126

 9 DEM-28 126

10 DEM-29 126

11 DEM-30 126

12 DEM-31 126

13 DEM-32C 126

14 DEM-33 126

15 LORIN I. MOLANDER

16 LIM-1T 126

17 LIM-2 126

18 ROGER A. MORIN

19 RAM-1T 126

20 RAM-2 126

21 RAM-3 126

22 RAM-4 126

23 RAM-5 126

24 RAM-6 127

25 RAM-7 127

0094

 1 RAM-8 127

 2 RAM-9 127

 3 RAM-10 127

 4 RAM-11 127

 5 RAM-12 127

 6 RAM-13 127

 7 RAM-14 127

 8 RAM-15 127

 9 RAM-16 127

10 RAM-17 127

11 RAM-18 128

12 RAM-19T 128

13 RAM-20T 128

14 RAM-21 128

15 RAM-22 128

16 RAM-23 128

17 RAM-24 128

18 RAM-25 128

19 RAM-26 128

20 RAM-27 128

21 RAM-28 128

22 RAM-29 128

23 RAM-30 128

24 RAM-31 128

25 RAM-32 128

0095

 1 LOUIS E. ODOM

 2 LEO-1CT 129

 3 LEO-2 129

 4 LEO-3C (Duplicate of RG-37C)

 5 LEO-4 129

 6 LEO-5C 129

 7 LEO-6C 129

 8 LEO-7C 129

 9 LEO-8C 129

10 LEO-9C 129

11 LEO-10CT 130

12 LEO-11C 130

13 LEO-12C 130

14 LEO-13CT 130

15 LEO-14C 130

16 LEO-15 130

17 LEO-16 130

18 JANET K. PHELPS

19 JKP-1T 131

20 JKP-2 131

21 JKP-3 131

22 JKP-4 131

23 JKP-5 131

24 JKP-6 131

25 JKP-7 131

0096

 1 JKP-8 131

 2 JKP-9 131

 3 JKP-10 131

 4 JKP-11 131

 5 JKP-12 131

 6 JKP-13 132

 7 JKP-14 132

 8 JKP-15 132

 9 JKP-16T 132

10 JKP-17 132

11 JKP-18 132

12 JKP-19 132

13 JKP-20 132

14 JKP-21 132

15 JKP-22 132

16 JKP-23 132

17 JKP-24 133

18 JKP-25T 133

19 JKP-26 133

20 JKP-27 133

21 JKP-28 133

22 JON A. PILIARIS

23 JAP-1T 133

24 JAP-2 133

25 JAP-3C 133

0097

 1 JAP-4 133

 2 JAP-5T 133

 3 JAP-6 134

 4 JAP-7 134

 5 JAP-8 134

 6 JAP-9 134

 7 JAP-10 134

 8 JAP-11 134

 9 R. CLAY RIDING

10 RCR-1CT 134

11 RCR-2 134

12 RCR-3 134

13 RCR-4CT 134

14 RCR-5 134

15 RCR-6T 135

16 RCR-7C 135

17 JOHN H. STORY

18 JHS-1T 135

19 JHS-2 135

20 JHS-3 135

21 JHS-4 135

22 JHS-5 135

23 JHS-6 135

24 JHS-7 135

25 JHS-8 136

0098

 1 JHS-9T 136

 2 JHS-10 136

 3 JHS-11 136

 4 JHS-12 136

 5 JHS-13 136

 6 JHS-14T 136

 7 JHS-15 136

 8 JHS-16 136

 9 JHS-17 136

10 JHS-18 137

11 JHS-19 137

12 JHS-20 137

13 JHS-21 137

14 JHS-22 137

15 JHS-23 137

16 JHS-24 137

17 JHS-25 137

18 JHS-26 137

19 JHS-27C 137

20 JHS-28C 137

21 JHS-29 137

22 JHS-30 137

23 JHS-31 137

24 JHS-32 138

25

0099

 1 MIKE J. STRANIK

 2 MJS-1T 138

 3 MJS-2 138

 4 MJS-3 138

 5 MJS-4 138

 6 MJS-5 138

 7 MJS-6 138

 8 MJS-7 138

 9 MJS-8T 138

10 MJS-9 138

11 MJS-10 138

12 MJS-11 138

13 MJS-12T 139

14 MJS-13 139

15 MJS-14 139

16 MJS-15 139

17 MJS-16 139

18 MJS-17 139

19 MJS-18 139

20 MJS-19 139

21 MJS-20 139

22 MJS-21 139

23 MJS-22C 139

24 MJS-23 139

25 MJS-24 139

0100

 1 BERTRAND A. VALDMAN

 2 BAV-1T 139 172

 3 BAV-2 140 172

 4 BAV-3 140 172

 5 BAV-4C 140 172

 6 BAV-5C 140 172

 7 BAV-6C 140 172

 8 BAV-7 140 172

 9 BAV-8 140 172

10 BAV-9 140 172

11 BAV-10CT 140 172

12 BAV-11 140 172

13 BAV-12C 141 172

14 PAUL K. WETHERBEE

15 PKW-1T 141

16 PKW-2 141

17 PKW-3 141

18 PKW-4 141

19 PKW-5 141

20 PKW-6 141

21 PKW-7 141

22 PKW-8 141

23 PKW-9 142

24 PKW-10 142

25

0101

 1 KATHRYN H. BREDA

 2 KHB-1TC 142

 3 KHB-2 142

 4 KHB-3 142

 5 KHB-4C 142

 6 KHB-5C 142

 7 KHB-6C 143

 8 ALAN BUCKLEY AND DONALD W. SCHOENBECK

 9 JT-1 143

10 APB-1 143

11 JT-2 143

12 JT-3C 143

13 JT-4 143

14 JT-5 143

15 JT-6C 143

16 JT-7C 143

17 MICHAEL D. FOISY

18 MDF-1T 143

19 MDF-2 143

20 MDF-3 143

21 JOANNA HUANG

22 JH-1T 144

23 JH-2 144

24 JH-3 144

25 JH-4 144

0102

 1 DANNY P. KERMODE

 2 DPK-1T 144

 3 DPK-2 144

 4 DPK-3 144

 5 DPK-4T 144

 6 ANN M. C. LARUE

 7 AMCL-1T 144

 8 AMCL-2 144

 9 ROLAND C. MARTIN

10 RCM-1T 144

11 RCM-2 144

12 DAVID NIGHTINGALE

13 DN-1T 144

14 DN-2 145

15 DN-3THC 145

16 DN-4 145

17 DN-5 145

18 DN-6 145

19 DN-7 145

20 DN-8 145

21 DN-9 145

22 DN-10 145

23 DN-11 146

24 VANDA NOVAK

25 VN-1T 146

0103

 1 VN-2 146

 2 VN-3 146

 3 VN-4 146

 4 DAVID C. PARCELL

 5 DCP-1T 146

 6 DCP-2 146

 7 DCP-3 146

 8 DCP-4 146

 9 DCP-5 146

10 DCP-6 146

11 DCP-7 146

12 DCP-8 146

13 DCP-9 146

14 DCP-10 146

15 DCP-11 146

16 DCP-12 146

17 DCP-13 146

18 DCP-14 147

19 DCP-15 147

20 DCP-16 147

21 DCP-17 147

22 DCP-18 147

23 MICHAEL P. PARVINEN

24 MPP-1T 147

25 MPP-2 147

0104

 1 THOMAS E. SCHOOLEY

 2 TES-1T 147

 3 JAMES R. DITTMER

 4 JRD-1TC 147

 5 JRD-2C 148

 6 JRD-3C 148

 7 JRD-4 148

 8 JRD-5 148

 9 JRD-6 148

10 JRD-7 148

11 JRD-8 148

12 JRD-9 148

13 JRD-10 148

14 JRD-11C 148

15 JRD-12 148

16 JRD-13 149

17 JRD-14 149

18 STEPHEN G. HILL

19 SGH-1THC 149

20 SGH-2 149

21 SGH-3 149

22 SGH-4 149

23 SGH-5 149

24 SGH-6 149

25 SGH-7 149

0105

 1 SGH-8 149

 2 SGH-9 149

 3 SGH-10 149

 4 SGH-11 149

 5 SGH-12 149

 6 SGH-13 149

 7 SGH-14 150

 8 SGH-15 150

 9 SGH-16 150

10 SCOTT NORWOOD

11 SN-1THC 150

12 SN-2 150

13 SN-3HC 150

14 SN-4HC 150

15 SN-5HC 150

16 SN-6 151

17 SN-7C 151

18 SN-8C 151

19 SN-9C 151

20 SN-10 151

21 SN-11HC 151

22 GLENN A . WATKINS

23 GAW-1T 151

24 GAW-2 151

25 GAW-3 151

0106

 1 GAW-4 151

 2 GAW-5 151

 3 RALPH C. SMITH

 4 RCS-1TC 152

 5 RCS-2 152

 6 RCS-3 152

 7 RCS-4 152

 8 KEVIN C. HIGGINS

 9 KCH-1T 152

10 KCH-2T 152

11 KCH-3 152

12 DONALD W. SCHOENBECK

13 DWS-1T 153

14 DWS-2 153

15 DWS-3 153

16 DWS-5T 153

17 DWS-6 153

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0107

 1 E X H I B I T L I S T

 2 BENCH EXHIBITS

 3 B-1 PUBLIC COUNSEL - Public Comment Exhibit

 4 PSE WITNESSES

 5 JEFFREY A. DUBIN

 6 JAD-1T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re water filtering

 7 and hydro normalization

 8 JAD-2 Witness Qualifications

 9 JAD-3 Additional Witness Qualifications

10 W. JAMES ELSEA

11 WJE-1HCT Prefiled Direct Testimony describing modeling

12 tools and quantitative analyses used to

13 evaluate resource alternatives and the

14 quantitative analyses of eight specific

15 resource alternatives

16 WJE-2 Witness Qualifications

17 WJE-3 Monthly Energy and Capacity Need By Month,

18 2008 - 2027

19 WJE-4C PSM Updates After 2007 IRP Until Completion of

20 Phase II of the 2008 IRP

21 WJE-5 AURORA Price Scenarios

22 WJE-6 2008 RFP Capital Costs (Nominal $/KW)

23 WJE-7HC Phase II - Individual Projects: Static Results

24 WJE-8HC Phase II - Individual Projects: Levelized

25 costs

0108

 1 WJE-9HC Phase II - Individual Projects: Dynamic

 2 Results

 3 WJE-10HC Phase II - Portfolios: All Portfolios Reduce

 4 Cost

 5 WJE-11HC Phase II Process

 6 WJE-12 Mint Farm Forecast Capacity Factors

 7 WJE-13HC Capital Costs - Information Gathered

 8 Telephonically from Various Sources

 9 WJE-14HC Alternatives to Wild Horse Expansion (Whiskey

10 Ridge) Development as of January 29, 2008

11 WJE-15HC Finalized Nooksack Contract Extension

12 Agreement - Fixed Price, 5 Year PPA at $57/MWh

13 WJE-16C Minutes of Energy Management Committee Meeting

14 on November 19, 2008

15 WJE-17C Resource Acquisition Comparison of Three

16 Alternatives

17 WJE-18 Mint Farm Energy Center Estimated Fixed Cost

18 Components of Operation and Maintenance

19 Expense, Depreciation, Taxes and Cost of

20 Capital Invested in Rate Base for 12-months

21 ended 12/31/2009

22 WJE-19 Mint Farm Energy Center Estimated Variable

23 Cost Components of Fuel, Fuel Transporation

24 and Electric Transmission Expense for

25 12-months ended 12/31/2009

0109

 1 WJE-20HCT Supplemental Testimony correcting errors in

 2 Portfolio Screening Models

 3 WJE-21HCT Prefiled Rebuttal re Mint Farm Prudence

 4 WJE-22 PSE Response to Public Counsel DR 515 re

 5 treatment of imputed debt per WAC

 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

 7 WJE-23C Public Counsel - PC Response to PC DR No. 563

 8 (Including Attachment A (Confidential))

 9 DONALD E. GAINES

10 DEG-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony re capital structure

11 and overall ROR proposing an equity ratio of

12 48% and a 10.8% ROE (per Morin) contributing

13 to an overall ROR of 8.56%

14 DEG-2 Witness Qualifications

15 DEG-3C Greenwich Associates Report: Credit Market

16 Seizure Deepens and Hits Companies Large and

17 Small, October 2008

18 DEG-4 Summary of Rate Cases Decided Between 1/1/2008

19 and 3/31/2000

20 DEG-5C Utility Capital Structure and Cost of Capital

21 Calculations

22 DEG-6 S&P Research Update: Puget Energy Term Loan,

23 Facility Assigned 'BB+' Rating; Puget Sound

24 Facilities Assigned 'BBB' Rating, January 30,

25 2009

0110

 1 DEG-7 Moody's Credit Opinion February 3, 2009

 2 DEG-8 Senior Secured Note Cost Comparison

 3 DEG-9T Prefiled Supplemental Direct presenting

 4 updated electric and gas load forecasts, and

 5 revised projected costs of long term debt and

 6 rate of return

 7 DEG-10C Utility Capital Structure, Cost of Capital and

 8 Rate of Return

 9 DEG-11HCT Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Cost of Capital

10 DEG-12 Staff Response to PSE DR 7 re AUS Utility

11 Reports underlying Exhibit DCP-9

12 DEG-13 Summary of Rate Cases Decided Between 1/1/2008

13 and 9/30/2009

14 DEG-14 Staff Response to PSE DR 6 re AUS Utility

15 Reports underlying Exhibit DCP-9

16 DEG-15 Staff Response to PSE DR 43 re Exhibit DCP-3

17 DEG-16 Overall Rates of Return Per PSE, Staff, Public

18 Counsel and PSE's last prior GRC

19 DEG-17 Staff Response to PSE DR 44 re Parcell's

20 contention concerning pre-tax interest

21 coverage ratio

22 DEG-18 Public Counsel Response to PSE DR 11 re

23 pre-tax interest coverage ratio

24 DEG-19 Charts Showing FFO to Interest, FFO to Average

25 Debt and Debt to Capital Ratios

0111

 1 DEG-20 Standard & Poor's Ratings Direct-PSE Credit

 2 Rating March 27, 2009

 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

 4 DEG-21 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 134

 5 (Including Attachment A)

 6 DEG-22C Public Counsel - PSE First Supplemental

 7 Response to PC DR No. 132 (Including

 8 Attachment A (Confidential)

 9 DEG-23 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 141

10 DEG-24C Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 142

11 DEG-25 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 551

12 (Highly Confidential)

13 DEG-26 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 552

14 (Highly Confidential)

15 DEG-27 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 555

16 (Including Attachment A)

17 DEG-28 Public Counsel - PSE Response to WUTC Staff DR

18 No. 221

19 DEG-29 Public Counsel - PSE Response to WUTC Staff DR

20 No. 225

21 DEG-30 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 548

22 ROGER GARRATT

23 RG-1HCT Prefiled Direct Testimony re resource

24 acquisition activity (focus on qualitative

25 analysis; see Elsea for quantitative analysis)
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 1 RG-2 Witness Qualifications

 2 RG-3HC 2008 All-Source RFP Evaluation--February 2008

 3 - July 2008

 4 RG-4HC Analyis of Wind Energy Proposals for 2008 RFP

 5 by DNV Global Energy Concepts Inc.

 6 RG-5HC PSE 2008 RFP Phase I Update Presentation to

 7 Commission Staff, May 28, 2008

 8 RG-6HC PSE 2008 RFP Phase II Update Presentation to

 9 Commission Staff, September 19, 2008

10 RG-7HC Mint Farm Energy Center Evaluation Presented

11 to Board of Directors August 4, 2008

12 RG-8 Board of Directors Resolution Approving Mint

13 Farm Acquisition

14 RG-9C Letter dated June 5, 2008 from Roger Garratt

15 to Wayzata Opportunities Fund

16 RG-10C Purchase Agreement for Mint Farm

17 RG-11 FERC Order Authorizing PSE Acquisition of Mint

18 Farm

19 RG-12 Memorandum-Odom and Schild to Wiegand: PSE

20 Generating Facility Operating Standard

21 RG-13C Mint Farm Balance Sheet

22 RG-14C EMC Market PPA Update, October 8, 2008

23 RG-15 WSPP Agreement, April 1, 2008

24 RG-16 Master Confirmation Agreement to WSPP

25 Agreement
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 1 RG-17C Barclays Bank/PSE Confirmation of Terms and

 2 Conditions

 3 RG-18C PPA between PSE and Puget Sound Hydro, LLC

 4 RG-19C Renewable Energy Credit Agreement No. 2009-001

 5 RG-20C PPA between PSE and Qualco Energy

 6 RG-21C Renewable Energy Credit Agreement No. 2009-002

 7 RG-22 Aggregation and Delivery Service Agreement

 8 RG-23 Notice of Termination from PSE to Lehman

 9 Brothers

10 RG-24 PSE Request for Proposals (50 MW power

11 purchase to begin January 1, 2009)

12 RG-25C PSE Trading Deal Sheet with Credit Suisse

13 Energy LLC 9/16/08

14 RG-26 Master Lease Agreement of September 1, 1988

15 Between BLC Corporation as Lessor and PSE as

16 Lessee

17 RG-27 GE Capital Commercial Inc. Notice to PSE of

18 Lessor's Election to Terminate Lease

19 RG-28 PSE Acknowledgement of GE Capital Commercial

20 Inc. Notice to PSE of Lessor's Election to

21 Terminate Lease

22 RG-29HC Fredonia 3&4 Lease Buyout; Energy Management

23 Committee Meeting January 14, 2008

24 RG-30HC Renewable Resource Acquisition Presentation to

25 Board of Directors August 3, 2007
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 1 RG-31C Wind Generation Market Outlook, December 2007

 2 RG-32C Assessment of the Wind Generation Market

 3 RG-33C Asset Purchase Agreement Between Whiskey Ridge

 4 Power Partners, LLC and PSE, February 12, 2008

 5 RG-34C Option and Real Estate Purchase Agreement

 6 (Kittitas County Property for Whiskey Ridge

 7 Project)

 8 RG-35C Wind Turbine Supply Agreement Between PSE as

 9 Buyer and Vestas-American Wind Technology,

10 Inc, as Supplier for the Whiskey Ridge Project

11 RG-36C Wild Horse Expansion Wind Project--Balance of

12 Plant Agreement Between PSE and RES America

13 Construction, Inc., April 6, 2009

14 RG-37C (same as LEO-3C) Service and Maintenance

15 Agreement Between PSE and Vestas-American Wind

16 Technology, Inc., for Whiskey Ridge Project,

17 November 7, 2008

18 RG-38C Wind Energy Royalty Agreement

19 RG-39HC Wild Horse Expansion--Board of Directors

20 Meeting, November 4, 2008

21 RG-40 Certificate of Secretary re Board of Directors

22 Approval of Development and Construction of

23 Expansion of Wild Horse Wind Power Facility

24 RG-41C Wild Horse Expansion Balance Sheet

25 RG-42 Wild Horse Expansion Milestones (as of May 6,
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 1 2009)

 2 RG-43 Gurantee of Renewable Energy Systems Ltd.

 3 RG-44 Supplier Parent Guaranty

 4 RG-45C Joint Development Agreement (Colombia and

 5 Garfield Counties) Among PSE, RES America

 6 Developments, Inc., Blue Sky Wind, LLC and RES

 7 America Construction Inc.

 8 RG-46C Minutes of PSE Energy Management Committee

 9 Meeting, May 27, 2008

10 RG-47C Minutes of PSE Energy Management Committee

11 Meeting, February 15, 2007

12 RG-48C PSE Renewable Energy Credits

13 RG-49 Chicago Climate Exchange--Baseline: 2003 -

14 2006 Emissions Verification and Analysis

15 RG-50C PSE Carbon Financial Interest Transactions

16 RG-51C Memo from Mills to Harris, Valdman, Markell,

17 O'Connor and McClain, 8/28/2007: Proposed

18 Revision to EMC Approval to Monetize Carbon

19 Financial Instruments through Chicago Climate

20 Exchange

21 RG-52C PSE Minutes of Energy Management Committee

22 Meeting of December 18, 2008

23 RG-53HCT Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Mint Farm

24 Prudence, Wild Horse Expansion and Costs to

25 Acquire Fredonia Units 3&4
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 1 RG-54 Mint Farm Energy Due Diligence Report, North

 2 American Energy Services Co., July 11, 2008

 3 RG-55 Inspection of Complete Works, Cowlitz County

 4 Consolidated Diking Improvement District No.

 5 1, August 1, 2007

 6 RG-56 PSE Response to Staff DR 146-Fredonia Power

 7 Plant Adjustment

 8 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

 9 RG-57HC Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 568

10 Highly Confidential

11 RG-58 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 570

12 RG-59C Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 576

13 (Including Attachment A (Confidential))

14 RG-60 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 577

15 RG-61 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 578

16 RG-62 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 579

17 RG-63 Public Counsel - PSE Response to WUTC Staff DR

18 No. 023 PC-005 (Including Attachment A only

19 (Confidential))

20 KIMBERLY J. HARRIS

21 KJH-1CT Prefiled Direct Testimony presenting summary

22 of PSE's long-term electric supply portfolio,

23 changes to the portfolio since the 2007 GRC,

24 update on projects resulting from 2008 RFP,

25 and PSE's gas supply portfolio including
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 1 Jackson Prairie Storage

 2 KJH-2 Witness Qualifications

 3 KJH-3 Map of PSE's Generation Resources

 4 KJH-4 Energy Resources - PSE's Changing Resource Mix

 5 KJH-5 Integrated Resource Plan, May 2007

 6 KJH-6 Request for Proposals January 2008--All

 7 Generation Sources and Demand Side Resources

 8 KJH-7C Schedule of Construction Activity

 9 KJH-8HCT Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Mint Farm

10 Prudence

11 JOEY M. HENDERSON

12 JMH-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony discussing Mint Farm

13 and Sumas Compliance with Washington

14 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Performance Standard

15 JMH-2 Witness Qualifications

16 JMH-3 Southwest [sic] Clean Air Agency Air Discharge

17 Permit 04-2571R2, February 25, 2008--Mint Farm

18 JMH-4 Correspondence: Henderson (PSE) to Newman

19 (Washington Dept of Ecology), November 21,

20 2008, re: Request for Determination of

21 Complaince with State Greenhouse Gas Emission

22 Performance Standard for Mint Farm

23 JMH-5 Correspondence: Rees (DOE) to Henderson (PSE)

24 re PSE purchase of Mint Farm & applicability

25 of WAC 173-407
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 1 JMH-6 Correspondence: Henderson (PSE) to Newman

 2 (Washington Dept. of Ecology) and Mahar (NW

 3 Clean Air Agency), March 19, 2009, re: 2007

 4 Annual GHG Emissions Report and EPS Compliance

 5 Determination Request for the PSE-Sumas

 6 Generating Station

 7 DAVID W. HOFF (Testimonies and Exhibits Adopted by Janet

 8 K. Phelps per JKP-25T at 2:8-11)

 9 DWH-1T David W. Hoff for PSE - Prefiled Direct

10 Testimony re electric cost of service, rate

11 spread, rate design

12 DWH-2 Professional Qualifications

13 DWH-3 Electric Cost of Service Summary and

14 Detail--Adjusted Test Year for 12 Months Ended

15 December 2008 @ Pro Forma Revenue Requirement

16 DWH-4 Electric Rate Spread and Rate Design Summaries

17 and Detail

18 DWH-5 Summary of Basic Charges

19 DWH-6 2009 GRC Addendum A PSE's Proposed Electric

20 Tariff Sheets--Advice 2009-11

21 DWH-7T Prefiled Supplemental Testimony re rate spread

22 of updated revenue requirement

23 DWH-8 Rate Spread and Rate Design Detail

24 TOM M. HUNT

25 TMH-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony re wages and
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 1 incentive plans

 2 TMH-2 Witness Qualifications

 3 TMH-3C Historic Merit Increases

 4 TMH-4 Executive Compensation

 5 TMH-5C CEO - S. Reynolds Comparator Group 25th to

 6 75th Percentile Total Comp Analysis

 7 TMH-6C Average Total Health Benefit Cost per Employee

 8 TMH-7C PSE Pension Plan Funding 1999 - 2008

 9 TMH-8 2008 Goals and Incentive Plan

10 TMH-9CT Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Retirement

11 Program Adjustments, Wages and Employee

12 Benefit Flex Credit Adjustments

13 TMH-10C EAP Data Information Solutions LLC Ad Hoc

14 Special Survey Report - 0917 DB and DC Plans

15 TMH-11C Actuaries Report for PSE Employee's Retirement

16 Plan for Plan Year Beginning January 1, 2009

17 TMH-12C PSE Retirement Plan Ten-Year Deterministic

18 Projection (2009-2018)

19 TMH-13C PSE Retirement Plan Recommended Funding

20 Guidelines

21 TMH-14C PSE Pension Market Value vs. PBO

22 TMH-15C PSE Retirement Plan Funding

23 Guidelines--Illustrated Results for

24 2009--Preliminary as of March 11, 2009

25 TMH-16C PSE Retirement Plan Historic Statistics
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 1 TMH-17C Trends in Executive Retirement Programs and

 2 Change in Control Arrangements

 3 TMH-18C Historic Merit Increases

 4 TMH-19 Employment Cost Index--All Private vs.

 5 Utilities

 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

 7 TMH-20 Staff - PSE Response to Staff Data Request

 8 No. 246

 9 TMH-21 Public Counsel - Snohomish Public Utility

10 District's 2008 Annual Report (Excerpt)

11 TMH-22 Public Counsel - Bureau of Labor Statistics

12 Labor Productivity News Release December 2009

13 TMH-23 FEA - Response to PSE Data Request No. 003 to

14 FEA (including attachments)

15 TMH-24 FEA - Supplemental Response to PSE Data

16 Request No. 003 to FEA

17 TMH-25 FEA - PSE Response to FEA DR 03.04 (same as

18 PSE Response to PC DR 082)

19 KIM W. LANE

20 KWL-1T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Operations and

21 Maintenance Expense Required To Implement the

22 Baker Project License and the Snoqualmie

23 Project License

24 KWL-2 Witness Qualifications

25 KWL-3 Table 1: Baker Project License O&M Breakdown
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 1 ($4,740,511 in rate year expense)

 2 Table 2: Snoqualmie Project License O&M

 3 Breakdown ($1,012,745 in rate year expense)

 4 MICHAEL L. JONES

 5 MLJ-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony re Colstrip

 6 MLJ-2 Witness Qualifications

 7 MLJ-3 Colstrip to Garrison Actual Loss Percentage by

 8 Month

 9 MLJ-4 Background of Settlement of Claims: Duane and

10 Carol Ankney et al. v. PPL Montana LLC et al.

11 MLJ-5CT Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Colstrip O&M

12 Expense

13 MLJ-6 Colstrip 5-Year Historical Average--Colstrip

14 O&M Actual Cost

15 MLJ-7 Colstrip O&M in Rates-Actuals

16 MATTHEW R. MARCELIA

17 MRM-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony re restating

18 adjustment for federal income taxes, tax

19 benefit of pro forma interest and adjustment

20 for interest paid to IRS

21 MRM-2 Witness Qualifications

22 MRM-3 Comparison of Original Tax Returns with the

23 Final IRS Settlement; Interest Calculation

24 MRM-4T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony concerning Tax

25 Adjustments
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 1 MRM-5 White Paper Re Property Taxes

 2 MRM-6 Electric and Gas Washington Taxable Property

 3 Values (actual)

 4 MRM-7 PSE Letter Request of October 26, 2005 Seeking

 5 To Withdraw Filings in Dockets UE-05125 and

 6 05128

 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBTS

 8 MRM-8 Staff - PSE Response to Staff Data Request

 9 No. 234

10 MRM-9 Staff - PSE Property Taxes for 2008 Worksheet

11 MRM-10 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 536

12 (Without Attachment A)

13 MRM-11 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 558

14 MRM-12 FEA - PSE Response to FEA DR 01.34

15 MRM-13 FEA - PSE Response to FEA DR 01.44

16 MRM-14 FEA - Utah Public Service Commission Order

17 Approving Stipulation Regarding Change in

18 Income Tax Treatment of Repair Deductions and

19 Basis Normalization (Rocky Mountain Power

20 Application to Increase Rates, PSCU Dockets

21 09-035-23 and 09-035-03)

22 MRM-15C FEA - CONFIDENTIAL - PSE Response to FEA DR

23 02.03

24 MRM-16C FEA - CONFIDENTIAL - PSE Response to FEA DR

25 04.01
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 1 ERIC M. MARKELL

 2 EMM-1CT Prefiled Direct Testimony summarizing the

 3 Company's requested rate relief, describing

 4 PSE's financial condition and need for

 5 capital, describing rate mitigation

 6 opportunities and cost management measures,

 7 summarizing pension plan funding, describing

 8 proposed sale of renewable energy credits

 9 (RECs), proposing increased low income program

10 funding, giving overview of other witnesses

11 EMM-2 Witness Qualifications

12 EMM-3C Multi-Year Financial Plan: 2009-2013

13 EMM-4C PSE Return on Equity for Rate Year

14 EMM-5T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony providing overview

15 of PSE Rebuttal

16 EMM-6C PSE Return on Regulatory Equity 2003 - 2009

17 EMM-7C PSE Return on Regulatory Equity GRC 2009 Rate

18 Year-12 Months Ending March 31, 2011

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBTS

20 EMM-8 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 136

21 EMM-9 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 137

22 EMM-10 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 144

23 EMM-11 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 145

24 EMM-12C Public Counsel - PSE First Supplemental

25 Response (9/29/09) and Response (8/19/09) to
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 1 PC DR No. 323 (Including Attachment B only

 2 (Confidential))

 3 EMM-13 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 538

 4 EMM-14 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 540

 5 DAVID E. MILLS

 6 DEM-1CT Prefiled Direct Testimony re power costs and

 7 risk management, wind integration, need for

 8 transmission, reassessment of electric

 9 resource need, economic dispatch of power,

10 Renewable Energy Credits (I-937) and Renewable

11 Portfolio Standard energy

12 DEM-2 Professional Qualifications

13 DEM-3CT Additional Testimony re PSE's Organizational

14 Structure, Policies and Portfolio Risk

15 Management; PSE Modeling Tools and Information

16 Used To Manage Portfolio and Manage Risk

17 DEM-4C Energy Cost Risk Management

18 DEM-5 Updated Planning Standard Increases Resource

19 Need

20 DEM-6C Heat Rates: Market vs Unit--Mid-C & Off-Peak

21 Power vs. Sumas Daily Natural Gas

22 DEM-7 2009 GRC Power Cost Projections AURORA vs

23 Non-AURORA Power Costs

24 DEM-8C 2009 GRC vs 2007 GRC Updated Power Cost

25 Projections
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 1 DEM-9CT Prefiled Supplemental Testimony updating

 2 projected rate year power costs to $1,134.3

 3 million, a $50.1 million decrease from the

 4 originally filed power costs

 5 DEM-10 Power Cost Projections AURORA + Non-AURORA

 6 Power 8.13.09 AURORA Model Run Costs

 7 DEM-11C Updated vs As-Filed Power Cost Projections

 8 DEM-12CT Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Power Costs

 9 DEM-13C PSE's Response to ICNU DR 3.11 concerning

10 budgets or power cost forecasts from Grant Co.

11 PUD re Priest Rapids and Wanapum

12 DEM-14C Joint Parties' Water Filtering Adjustment

13 Calculation--With Correction

14 DEM-15 Rebuttal Production O&M Summary

15 DEM-16C Summary of Rebuttal Power Costs Changes from

16 09 GRC Update

17 DEM-17C Estimated Prudence Disallowance for Tenaska

18 and March Point 2 Using PSE's Rate of Return

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

20 DEM-18C Staff - DEM-WP(C) Major Maintenance Tool 2009

21 GRC Update - CONFIDENTIAL

22 DEM-19 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 571

23 DEM-20 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 572

24 DEM-21 ICNU - DEM Table 3 workpapers.pdf

25 DEM-22C ICNU - DEM Westcoast MTM Workpaper.pdf
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 1 DEM-23 ICNU - Gas Hedges v Need (C).pdf

 2 DEM-24C ICNU - Gas MTM Summary.pdf

 3 DEM-25C ICNU - Gas Purchases.pdf

 4 DEM-26 ICNU - PSE 1999 10K.pdf

 5 DEM-27C ICNU - PSE Tenaska Economics.pdf

 6 DEM-28 ICNU - Staff Memo on Encogen Buyout.pdf

 7 DEM-29 ICNU - Tenaska Ecogen Data Responses.pdf

 8 DEM-30 ICNU - PSE Response to ICNU Data Request 2.28

 9 DEM-31 ICNU - PSE Response to ICNU Data Request 2.29

10 DEM-32C ICNU - PSE Response to Staff Data Request 259

11 DEM-33 ICNU - PSE Response to ICNU Data Request 7.01

12 LORIN I. MOLANDER

13 LIM-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony presenting electric

14 and gas temperature adjustment methodology and

15 results; effect of proposed electric and gas

16 rate increase on residential customers' bills

17 LIM-2 Professional Qualifications

18 ROGER A. MORIN

19 RAM-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony re cost of capital

20 RAM-2 Professional Qualifications

21 RAM-3 Integrated Electric Utility Beta Estimates

22 RAM-4 S&P Utility Index Electric Utilities Beta

23 Estimate

24 RAM-5 Value Line Western Electric Utilities Beta

25 Estimates
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 1 RAM-6 CAPM, Empirical CAPM

 2 RAM-7 Historical Risk Premium for the Electric

 3 Utility Industry

 4 RAM-8 Utility Industry Historical Risk Premium

 5 RAM-9 Historical Growth Rates - Electric Utilities

 6 RAM-10 Integrated Electric Utilities DCF Analysis:

 7 Value Line Growth Projections

 8 RAM-11 Integrated Electric Utilities DCF Analysis:

 9 Value Line Growth Projections (expanded data)

10 RAM-12 Integrated Electric Utilities DCF Analysis:

11 Analysts' Growth Projections

12 RAM-13 S&P Utility Index Electric Utilities DCF

13 Analysis Value Line Growth Projections

14 RAM-14 S&P Utility Index Electric Utilities DCF

15 Analysis Value Line Growth Projections

16 (expanded data)

17 RAM-15 S&P Utility Index Electric Utilities DCF

18 Analysis Value Line Growth Projections

19 (expanded data)

20 RAM-16 S&P Utility Index Electric Utilities DCF

21 Analysis Analysts' Growth Projections

22 (expanded data)

23 RAM-17 S&P Utility Index Electric Utilities DCF

24 Analysis Analysts' Growth Projections

25 (expanded data)
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 1 RAM-18 S&P Utility Index Electric Utilities Common

 2 Equity Ratios

 3 RAM-19T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Cost of Capital

 4 RAM-20T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Mr. Hill's

 5 Flotation Cost Allowance

 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

 7 RAM-21 Staff - PSE Response to Staff Data Request

 8 No. 226

 9 RAM-22 Staff - PSE Response to Staff Data Request

10 No. 227

11 RAM-23 Staff - PSE Response to Staff Data Request

12 No. 228

13 RAM-24 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 162

14 RAM-25 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 168

15 (Including Attachment A)

16 RAM-26 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 170

17 (Including Attachment A)

18 RAM-27 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 544

19 RAM-28 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 545

20 RAM-29 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 546

21 RAM-30 Public Counsel- PSE Response to PC DR No. 547

22 (Including Attachment A)

23 RAM-31 Public Counsel - PSE Response WUTC Staff DR

24 No. 227

25 RAM-32 Public Counsel - Direct Testimony
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 1 (Nonconfidential) of Dr. Roger A. Morin in

 2 Docket No. UE-072300 (Excerpts) (Including

 3 Exhibit No. RAM-7)

 4 LOUIS E. ODOM

 5 LEO-1CT Prefiled Direct Testimony describing wind and

 6 thermal resources, performance and operations

 7 of resources, maintenance management programs

 8 and service contract specifics; describing how

 9 Mint Farm and Sumas are designed and intended

10 for baseload generation

11 LEO-2 Professional Qualifications

12 LEO-3C (same as RG-37C)

13 LEO-4 Heavy-Duty Gas Turbine Operating and

14 Maintenance Considerations by GE Energy

15 LEO-5C Maintenance Expense on Thermal Units: 5-Year

16 Average of Expense Less Than $2 Million

17 LEO-6C Contractual Service Agreement Between PSE and

18 General Electric International, Inc., December

19 6, 2007

20 LEO-7C General Electric Contract Services

21 Contract--Appendix 7

22 LEO-8C Long Term Service Agreement Between Mint Farm

23 Generation, LLC and General Electric

24 International, Ic., June 16, 2004

25 LEO-9C Parts and Service Agreement - PSE and GE, May
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 1 1, 2008

 2 LEO-10CT Prefiled Supplemental Testimony updating

 3 maintenance expense on Encogen and correcting

 4 other maintenance costs (budgeted labor costs

 5 for thermal facilities)

 6 LEO-11C Maintenance Expense on Thermal Units--5-Year

 7 Average of Expense Less Than $2 Million,

 8 2010-2014

 9 LEO-12C Thermal Units Production O&M

10 LEO-13CT Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony stating PSE's

11 agreement to accounting guidelines similar to

12 what Staff and Public Counsel propose for

13 major maintenance O&M costs for SCCT, CCCT and

14 wind generation, subject to a change from

15 Staff's proposed amortization; proposing use

16 of test period or recent period data for

17 determining routine maintenance expense, as

18 opposed to Staff five-year average approach.

19 LEO-14C Production O&M Summary

20 LEO-15 PSE Response to Staff DR 177

21 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

22 LEO-16 PSE Response to Staff DR 260

23 JANET K. PHELPS

24 (Note that Ms. Phelps also adopts Mr. Hoff's prefiled

25 testimonies and exhibits)
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 1 JKP-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony re pro forma gas

 2 revenue, gas cost of service study, rate

 3 spread and rate design; gas cost of service

 4 collaborative per Dockets UE-072300 and

 5 UG-072301 (2007 GRC)

 6 JKP-2 Witness Qualifications

 7 JKP-3 Adjustments to Volume (Therms) by Rate

 8 Schedule for Test Year ended December 31, 2008

 9 JKP-4 Correspondence dated 12/30/2008, Ruther&

10 Reynolds to Phelps re: Facilitator Report on

11 the PSE Natural Gas Cost of Service

12 Collaborative

13 JKP-5 2009 Gas Cost of Service Study--Proposed Test

14 Year Without Gas--Summary

15 JKP-6 2009 Gas Cost of Service Study--Proposed Test

16 Year With Gas--Summary

17 JKP-7 Account Detail by Classification and Rate

18 Class

19 JKP-8 Account Inputs

20 JKP-9 External Allocators

21 JKP-10 2009 Gas Cost of Service Study--Proposed Test

22 Year Without Gas (UG-072301 Method)--Summary

23 JKP-11 2009 Gas Cost of Service Study--Proposed Test

24 Year With Gas (UG-072301 Method)--Summary

25 JKP-12 Proposed Allocation of Account 376
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 1 Distribution Mains

 2 JKP-13 Allocation of Revenue Deficiency to Rate

 3 Classes

 4 JKP-14 Comparison of Residential Basic Charges of Gas

 5 Distribution Companies

 6 JKP-15 Proposed Natural Gas Tariff Sheets

 7 JKP-16T Prefiled Supplemental Testimony Updating

 8 Proforma Revenue, Cost of Service and Rate

 9 Spread to reflect Mr. Stranik's removal of

10 Everett Delta Lease revenue, which increases

11 the gas revenue requirement request in this

12 case

13 JKP-17 Revised Adjustments to Volume (Therms) by Rate

14 Schedule for Test Year ended December 31, 2008

15 JKP-18 Revised 2009 Gas Cost of Service

16 Study--Proposed Test Year Without Gas--Summary

17 JKP-19 Revised 2009 Gas Cost of Service

18 Study--Proposed Test Year With Gas--Summary

19 JKP-20 Revised Account Detail by Classification and

20 Rate Class

21 JKP-21 Revised Account Inputs

22 JKP-22 Revised 2009 Gas Cost of Service

23 Study--Proposed Test Year Without Gas

24 (UG-072301 Method)--Summary

25 JKP-23 Revised 2009 Gas Cost of Service
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 1 Study--Proposed Test Year With Gas (UG-072301

 2 Method)--Summary

 3 JKP-24 Revised Allocation of Revenue Deficiency to

 4 Rate Classes

 5 JKP-25T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony concerning Gas and

 6 Electric Cost of Service Studies, Rate Spread

 7 and Rate Design

 8 JKP-26 Hypothetical Example--Impact of Revenue

 9 Deficiency Calculation on Revenue to Cost

10 Ratios and Class Rates of Return

11 JKP-27 Electric Cost of Service Summary

12 JKP-28 Summary Rate Spread

13 JON A. PILIARIS

14 JAP-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony presenting

15 classification of electric production costs

16 within COS study; proposed implementation of

17 new adjustment to restate weather normalized

18 test year loads to reflect phase-in of

19 conservation programs

20 JAP-2 Witness Qualifications

21 JAP-3C Peak Credit Method for 2009 COS Study--Company

22 Proposal

23 JAP-4 Conservation Phase-In Adjustments for Electric

24 and Gas

25 JAP-5T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Conservation
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 1 Phase-In Adjustment and Peak Credit

 2 Calculations

 3 JAP-6 Independent Third-Party Evaluation of PSE's

 4 Electric Conservation Incentive Mechanism

 5 JAP-7 Conservation Phase-In Adjustment Savings

 6 JAP-8 Derivation of "Modified" Conservation Phase-In

 7 Adjustment--Electric

 8 JAP-9 Derivation of "Modified" Conservation Phase-In

 9 Adjustment--Natural Gas

10 JAP-10 Estimated Impact of Conservation-Related

11 Demand Charge Revenue Loss on Electric System

12 Revenue Deficiency Under Proposed and Modified

13 Conservation Phase-In

14 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

15 (JAP-11) Staff - Staff Response to Company Data Request

16 R. CLAY RIDING

17 RCR-1CT Prefiled Direct Testimony addressing issues

18 related to natural gas transmission and

19 storage

20 RCR-2 Witness Qualifications

21 RCR-3 Map-Western Natural Gas Infrastructure

22 RCR-4CT Prefiled Supplemental Testimony updating

23 status of pipeline capacity acquisition

24 RCR-5 PSE Power Book - Northwest Pipeline Firm

25 Capacity, with Renewal Rights
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 1 RCR-6T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony

 2 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

 3 RCR-7C ICNU - PSE Response to ICNU Data Request 2.19

 4 JOHN H. STORY

 5 JHS-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony re electric results

 6 of operations (revenue requirement);

 7 allocation of common expenditures between

 8 electric and gas; update for Power Cost

 9 Adjustment (PCA) mechanism; deferred

10 accounting for Mint Farm; sale of renewable

11 energy credits (RECs)

12 JHS-2 Professional Qualifications

13 JHS-3 Income Statement for 12 Months Ended 9/30/2007

14 and 12/31/2008

15 JHS-4 Results of Operations for 12 Months Ended

16 12/31/2008 - General Rate Increase

17 JHS-5 Electric General Rate Increase for 12 Months

18 Ended 12/31/2008

19 JHS-6 Electric Results of Operations Forecast 12

20 Months Ended 12/31/2008 vs 9/30/2007 GRC--

21 Unit Cost

22 JHS-7 Exhibit A-1: Power Cost Rate; Exhibit A-2:

23 Transmission Rate Base; Exhibit A-3: Colstrip

24 Fixed Costs; Exhibit A-4: Production

25 Adjustment; Exhibit A-5: Power Costs; Exhibit
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 1 D: Regulatory Assets and Liabilities net of

 2 Accumulated Amoritization and Deferred Taxes

 3 (PCA Period 7--12/31/2008)

 4 JHS-8 Settlement Terms for PCA

 5 JHS-9T Prefiled Supplemental Testimony updating pro

 6 forma power costs and other adjustments,

 7 increasing electric revenue deficiency from

 8 $148,443,904 to $153,940,365

 9 JHS-10 Update to JHS-4: Results of Operations

10 JHS-11 Revised Capital Structure

11 JHS-12 Revised Electric Results of Operations

12 Forecast 12 Months Ended 12/31/2008 vs

13 9/30/2007 GRC-- Unit Cost

14 JHS-13 REVISED JHS-7C: Exhibit A-1: Power Cost Rate;

15 Exhibit A-2: Transmission Rate Base; Exhibit

16 A-3: Colstrip Fixed Costs; Exhibit A-4:

17 Production Adjustment; Exhibit A-5: Power

18 Costs; Exhibit D: Regulatory Assets and

19 Liabilities net of Accumulated Amoritization

20 and Deferred Taxes (PCA Period 7--12/31/2008)

21 JHS-14T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony--Revenue

22 Requirement

23 JHS-15 Income Statement

24 JHS-16 Results of Operations

25 JHS-17 General Rate Increase
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 1 JHS-18 Electric Results of Operations Forecast 12

 2 Months Ended December 31, 2008 vs. September

 3 30, 2007 GRC Unit Cost

 4 JHS-19 Exhibit A-1 Power Cost Rate

 5 JHS-20 Comparison of Revenue Requirement Between

 6 Commission Staff Response and PSE Rebuttal

 7 JHS-21 Exhibit MPP-2T in Docket UE-072300 prefiled

 8 testimony of Mike Parvinen

 9 JHS-22 Exhibit WHW-1T in Docket UE-072300 prefiled

10 testimony of William Weinman

11 JHS-23 Unit Cost - Power Cost

12 JHS-24 Power Cost Adjustment Summary

13 JHS-25 Response of Public Counsel to PSE DR 12

14 JHS-26 PSE Response to Staff DR 166

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

16 JHS-27C Staff - Fourth Supplemental Response to Staff

17 Data Request 23-WUTC-033 CONFIDENTIAL

18 JHS-28C Staff - Workpaper for Adjustment 16.25

19 CONFIDENTIAL

20 JHS-29 Staff - PSE Response to Staff Data Request

21 No. 209

22 JHS-30 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 539

23 JHS-31 Public Counsel - PSE Supplemental Response to

24 PC DR No. 583 in Docket Nos. UE-072300 and

25 UG-072301 (Without Attachments A, B and C)
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 1 JHS-32 ICNU - Excerpt from JHS workpaper 16.31

 2 MIKE J. STRANIK

 3 MJS-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony describing natural

 4 gas results of operations and revenue

 5 deficiency; allocation; electric and gas

 6 savings resulting from merger with Puget

 7 Holdings LLC

 8 MJS-2 Witness Qualifications

 9 MJS-3 Income Statement for 12 Months Ended 9/30/2007

10 and 12/31/2008

11 MJS-4 Gas Results of Operations

12 MJS-5 General Rate Increase--Gas

13 MJS-6 Gas Results of Operations Unit Cost

14 MJS-7 Cost Savings as Result of Merger--2008 Test

15 Year

16 MJS-8T Prefiled Supplemental Testimony updating

17 revenue requirement by removing $3,209,260 in

18 Everett Delta lease revenues, which are now

19 passed through in the PGA (raises revenue

20 requirement request from $27,199,177 to

21 $30,408,378)

22 MJS-9 Revised Results of Operations

23 MJS-10 Revised Revenue Requirement Deficiency

24 Calculation

25 MJS-11 Revised Gas Results of Operations Unit Cost
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 1 MJS-12T Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony re Natural Gas

 2 Revenue Requirement, Contested and Uncontested

 3 Adjustments

 4 MJS-13 Income Statement for 12 mos ended 9/30/2007

 5 and 12/31/08

 6 MJS-14 Balance Sheet for 12 mos ended 9/30/2007 and

 7 12/31/08

 8 MJS-15 General Rate Increase--Gas--Revised

 9 MJS-16 Gas Results of Operations Unit Cost--Revised

10 MJS-17 Comparison of Revenue Requirement Between

11 Commission Staff Response and PSE Rebuttal

12 MJS-18 Pictures and Data re Use of Company Aircraft

13 MJS-19 Aircraft Log

14 MJS-20 Union Wage Increases

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

16 MJS-21 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 140

17 MJS-22C Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 380

18 (Including Attachment A, B and C

19 (Confidential))

20 MJS-23 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 557

21 (Without Attachments A and B)

22 MJS-24 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 121

23 (Without Attachment A)

24 BERTRAND A. VALDMAN

25 BAV-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony describing efforts
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 1 to control costs while maintaining high levels

 2 of service quality, safety and reliability

 3 BAV-2 Witness Qualifications

 4 BAV-3 2007 Combo Non-Production/Generation O&M Cost

 5 per Customer

 6 BAV-4C T&D Capital Expenditures by Category -

 7 Electric

 8 BAV-5C T&D Capital Expenditures by Category - Gas

 9 BAV-6C T&D Capital Expenditures by Category -Electric

10 and Gas Total

11 BAV-7 Rising Utility Construction Costs: Source and

12 Impacts by M. W. Chupka and G. Basheda, The

13 Bratttle Group, September 2007

14 BAV-8 Storm Hardening the Electric Transmission

15 System by S. Guggenmoos, Ecological Solutions

16 Inc., March 2009

17 BAV-9 Organization Chart

18 BAV-10CT Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony responding to

19 Dittmer on efficiency gains (Pro Forma

20 Principles) and Foisey proposed elimination of

21 pro forma increases in service contract

22 baseline charges (O&M)

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

24 BAV-11 Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 234

25 (Including Attachment A)
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 1 BAV-12C Public Counsel - PSE Response to PC DR No. 232

 2 (Including Attachment A (Confidential))

 3 PAUL K. WETHERBEE

 4 PKW-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony regarding PSE's

 5 Rejection of original FERC license for White

 6 River issued in 1997; due diligence re sale of

 7 White River Project assets; status of PSE's

 8 application to transfer White River assets;

 9 request for approval of Cascade Water Alliance

10 transaction sale; update of the on-going

11 activities to sell White River real estate

12 PKW-2 Witness Qualifications

13 PKW-3 Map of White River lands and proposed

14 conveyances

15 PKW-4 Lake Tapps Asset Purchase Agreement Between

16 PSE and Cascade Water Alliance

17 PKW-5 Summary Appraisal Report of PSE Lake Tapps,

18 Bedlands, and Flume and Outfall Properties,

19 April 25, 2008

20 PKW-6 White River Project Retirement Cost Estimate,

21 August 2006

22 PKW-7 Lake Tapps Water Valuation Research, West

23 Water Research LLC, May 24, 2004

24 PKW-8 Agreement Regarding Reservoir Management

25 Between PSE and the Lake Tapps Community
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 1 PKW-9 Memorandum of Understanding on Management of

 2 Lake Tapps for Public Water Supply and

 3 Recreation Between the Cascade Water Alliance

 4 and Pierce County, August 2, 2005

 5 PKW-10 Correspondence of January 27, 2006, from J.

 6 Daniels, Muckleshoot Tribal Council to S.

 7 Reynolds and P. Wiegand, PSE; Correspondence

 8 of July 16, 2007, from Charlotte Williams,

 9 Muckleshoot Indian Tribe to S. Reynolds and G.

10 Duvernoy Cascade Land Conservancy

11 COMMISSION STAFF

12 KATHRYN H. BREDA

13 KHB-1TC Prefiled Response Testimony re Electric and

14 Natural Gas Revenue Requirements; Company

15 Accounting Proposal For Major Maintenance

16 Activities; Ratemaking Adjustments for Power

17 Cost O&M, and Major Plant Additions

18 KHB-2 Electric Results of Operations and Revenue

19 Requirement

20 KHB-3 Gas Results of Operations and Revenue

21 Requirement

22 KHB-4C PSE Maintenance Under Long-Term Service

23 Agreements From 2010 to 2015

24 KHB-5C Maintenance Expense Comparison, Company

25 Proposed Change Versus Current Accounting
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 1 Method

 2 KHB-6C Comparison of Staff Versus Company Adjustment

 3 10.03 Power Costs- O&M

 4 ALAN BUCKLEY (co-sponsored with DONALD W. SCHOENBECK,

 5 ICNU)

 6 JT-1 Joint Prefiled Response Testimony re power

 7 costs

 8 APB-1 Witness Qualifications

 9 JT-2 Summary of ICNU/Staff Adjustments to Rate Year

10 Power Cost Projection

11 JT-3C PSE 2009 GRC Update vs. Joint Testimony Power

12 Cost Projections

13 JT-4 Company Response to ICNU DR 2.15

14 JT-5 Company Responses to ICNU DRs 3.11 and 3.14

15 JT-6C Company Response to ICNU DR 2.24

16 JT-7C Company Response to ICNU DR 1.14

17 MICHAEL D. FOISY

18 MDF-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re Revenue

19 Requirement Adjustments: Miscellaneous

20 Operating Expenses and Property Taxes

21 MDF-2 Staff Miscellaneous Operating Expenses

22 Adjustment, Electric

23 MDF-3 Staff Miscellaneous Operating Expenses

24 Adjustment, Gas

25
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 1 JOANNA HUANG

 2 JH-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re Revenue

 3 Requirement Adjustments: Wage Increases,

 4 Investment Plan, and Employee Insurance

 5 JH-2 Staff Wage Increase Adjustments

 6 JH-3 Staff Investment Plan Adjustments

 7 JH-4 Staff Employee Insurance Adjustments

 8 DANNY P. KERMODE

 9 DPK-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re Working Capital

10 DPK-2 Staff Schedule of ISWC

11 DPK-3 Staff Schedule of the Allocation of ISWC

12 DPK-4T Supplemental Prefiled Response Testimony re

13 ISWC

14 ANN M. C. LARUE

15 AMCL-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re Directors &

16 Officers Insurance Adjustments

17 AMCL-2 Staff Adjustments 10.17 and 9.12 D&O Insurance

18 Restated

19 ROLAND C. MARTIN

20 RCM-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re Revenue

21 Requirement Adjustments, Mint Farm Deferral

22 RCM-2 Analysis of Net Benefit Related to SSCM

23 Deductions and Repayments

24 DAVID NIGHTINGALE

25 DN-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re Prudence of
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 1 Electric Generation Resources, and Mint Farm

 2 and Sumas Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standard

 3 Compliance

 4 DN-2 Letter of June 9, 2009 from Dept of Ecology to

 5 PSE re Purchase of Sumas Generating Station

 6 and Applicability of Chapter 173-407 WAC

 7 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions Performance

 8 Standard)

 9 DN-3THC Prefiled Cross-Answering Testimony re Mint

10 Farm Prudence

11 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

12 DN-4 Public Counsel - WUTC Staff Response to PC DR

13 No. 2

14 DN-5 Public Counsel - WUTC Staff Response to PC DR

15 No. 3

16 DN-6 Public Counsel - WUTC Staff Response to PC DR

17 No. 5

18 DN-7 Public Counsel - WUTC Staff Response to PC DR

19 No. 6

20 DN-8 Public Counsel - WUTC Staff Response to PC DR

21 No. 7

22 DN-9 Public Counsel - WUTC Staff Response to PC DR

23 No. 8

24 DN-10 Public Counsel - WUTC Staff Response to PC DR

25 No. 9
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 1 DN-11 Public Counsel - WUTC Staff Response to PC DR

 2 No. 10

 3 VANDA NOVAK

 4 VN-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re Electric and

 5 Gas Temperature Normalization Adjustments

 6 VN-2 Company Response to Staff DR 186

 7 VN-3 Company Response to Staff DR 187

 8 VN-4 Company Response to Staff DR 188

 9 DAVID C. PARCELL

10 DCP-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re Cost of Capital

11 DCP-2 Witness Qualifications

12 DCP-3 PSE Inc. Total Cost of Capital

13 DCP-4 Economic Indicators

14 DCP-5 Rating Agency Reports

15 DCP-6 Puget Energy, Inc. Segment Financial

16 Information 2006-2008

17 DCP-7 Bond Ratings

18 DCP-8 PSE Capital Structure Ratios 2004 -2008

19 DCP-9 AUS Utility Reports Electric Utility Groups

20 Average Common Equity Ratios

21 DCP-10 Proxy Companies Basis for Selection

22 DCP-11 Comparison Companies Divident Yield

23 DCP-12 Standard & Poor's 500 Composit Return on

24 Average Common Equity

25 DCP-13 Comparison Companies CAPM Cost Rates
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 1 DCP-14 Comparison Companies Rates of Return on

 2 Average Common Equity

 3 DCP-15 Standard & Poor's 500 Composit Returns and

 4 Market-to-Book Ratios 1992-2007

 5 DCP-16 Risk Indicators

 6 DCP-17 PSE Rating Agency Ratios

 7 DCP-18 Risk Premium by Decade as Derived by PSE

 8 Witness Morin

 9 MICHAEL P. PARVINEN

10 MPP-1T Prefiled Direct Testimony re General

11 Ratemaking Policy; Company Conservation

12 Phase-In Proposal; Company Production Factor

13 Adjustment; Merger Commitment Compliance

14 MPP-2 Contested/Uncontested Adjustments and Staff

15 Responsibility

16 THOMAS E. SCHOOLEY

17 TES-1T Revenue Requirement Adjustments 10.02 and

18 9.02, General Revenues, and

19 Adjustments 10.23 and 9.16, Property and

20 Liability Insurance; Cost of Service; Rate

21 Spread and Rate Design

22 PUBLIC COUNSEL

23 JAMES R. DITTMER

24 JRD-1TC Prefiled Response Testimony re revenue

25 requirements: cost of capital recommendations
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 1 sponsored by Mr. Stephen Hill, the power

 2 supply/production cost adjustments sponsored

 3 by Mr. Scott Norwood, as well as the

 4 miscellaneous rate base and income statement

 5 adjustments

 6 JRD-2C PSE Electric Accounting Exhibits

 7 JRD-3C PSE Gas Accounting Exhibits

 8 JRD-4 PSE's Response to Public Counsel Data Request

 9 No. 439

10 JRD-5 PSE's Response to Public Counsel Data Request

11 No. 234

12 JRD-6 PSE's Response to Public Counsel Data Request

13 No. 58

14 JRD-7 September 2009 Producer Price Indexes News

15 Release issued by the Bureau of Labor

16 Statistics

17 JRD-8 PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request

18 No. 434

19 JRD-9 PSE Weather Normalized Energy Sales (MWh)

20 Revenue Class 2003 through 2008

21 JRD-10 PSE's Weather Normalized Sales (Therms) by

22 Customer Class 2003-2008

23 JRD-11C PSE's Response to Public Counsel Data Request

24 No. 414

25 JRD-12 Actual NonFuel Production Operations and
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 1 Maintenance Expense for PSE Generating Units

 2 in Service for the Entire Historic Test Year

 3 JRD-13 PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request

 4 No. 59

 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS

 6 JRD-14 PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request

 7 434

 8 STEPHEN G. HILL

 9 SGH-1THC Prefiled Response Testiomony re cost of

10 capital

11 SGH-2 Professional Qualifications

12 SGH-3 Fundamentals of Utility Long-Term Growth

13 SGH-4 Sample Company Growth Rate Analysis

14 SGH-5 PSE Historical Capital Structure

15 SGH-6 PSE Electric Utility Sample Group Selection

16 SGH-7 DCF Growth Rate Parameters Electric Utilities

17 (Corrected 12/2/09)

18 SGH-8 DCF Growth Rates--Electric Utilities

19 (Corrected 12/2/09)

20 SGH-9 Stock Price, Dividends, Yields--Electric

21 Utilities

22 SGH-10 DCF Cost of Equity Capital--Electric Utilities

23 SGH-11 Multi-Stage DCF Analysis

24 SGH-12 CAPM Cost of Equity Capital

25 SGH-13 Proof
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 1 SGH-14 Modified Earnings-Price Ratio

 2 Analysis--Electric Utilities

 3 SGH-15 Market-To-Book Ratio Analysis--Electric

 4 Utilities (Corrected 12/2/09)

 5 SGH-16 Overall Cost of Capital

 6 SCOTT NORWOOD

 7 SN-1THC Prefiled Response Testimony 1) challenging the

 8 prudence of PSE's acquisition of the Mint Farm

 9 generating facility, 2) opposing PSE's

10 proposal to defer and recover fixed and

11 variable costs of its Mint Farm facility from

12 the acquisition through the effective date of

13 new rates in this case; 3) adjusting PSE's

14 updated rate year baseline power cost

15 forecast; 4) proposing ratemaking treatment of

16 revenues from PSE's sale of Renewable Energy

17 Credits during the rate year period; and 5)

18 PSE's announced development strategy for wind

19 generation

20 SN-2 Background and Experience of Scott Norwood

21 SN-3HC PSE's Phase I Quantitative Analysis Gas-Fired

22 Bids

23 SN-4HC PSE's Phase II Quantitative Analysis Gas-Fired

24 Bids

25 SN-5HC PSE's Phase II Quantitative Portfolio Analysis
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 1 New Resources

 2 SN-6 PCA Settlement Agreement from Docket Nos.

 3 UE-011570 and UG-011571, Exhibit G

 4 SN-7C Comparison of Mint Farm Energy Costs to

 5 On-Peak Market Prices

 6 SN-8C Hydro Generation Adjustment for Most Recent

 7 50-year Average (Revised 1/11/10)

 8 SN-9C Off System Sales Adjustment to Reflect 5-year

 9 Average Levels

10 SN-10 Post-Rate Year Mark-to-Market Credit Factor

11 Adjustment

12 SN-11HC Renewable Energy Credit Revenue Adjustment to

13 Rate Year Power Costs

14 GLENN A. WATKINS

15 GAW-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re cost of

16 service, rate spread and rate design

17 GAW-2 Witness Qualifications

18 GAW-3 Electric Cost of Service Summary (Income Taxes

19 Calculated)

20 GAW-4 Electric Residential Customer Costs (Cost of

21 Equity @ PSE Proposed)

22 GAW-5 Natural Gas Residential Customer Costs (Cost

23 of Equity @ PSE Proposed)

24

25
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 1 FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES (FEA)

 2 RALPH C. SMITH

 3 RCS-1TC Prefiled Response Testimony (Confidential)

 4 RCS-2 Professional Qualifications

 5 RCS-3 Qualified Pension Plan Adjustment for the

 6 Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2008

 7 RCS-4 SERP Expense Adjustment for the Twelve Months

 8 Ended December 31, 2008

 9 NUCOR STEEL SEATTLE and KROGER COMPANY

10 KEVIN C. HIGGINS

11 KCH-1T Prefiled Response Testimony for NUCOR Steel

12 supporting PSE's rate spread for gas

13 distribution service and rate design for

14 non-residential customers

15 KCH-2T Prefiled Response Testimony for Kroger Company

16 re (1) the relationship between this GRC and

17 PSE's recent filing (Docket No. UE-070725)

18 regarding the pending sale of Renewable Energy

19 Credits ("RECs") and Carbon Financial

20 Instruments ("CFIs"); (2) rate spread for

21 PSE's electric service; and (3) rate design

22 for Schedule 26

23 KCH-3 Professional Qualifications

24

25
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 1 NWIGU

 2 DONALD W. SCHOENBECK

 3 DWS-5T Prefiled Response Testimony re rate spread

 4 DWS-6 Puget Sound Energy - 2009 Gas Cost of Service

 5 Study--Proposed Test Year Without Gas - No

 6 Small & Med - REVISED

 7 NWIGU Summary

 8 ICNU

 9 DONALD W. SCHOENBECK

10 DWS-1T Prefiled Response Testimony re rate spread

11 DWS-2 Witness Qualifications

12 DWS-3 COS Study---ICNU Recommendations

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25
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 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

 2 JUDGE MOSS: All right, good morning

 3 everyone, my name is Dennis Moss. I'm an Administrative

 4 Law Judge with the Washington Utilities and

 5 Transportation Commission. I will be assisting the

 6 Commissioners who are here on the Bench with me today

 7 presiding in this matter, Chairman Goltz, Commissioner

 8 Oshie, and Commissioner Jones. We are convened in the

 9 matter styled Washington Utilities and Transportation

10 Commission against Puget Sound Energy, Inc., Docket

11 Numbers UE-090704 and UG-090705, and the dockets are

12 consolidated.

13 This is a general rate proceeding in which

14 the company is seeking increased revenue in both the

15 electric and gas sides of its business. We have

16 received a considerable volume of prefiled testimony and

17 exhibits in this matter, and our purpose today is to

18 begin making witnesses available for cross-examination

19 as designated by parties in the case or as requested by

20 the Commissioners, who may have questions independent of

21 those the parties may wish to raise.

22 Our first order of business with you will be

23 to take your appearances, and we'll start with the

24 company.

25 MS. CARSON: Good morning, Judge Moss,
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 1 Chairman Goltz, and Commissioners. My name is Sheree

 2 Strom Carson with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound

 3 Energy. Also here with me today is Jason Kuzma, who has

 4 not previously appeared. Do we need to have Mr. Kuzma

 5 give a full appearance?

 6 JUDGE MOSS: I assume his address and so

 7 forth is the same.

 8 MS. CARSON: It is.

 9 JUDGE MOSS: We'll be fine with that, thank

10 you.

11 Go ahead, Mr. Stokes, we'll just proceed

12 around the room.

13 MR. STOKES: Good morning, Chad Stokes for

14 the Northwest Industrial Gas Users.

15 MR. VAN CLEVE: Good morning, Brad Van Cleve

16 on behalf of the Industrial Customers of Northwest

17 Utilities.

18 MR. FURUTA: Norman Furuta for the Consumer

19 Interests of the Federal Executive Agencies.

20 MR. FFITCH: Simon ffitch for the Office of

21 Public Counsel.

22 MR. CEDARBAUM: Robert Cedarbaum for

23 Commission Staff. I should just point out for the

24 record that Michael Fassio is still -- is not present

25 today because of a family emergency, but he will be in
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 1 the hearing later on this week.

 2 JUDGE MOSS: All right, thank you,

 3 Mr. Cedarbaum.

 4 Ms. Spencer, go ahead.

 5 MS. SPENCER: Elaine Spencer on behalf of

 6 Seattle Steam.

 7 JUDGE MOSS: Are there other counsel in the

 8 room? Play musical chairs here for a few minutes.

 9 MR. JOHNSON: Good morning, David Johnson

10 representing the Northwest Energy Coalition.

11 MR. BOEHM: Good morning, Kurt Boehm

12 appearing on behalf of The Kroger Company.

13 JUDGE MOSS: Anyone else in the room?

14 All right, do we have -- yes, Mr. Stokes, you

15 can resume your seat.

16 MR. STOKES: Thank you.

17 JUDGE MOSS: All right, do we have anyone on

18 the teleconference bridge line who wishes to enter an

19 appearance this morning?

20 MR. XENOPOULOS: Yes, Your Honor, that is

21 Damon Xonopoulos on behalf of Nucor Steel Seattle.

22 JUDGE MOSS: Okay, Mr. Xonopoulos, thank you.

23 Anyone else?

24 All right, apparently that completes our

25 appearances this morning. I will just note for the
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 1 record at this juncture that we do have others on the

 2 conference bridge line who are either assisting counsel

 3 in one capacity or another or actually who may appear as

 4 a witness. I believe Mr. Watkins, is that correct,

 5 Mr. ffitch?

 6 MR. FFITCH: Yes, Your Honor, I have

 7 confirmed that Mr. Watkins is on the line.

 8 JUDGE MOSS: Okay, and is he our only witness

 9 appearing by telephone this morning for purposes of the

10 electric and/or gas rate spread/rate design settlements?

11 Okay, fine, so the other witnesses are

12 present in the room.

13 With respect to those matters, those two

14 stipulations which we haven't had a whole lot of time to

15 review, we nevertheless, the Commissioners have

16 discussed, at least two of the Commissioners, I

17 apologize to the third, this morning, apparently the

18 interest is to go ahead with the panel this morning, so

19 the Commissioners are in agreement that we can proceed

20 with the -- will it be two panels, or can we do it with

21 one panel, Ms. Carson?

22 MS. CARSON: It's my understanding it's two

23 separate panels.

24 JUDGE MOSS: Is it basically the same people?

25 MS. CARSON: It is pretty much the same
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 1 people.

 2 JUDGE MOSS: All right, well, let's make sure

 3 we have all the panelists, and we'll do it in one fell

 4 swoop so to speak. Okay, is that agreeable to

 5 everybody?

 6 All right, apparently so. Before we get

 7 those people up here to be sworn, I will just mention

 8 again for the record since we predistributed the exhibit

 9 list there are to my knowledge three additional exhibits

10 this morning that have been identified. The Industrial

11 Customers Northwest Utilities identified two new

12 exhibits, cross-examination exhibits for Mr. Mills, and

13 I have numbered those I think it's DEM-32 and 33. Yes,

14 that's correct. And then they also identified one

15 cross-examination exhibit or possible cross-examination

16 exhibit for Mr. Story, which I have marked as JHS-32.

17 And these of course will be on the updated exhibit list.

18 And then we had one exhibit I believe, cross-exhibit

19 from Staff.

20 MR. CEDARBAUM: Yes, Your Honor, it's a

21 proposed exhibit for cross-examination of Mr. Piliaris.

22 JUDGE MOSS: Okay, Mr. Piliaris, let me see

23 if I can find it here.

24 MR. CEDARBAUM: It's the Staff response to

25 the company Data Request 9.
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 1 JUDGE MOSS: Okay, and I did -- no, I didn't

 2 get that one in, that will be JAP-11, so that's in the

 3 updated exhibit list which, Commissioners, I did provide

 4 you with an updated copy at the top of your desk here.

 5 And none of -- we won't be hearing from any of these

 6 witnesses this morning, so I'm not going to be overly

 7 concerned about distributing those to the Bench or in

 8 fact getting them into my own notebooks at this point in

 9 time. We'll deal with that at the noon hour. And there

10 are no other exhibits. I understand there are some

11 revisions to some of the testimonies probably making

12 minor corrections and so forth. None of those witnesses

13 will appear this morning. The only witness today

14 apparently is Mr. Markell, and he's designated as our

15 last witness for today, so we'll take care of that at

16 the noon hour as well. If we move quickly today, we may

17 add one witness from the Wednesday list. I'm not sure

18 who that will be. Mr. Hunt is the first designated for

19 that date, but his cross is indicated to be somewhat

20 lengthy, so we may move someone else up, we'll see.

21 As far as the question that was put to me

22 last week concerning how we would proceed in terms of

23 the order of presentation and the designated dates and

24 so on and so forth, this was Mr. Van Cleve and

25 Mr. ffitch and I spoke on the telephone about this, the
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 1 current intention is to just move forward. And,

 2 Mr. ffitch, I understand that maybe Mr. Norwood can be

 3 available on Thursday after all.

 4 MR. FFITCH: He can, Your Honor. I think if

 5 there are questions for him from the Bench, he can be

 6 here. And if that's the case, of course that would be

 7 good to know as soon as possible. Otherwise, we would

 8 ask permission to have him appear by phone.

 9 JUDGE MOSS: All right, we can keep that

10 option open, because I think if there are questions from

11 the Bench, they will be reasonable in number so that we

12 could have him by telephone if necessary.

13 MR. FFITCH: Should we just have him be

14 available by phone?

15 JUDGE MOSS: I think that would, considering

16 his travel, that would be appropriate, yes. I would say

17 just let him know that if we have questions for him,

18 then we will just have those by telephone.

19 MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

20 JUDGE MOSS: And we have a couple of

21 witnesses who are in that situation, I believe

22 Mr. Parcell.

23 MR. CEDARBAUM: Yes, Your Honor, I think

24 we've already discussed with you having Mr. Parcell by

25 telephone on Thursday for the cost of capital witnesses.
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 1 JUDGE MOSS: There were a number of

 2 communications in this regard, so if others have

 3 questions, I think I've answered everybody's questions

 4 on this, but if you have questions, ask them to me at

 5 the break, or you can raise it now if you need to.

 6 MS. CARSON: Your Honor.

 7 JUDGE MOSS: Ms. Carson.

 8 MS. CARSON: We did have a question regarding

 9 PSE witnesses who are not scheduled for cross-exam, and

10 some of those would be up first thing tomorrow, so we

11 wanted to clarify whether or not they should -- they

12 need to be present here, and I have a list of them.

13 JUDGE MOSS: That would be Wetherbee,

14 Henderson, and Lane?

15 MS. CARSON: Yes, also Molander and Jones I

16 believe, unless I'm missing some cross.

17 JUDGE MOSS: I see Molander. I may have

18 missed it, Jones did you say?

19 MS. CARSON: Jones was scheduled for Friday.

20 JUDGE MOSS: Oh, yeah, Jones, okay, well,

21 we'll -- I'll take that up with the Commissioners in due

22 course, and we'll see if we need them here tomorrow

23 morning or not. I don't think so.

24 MS. CARSON: Thank you.

25 JUDGE MOSS: Okay.
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 1 All right, anything else preliminary before

 2 we get started with the panel?

 3 Mr. ffitch.

 4 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, I will just report

 5 that Mr. Dittmer will be here arriving this afternoon,

 6 later this afternoon, and Mr. Hill is here already and

 7 will be available during the hearing.

 8 JUDGE MOSS: Great. Although I saw him flee

 9 the jurisdiction as I was on my way to the hearing room,

10 so.

11 All right, very good, all right, with that I

12 believe we're ready to have our panelists, if they could

13 come up here and sit. How many do we have? Five, we

14 can probably fit in another chair or two there if

15 perhaps counsel can help us out a little bit. Those who

16 move quickly will get the comfortable chairs, those who

17 move slowly will get the uncomfortable chairs.

18 Mr. Watkins is by telephone. If those of you

19 in the room will please rise and raise your right hands,

20 and Mr. Watkins, if you will do likewise at your end of

21 the telephone, I'm going to give you the oath now.

22 (Witnesses KEVIN C. HIGGINS, JANET K.

23 PHELPS, DONALD W. SCHOENBECK, THOMAS E.

24 SCHOOLEY, and GLENN A. WATKINS were

25 sworn.)
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 1 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, please be seated.

 2 Mr. Watkins, just to confirm that you did

 3 hear and take the oath?

 4 MR. WATKINS: I did.

 5 JUDGE MOSS: All right, thank you very much.

 6 MR. WATKINS: Thank you.

 7 JUDGE MOSS: I have marked for identification

 8 this morning the electric, let me get the title right,

 9 Multiparty Settlement Regarding Electric Rate Spread and

10 Electric Rate Design as Exhibit JT-1 and the associated

11 joint testimony of Kevin C. Higgins, Janet K. Phelps,

12 Donald Schoenbeck, Thomas Schooley, and Glenn Watkins as

13 JT-2. I have marked for identification the Multiparty

14 Settlement Regarding Natural Gas Rate Spread and Natural

15 Gas Rate Design as Exhibit JT-3 and the associated

16 testimony by the same witnesses I just mentioned as

17 JT-4. And our witnesses are present here for

18 examination.

19 I indicated earlier off the record that I

20 would like to have either one of our panelists or even

21 more than one of our panelists or counsel give us at the

22 Bench a brief description of each of these settlement

23 agreements since we have not had as much time as would

24 be ideal to review them and study them. So if someone

25 can give us the essential parts, Ms. Carson, how would
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 1 you like to proceed on that?

 2 MS. CARSON: Ms. Phelps will do that.

 3

 4 Whereupon,

 5 KEVIN C. HIGGINS, JANET K. PHELPS, DONALD W.

 6 SCHOENBECK, THOMAS E. SCHOOLEY, and GLENN A. WATKINS,

 7 having been first duly sworn, were called as witnesses

 8 herein and were examined and testified as follows:

 9

10 E X A M I N A T I O N

11 BY JUDGE MOSS:

12 Q. All right, Ms. Phelps.

13 A. (Ms. Phelps) With respect to the gas

14 settlement, there were multiple cost of service studies

15 in this proceeding, and so all studies were considered

16 in making decisions about the rate spread. We decided

17 on for Schedule 23, which is residential, and other

18 residential schedules it would be 100% of the average,

19 system average increase. For 31, which is general

20 commercial industrial, they would get 100% of the system

21 average increase. For Schedule 41 and 41-T, which are

22 large volume high load factor sales and transportation,

23 they would get 75% of the uniform increase. 85, 85-T,

24 86, 86-T, 87, 87-T, which are all interruptable

25 schedules, would get 50% of the system increase. And
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 1 that the water heater rentals would get 100% of the

 2 average increase based on the margin. And with respect

 3 to rate design, the residential basic charge will remain

 4 at $10 per month, and other elements of the rates for

 5 gas will basically increase on an equal percentage

 6 basis.

 7 That's the summary for gas, do you want me to

 8 go on to the summary for electric now?

 9 Q. Sure.

10 A. (Ms. Phelps) Again there were multiple cost

11 of service studies to be considered in determining the

12 rate spread. Schedule 40 is a campus rate, and so its

13 increase is based on a formula. Aside from that,

14 Schedule 25, which is secondary small demand, is

15 assigned to 75% of the system increase. And all other

16 schedules are basically assigned 100% of the system

17 increase. And again with the rate design the

18 residential basic charge will increase from $7 to $7.25.

19 And again Schedule 40 is based on -- is formulaic, and

20 in general other rate design elements will increase on

21 an average basis.

22 Q. Okay. And as I view the attachments here, I

23 see an attachment on the electric settlement agreement

24 that reflects a summary of rate spread. This is based

25 on a hypothetical revenue of $113 Million?
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 1 A. (Ms. Phelps) Yes.

 2 Q. Is that correct? All right, and then also

 3 that attachment includes a summary of proposed rate

 4 design which describes the increases that you just

 5 reviewed with us; is that right?

 6 A. (Ms. Phelps) Yes.

 7 Q. Okay. And then on the gas side similarly we

 8 have an alocation of revenue deficiency to rate classes

 9 based on what, $28 Million?

10 A. (Ms. Phelps) Yes.

11 Q. Hypothetical?

12 A. (Ms. Phelps) Yes.

13 Q. $28 Million increase in revenue. And that's

14 the only attachment to the gas that I have.

15 A. (Ms. Phelps) There's a second page to that

16 attachment.

17 Q. Okay, I seem to be missing it.

18 A. (Ms. Phelps) That is similar to the electric

19 second page that summarizes the rate design and rate

20 spread.

21 Q. Okay, but as you described it, so --

22 A. (Ms. Phelps) Yes.

23 Q. -- we have that in mind.

24 JUDGE MOSS: All right, was there anything

25 further that you wish to have the panelists put on, any
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 1 parties who are participating?

 2 Mr. ffitch.

 3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, I just wanted to add

 4 with respect to gas rate design that the settlement

 5 provides that there is no increase to the gas customer

 6 charge. It remains at --

 7 JUDGE MOSS: $10 I believe.

 8 MR. FFITCH: Per month.

 9 JUDGE MOSS: Is that right?

10 MR. FFITCH: And I just wanted to mention

11 that --

12 MS. PHELPS: The residential.

13 MR. FFITCH: -- the residential gas customer

14 charge --

15 MS. PHELPS: Remains at $10.

16 JUDGE MOSS: Right. And the electric

17 increases to $7.25 from $7; is that right?

18 MS. PHELPS: That's correct.

19 JUDGE MOSS: Very good.

20 All right, anything further?

21 All right, with that I will ask if the

22 Commissioners have questions for the panelists or any of

23 them with respect to either of these proposed settlement

24 agreements.

25 COMMISSIONER OSHIE: No questions.
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 1 COMMISSIONER JONES: No questions.

 2 CHAIRMAN GOLTZ: Just one.

 3

 4 E X A M I N A T I O N

 5 BY CHAIRMAN GOLTZ:

 6 Q. What was the, and I'm just going through here

 7 to refresh my memory, but what was the company's

 8 proposal for the basic charge for both electric and gas

 9 in your direct case?

10 A. (Ms. Phelps) In the direct case it was an

11 equal percentage increase over the $10, and I have to

12 look, I'm sorry, I have to look up the -- $10.82, it was

13 $10.82.

14 Q. And that's for gas, and for electric do you

15 recall what it was?

16 A. (Ms. Phelps) Yeah, I have that, $7.59.

17 CHAIRMAN GOLTZ: Thank you.

18 JUDGE MOSS: Did other parties have proposals

19 in those regards? Speak up if you did. Apparently not,

20 okay, very well.

21 A. (Ms. Phelps) Actually I believe Public

22 Counsel had proposed in both cases that they remain at

23 the current levels.

24 JUDGE MOSS: Remain at the current levels,

25 all right, okay, very good, thank you, Mr. ffitch, for
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 1 confirming that.

 2 MR. CEDARBAUM: Your Honor, can I just ask

 3 one clarification question for the record?

 4 JUDGE MOSS: You certainly may.

 5

 6 E X A M I N A T I O N

 7 BY MR. CEDARBAUM:

 8 Q. Ms. Phelps, the numbers that you just gave

 9 now for the company proposed customer charges, were

10 those based on the direct case filing or the rebuttal

11 case filing?

12 A. (Ms. Phelps) The $10.82 was from the direct

13 case, and the $7.59 was also from the direct case.

14 Q. So if you know, what would the numbers have

15 been then based on the rebuttal case, because the

16 rebuttal case was --

17 A. (Ms. Phelps) Right, the rebuttal on the gas

18 went down. We didn't file cost of service or rate

19 spread on gas for rebuttal, but it would have dropped to

20 about $10.77, and on electric I'm afraid I would have to

21 look that up.

22 Q. But it would be a percentage increase?

23 A. (Ms. Phelps) An equal percentage increase

24 over the $7.

25 MR. CEDARBAUM: Thank you.
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 1 JUDGE MOSS: Okay, it would appear then that

 2 we have completed our work with our panel on the rate

 3 spread and rate design issues, and so I will excuse you

 4 subject to recall if needed.

 5 And as they retire from the witness stand,

 6 then we can have Mr. Valdman I believe is our first

 7 witness for the company for whom cross has been

 8 designated.

 9 If you will just remain standing, I will go

10 ahead and get you sworn in.

11 (Witness BERTRAND A. VALDMAN was sworn.)

12 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, please be seated.

13 All right, Ms. Carson, proceed.

14

15 Whereupon,

16 BERTRAND A. VALDMAN,

17 having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness

18 herein and was examined and testified as follows:

19

20 D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N

21 BY MS. CARSON:

22 Q. Mr. Valdman, please state your name and title

23 and spell your name for the court reporter.

24 A. Bertrand Valdman, B-E-R-T-R-A-N-D,

25 V-A-L-D-M-A-N. I'm the Executive Vice President and

0171

 1 Chief Operating Officer at Puget Sound Energy.

 2 Q. Mr. Valdman, do you have before you what has

 3 been marked for identification as Exhibit Numbers BAV-1T

 4 through BAV-10CT?

 5 JUDGE MOSS: And before you answer,

 6 Mr. Valdman, will you check to see that the red light is

 7 on your microphone there.

 8 THE WITNESS: It is now.

 9 JUDGE MOSS: Okay, great, thank you very

10 much.

11 THE WITNESS: And they're getting the

12 exhibits for me.

13 BY MS. CARSON:

14 Q. Do these exhibits constitute your prefiled

15 direct and rebuttal testimony and related exhibits in

16 this proceeding?

17 A. Yes, they do.

18 Q. Were these exhibits prepared under your

19 supervision and direction?

20 A. Yes, they were.

21 Q. Do you have any corrections to any of your

22 exhibits at this time?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Are your prefiled direct and rebuttal

25 testimony and accompanying exhibits true and correct to
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 1 the best of your knowledge and belief?

 2 A. Yes.

 3 MS. CARSON: Thank you.

 4 Your Honor, PSE offers Exhibits BAV-1T

 5 through BAV-10CT into evidence and offers Mr. Bertrand

 6 A. Valdman for cross-examination.

 7 JUDGE MOSS: Okay, hearing no objection,

 8 those will be admitted as marked.

 9 We have a couple of cross-examination

10 exhibits identified for Mr. Valdman, and I'm going to

11 start here the practice that I will follow throughout

12 the hearing, which will be to ask if we can stipulate

13 those in or if we're going to have some discussion about

14 one or more of them?

15 MS. CARSON: PSE is agreeable to stipulating

16 those in.

17 JUDGE MOSS: All right, so we'll go ahead and

18 identify BAV-11 and 12C, and we will admit all of

19 Mr. Valdman's direct and cross-examination exhibits into

20 our record. And with that, Mr. Valdman is available for

21 cross-examination, and I'm showing, Mr. Cedarbaum, that

22 Staff has requested 5 minutes, so why don't you go

23 ahead.

24 MR. CEDARBAUM: Thank you, Your Honor.

25
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 1 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N

 2 BY MR. CEDARBAUM:

 3 Q. Good morning, Mr. Valdman.

 4 A. Good morning.

 5 Q. My questions relate to your rebuttal

 6 testimony, 10CT, at page 15 where you discuss the Quanta

 7 service provider contract issue with Staff.

 8 A. Yes.

 9 Q. Do you recall that? You don't need to switch

10 to it it looks like.

11 A. No, I recall that testimony.

12 Q. And at that page you indicate that the

13 company and Patelco and Quanta have already agreed to

14 specific unit pricing increases for 2010, and then on

15 the following page you indicate that you're finalizing

16 minor contractual terms with those providers, and all of

17 that taken together will result in a newly amended

18 service provider contract prior to 2010. Do you recall

19 that?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Is it correct that that service provider

22 contract as amended has been signed by the parties?

23 A. Subject to check, I believe it has.

24 Q. Do you recall the date that it was signed?

25 A. I don't.
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 1 Q. Subject to check, you can confirm that the

 2 contract has been signed?

 3 A. Yes.

 4 MR. CEDARBAUM: Your Honor, those are all my

 5 questions, thank you.

 6 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, Mr. Cedarbaum.

 7 Mr. ffitch, you indicated some 45 minutes for

 8 this witness, go ahead.

 9 MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor, I think

10 that we may beat that time.

11

12 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N

13 BY MR. FFITCH:

14 Q. Good morning, Mr. Valdman.

15 A. Good morning.

16 Q. First I'm going to refer you to your rebuttal

17 testimony again, which is Exhibit 10CT and to page 4,

18 the bottom of page 4 of that exhibit.

19 JUDGE MOSS: What page was that, Mr. ffitch?

20 MR. FFITCH: Page 4, Your Honor.

21 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

22 BY MR. FFITCH:

23 Q. Exhibit 10CT, are you there, Mr. Valdman?

24 A. I am.

25 Q. And there you, at the bottom of page 4 and
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 1 the top of page 5, you briefly address Puget's new bill

 2 processing equipment, and you're disagreeing with

 3 Mr. Dittmer that the efficiencies of the new equipment

 4 should offset PSE costs, correct?

 5 A. That's correct.

 6 Q. Now I'm going to ask you to turn to your

 7 cross exhibit 12C, that's the document entitled payment

 8 processing and options; do you have that?

 9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And could you go to page 6 of that, please.

11 And I will say that some pages of this exhibit are

12 marked confidential, and I'm going to ask the questions

13 in such a way that I'm not asking you to disclose those

14 publicly.

15 A. Understand.

16 JUDGE MOSS: And in terms of page numbers,

17 Mr. ffitch, we're looking at the numbers in the upper

18 right-hand corner, page 6 of 29?

19 MR. FFITCH: Yes, Your Honor, I'm using the

20 page numbers that we've designated on the exhibit.

21 JUDGE MOSS: Great, thank you.

22 MR. FFITCH: It's also page 4 on the power

23 pointer.

24 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

25 BY MR. FFITCH:
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 1 Q. And you see there that the first arrow on the

 2 current equipment situation indicates that the current

 3 equipment has exceeded normal useful life, correct?

 4 A. Correct.

 5 Q. And so that would basically be consistent

 6 with your statement in your rebuttal testimony that

 7 that's a reason for disagreeing with Mr. Dittmer's

 8 testimony?

 9 A. Correct.

10 Q. And essentially what you said was that the

11 new equipment was being purchased because the equipment

12 was old and required replacement, correct?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. Now could you please turn to page 9 of that

15 exhibit. This is the numbering in the top right-hand

16 corner, and this is a confidential page. As I look at

17 this page, I don't think this sort of conceptual point

18 is confidential, it appears that the company considered

19 outsourcing bill processing?

20 A. That is correct.

21 Q. And so that was an option or that was

22 something the company could have done had it chosen to

23 do so, correct?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. Without revealing any numbers which the
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 1 company has labeled confidential in this response, would

 2 you agree with me that the outsourcing option was

 3 rejected because it was not the least cost option?

 4 A. Yes.

 5 Q. Could you please turn to page 11 of this

 6 exhibit. That's the page entitled recommendation. I

 7 don't believe anything on this page is confidential; is

 8 that correct?

 9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. And would you agree that this page clearly

11 indicates that the recommendation was to purchase the

12 equipment which eventually was purchased in April of

13 2008?

14 A. Yes. We're at page 11, correct.

15 Q. Page 11.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And the top line says PSE should purchase the

18 equipment as the lead recommendation.

19 A. I have page 11 overview of benefits.

20 Q. Okay, I'm looking at the -- essentially these

21 are renumbered by parties when they're submitted as

22 cross exhibits, so it would be page 9 on the original

23 pagination and page 11 of the exhibit, and the heading

24 is recommendation.

25 A. Yes.

0178

 1 Q. So just to clarify, would you agree that this

 2 page clearly indicates the recommendation was to

 3 purchase the equipment, and in fact Puget did purchase

 4 the equipment in April 2008?

 5 A. Yes.

 6 Q. And am I reading this correctly that the

 7 company envisioned at the time it was making its

 8 decision to purchase the new equipment that it

 9 anticipated earning a return on this investment of 35%,

10 that's the $500,000 investment in equipment?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. And that's calculated by taking the total

13 savings of $180,000 and dividing that into the $500,000

14 investment, right?

15 A. Right, simple math.

16 Q. All right. Now one of the components of the

17 savings that's listed there on that page is maintenance

18 and consumables, right?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And please turn two pages on to page 13 of

21 that exhibit, which is entitled overview of benefits,

22 we're now there.

23 A. Page 10 or page 11?

24 Q. Page 11 on the original, page 13 on the

25 exhibit, overview of benefits. And if you look at the
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 1 top bullet point on that page, wouldn't you agree with

 2 me that as stated here the new processing equipment was

 3 envisioned and expected to actually reduce historic

 4 expense levels by about 25%?

 5 A. By about 25,000.

 6 Q. Excuse me, 25,000.

 7 A. Yes.

 8 Q. All right. And if you go to the immediately

 9 preceding page, page 12 of the exhibit, third arrow

10 point is another component of claimed savings regarding

11 encoding, correct?

12 A. Correct, and it's a labor savings.

13 Q. All right. And as I understand it with the

14 current, what that means is that with the current bill

15 processing equipment, the same -- some type of encoding

16 is not required any longer?

17 A. Correct.

18 Q. And am I correct that as a result of not

19 having to encode checks that three quarters of a

20 full-time FTE position can be eliminated; is that what

21 that says here?

22 A. For bill processing.

23 Q. Right.

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. So as the company continues to grow and needs
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 1 to employ more people because of this new equipment

 2 purchase, they can just hire fewer people or three

 3 quarters of one person less according to this

 4 prospectively; is that correct?

 5 A. With respect to bill processing, is that your

 6 question?

 7 Q. Yes.

 8 A. With respect to bill processing, correct,

 9 we're able to realize those labor savings.

10 Q. And would you agree with me that if the

11 company continues to grow, thus necessitating the need

12 to hire more people, the sales resulting from the

13 customer growth will also produce attendant margins?

14 MS. CARSON: Could you repeat that question.

15 Q. If the company continues to grow,

16 necessitating the need for more hiring, then the sales

17 resulting from that customer growth would also produce

18 attendant margins, correct?

19 A. Correct. I think, if I can clarify the

20 question, if as revenues grow, all things being equal,

21 profitability should grow as well. Is that the point

22 you're trying to make, counselor?

23 Q. All right, thank you.

24 A. If I understood the question correctly.

25 MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment here,
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 1 Your Honor?

 2 JUDGE MOSS: Sure, Mr. ffitch.

 3 MR. FFITCH: Thank you.

 4 Just a couple more questions.

 5 BY MR. FFITCH:

 6 Q. Mr. Valdman, could you turn to, please, Cross

 7 Exhibit BAV-11, and that is the business case for the

 8 mobile work force management. And again in general it's

 9 your position as stated in your rebuttal testimony that

10 this project will not truly cut costs but will improve

11 customer service and allow growing numbers of customers

12 to be served without adding new personnel; is that a

13 fair paraphrase?

14 A. No, it isn't. If I could add, I think my

15 point for both this initiative as well as the bill

16 processing is that these are initiatives that help

17 offset ongoing cost growth.

18 Q. All right.

19 And can you turn to page 7 of your rebuttal,

20 line 6, you do disagree with Mr. Dittmer that the

21 efficiencies of the mobile work force project should

22 offset Puget's costs, correct?

23 A. Correct, but I think I make the subsequent

24 point that it's a number of initiatives that these cost

25 savings are offset by cost growth later on a couple
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 1 pages later.

 2 Q. All right. But you state explicitly that the

 3 installation and use of the system should not be

 4 utilized to offset certain necessary cost increases,

 5 right?

 6 A. Correct.

 7 Q. And let's turn to Exhibit 11 now to page 5,

 8 executive summary. This is again the exhibit

 9 pagination.

10 A. So is this the first page?

11 Q. The first page of the exhibit is the cover

12 business case, and then I'm in page 3 of the business

13 case, which is page 5 of exhibit pagination. It's the

14 executive summary.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And if you look at the fourth paragraph, the

17 last paragraph of the executive summary, doesn't that

18 state in the third line down that the project will

19 result in hard cost reductions of $1.9 Million per year?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. And if we go to page 15 of the exhibit, I'll

22 give you time to get there.

23 Are you there?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. At the bottom of page 15, you see the heading
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 1 cost savings financial benefit?

 2 A. Yes.

 3 Q. And that breaks down the cost savings

 4 financial benefit. We see that that adds up to $2.4

 5 Million. Am I correct that the $1.9 Million of hard

 6 savings that we just discussed are the first 3 lines of

 7 that list?

 8 A. Yes.

 9 Q. And then the company also projects benefits

10 from increased service orders of $500,000 and that

11 brings us up to the $2.4 Million, right?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. And then if you turn to page 16, the next

14 page of the exhibit, in the summary results box the

15 company's projecting an internal rate of return on this

16 project of 31%; is that correct, am I reading that

17 properly?

18 A. Correct.

19 MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Mr. Valdman.

20 Those are all my questions, Your Honor.

21 JUDGE MOSS: All right, thank you,

22 Mr. ffitch.

23 I don't have any other cross indicated for

24 this witness; is that correct?

25 Apparently so.
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 1 Let me ask then if there are questions from

 2 the Commissioners for Mr. Valdman.

 3 COMMISSIONER OSHIE: No questions.

 4 COMMISSIONER JONES: No questions.

 5 CHAIRMAN GOLTZ: I'll have one then.

 6

 7 E X A M I N A T I O N

 8 BY CHAIRMAN GOLTZ:

 9 Q. On page 13 of your rebuttal testimony, you

10 reference in line 17, you reference adding 90 seasonal

11 customer service positions, is that still -- are you

12 still maintaining that staff of seasonal workers?

13 A. I have to confirm whether it's 90. We've

14 been able to increase the productivity of our call

15 service business to meet the service quality metric, so

16 I don't know whether it's 90, but we were --

17 Q. And is the -- why is it seasonal, I mean what

18 -- is there something about service quality that

19 fluctuates by season?

20 A. Weather, storms.

21 Q. So this is a wintertime --

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. -- employment?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. And is that offset in any way, because I
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 1 would imagine that your new orders are going down, so

 2 are you able to staff some of those seasonal workers

 3 from within the company?

 4 A. Most of -- our customers continue to grow.

 5 We have, albeit less than historic, but we still have

 6 customer growth, and our calls into our call center have

 7 actually increased by 4% from 2000 to 2009, so our call

 8 centers experience greater volume of work.

 9 Q. So from 2000 to 2009, the call center

10 increased by 4%?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. But your number of customers has to have

13 increased by at least that same amount in that period of

14 of time?

15 A. By less.

16 Q. By less?

17 A. What's happening, it could -- weather related

18 generates call volume as well as payment issues. And as

19 you might imagine in the current economic situation,

20 we're receiving a number of calls from our customers

21 requesting payment plans and payment options, so that's

22 increasing our call volume.

23 CHAIRMAN GOLTZ: Thank you.

24 JUDGE MOSS: All right.

25 Any redirect?
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 1 MS. CARSON: Yes, Judge Moss, thanks.

 2

 3 R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N

 4 BY MS. CARSON:

 5 Q. Mr. Valdman, when was the mobile work force

 6 actually implemented?

 7 A. It was implemented in calendar year 2007 for

 8 the natural gas first responders.

 9 Q. And when was it implemented for the remainder

10 of the program?

11 A. The next year, in 2008.

12 Q. Was the full proposed mobile work force

13 implemented by the company?

14 A. It was partially implemented. For gas and

15 electric and the substation crews, we are still weighing

16 the implementation.

17 Q. So when we read, when we look at BAV-11 I

18 believe it is --

19 JUDGE MOSS: Is your microphone on?

20 MS. CARSON: It is, yes.

21 BY MS. CARSON:

22 Q. When we look at BAV-11 and we see the

23 potential savings from this program, does that reflect

24 what the company actually implemented or what was

25 originally proposed to be implemented?
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 1 A. It reflects what was originally proposed to

 2 be implemented.

 3 Q. And just to be clear, well, were there

 4 efficiencies realized as a result of implementation of

 5 the mobile work force?

 6 A. There were a number of benefits that were

 7 realized, and in fact we could see it in our SQI's. Our

 8 gas first response time has decreased. From memory as

 9 of November calendar year 2009 it's 33 minutes down from

10 38 minutes. Our levels of customer satisfaction in

11 field operations have increased 95%, which is

12 considerably higher than in calendar year 2007, I

13 believe it was 90%. So the operational benefits have

14 been realized.

15 Q. And to the extent these are actual dollar

16 efficiencies or savings, were those realized during the

17 test year 2008?

18 A. Yes, that's when the mobile work force for

19 gas was implemented and active.

20 Q. Now turning to the bill processing equipment

21 which was discussed in BAV-12, a cross-exam exhibit.

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Mr. ffitch asked you about cost savings or

24 efficiencies that were recognized as a result of that.

25 Were you, was the company able to recognize or has it
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 1 been able to recognize all the efficiencies that were

 2 set forth in that cross-exam exhibit?

 3 A. No.

 4 Q. And can you elaborate on that?

 5 A. Certainly. The largest dollar savings in the

 6 implementation of that equipment related to a practice

 7 referred to as ARCing, accounts receivable conversion.

 8 And for operational reasons, I think the decision was to

 9 try to not proceed with ARCing but instead to proceed

10 with electronic imaging, and so that caused a delay. I

11 think we felt that operationally it would be better to

12 have an electronic image of the check rather than the

13 actual code of the information on the check.

14 Mr. Gaines will be in a position to describe

15 why we decided not to proceed with the bidding process

16 with financial institutions, and so I will leave that to

17 his testimony, but there was a fair amount of turmoil in

18 the banking industry in 2008, and so we were very

19 careful about what counterpart we wanted to choose as a

20 banking partner.

21 In addition, because we continue to code the

22 checks, we didn't realize roughly $7,000 of savings

23 related to the ribbons, and that was contemplated in the

24 original estimates.

25 Q. Just to clarify, so those are the encoding
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 1 savings that you were not able to realize?

 2 A. Correct.

 3 JUDGE MOSS: That wasn't clear from the

 4 exhibit, was that $7,000 you just mentioned, it's $8,000

 5 I think on the exhibit, was that within the $25,000 or

 6 in addition to?

 7 THE WITNESS: It's within the $25,000.

 8 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

 9 A. We were able to realize the labor savings,

10 that portion of a FTE was reallocated to another portion

11 of our call center business, so in a sense it did offset

12 an increasing cost elsewhere in our customer service

13 area.

14 BY MS. CARSON:

15 Q. Mr. Valdman, just to clarify, were all areas

16 of the mobile work force that were included in the

17 business plan implemented in 2008?

18 A. The electric and the gas was implemented in

19 2008.

20 Q. And so there were parts of it that were not

21 implemented?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. And what parts were those?

24 A. Substation.

25 Q. Was there anything else?
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 1 A. I may be missing something, but.

 2 JUDGE MOSS: That would be the suggestion I

 3 think.

 4 A. Perhaps.

 5 Q. Was there a metering component of that?

 6 A. Yes.

 7 MR. FFITCH: Objection.

 8 JUDGE MOSS: We have a leading objection from

 9 Mr. ffitch, I'll just overrule it.

10 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

11 A. Our meter network services area also was

12 scheduled to be -- to have mobile work force, and that

13 was not implemented.

14 BY MS. CARSON:

15 Q. Thank you. And in terms of the aspects of

16 the mobile work force that were implemented, the gas and

17 electric first responder, correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. Was the company able to recognize

20 efficiencies in terms of having less gas first

21 responders working as a result of this?

22 A. No, we were able to maintain the same level

23 of gas and electric first responders in spite of an

24 increasing volume of work. If you take a look at the

25 units of work there on the electric side, they're in
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 1 excess of 8% year over year, and I'm now 2008 and 2009,

 2 but I think the trend has consistently held. And I

 3 think the numbers are even higher on odor calls and

 4 non-outage related gas work as well. So what it allowed

 5 us to do is allocate our work force more efficiently and

 6 handle larger volumes of work with the same amount of

 7 personnel. I will also add that on the electric side

 8 our service quality metrics are higher and better in

 9 terms of first response, emergency first response time.

10 So you can see the similar trend that I mentioned for

11 gas also holds true for electric.

12 MS. CARSON: I have no further questions.

13 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

14 Anything further from the Bench or the

15 parties?

16 All right, fine. Mr. Valdman, thank you for

17 your testimony today, and we'll release you subject to

18 recall if needed, thank you.

19 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

20 JUDGE MOSS: All right, well, let's go ahead,

21 you still have cross-examination for Ms. Harris,

22 Mr. ffitch?

23 MR. FFITCH: Brief, Your Honor.

24 JUDGE MOSS: All right, let's have Ms. Harris

25 then.
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 1 Go ahead and raise your right hand.

 2 (Witness KIMBERLY J. HARRIS was sworn.)

 3 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, please be seated.

 4

 5 Whereupon,

 6 KIMBERLY J. HARRIS,

 7 having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness

 8 herein and was examined and testified as follows:

 9

10 D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N

11 BY MS. CARSON:

12 Q. Ms. Harris, please state your name and title

13 and spell your name for the court reporter.

14 A. My name is Kimberly Harris, K-I-M-B-E-R-L-Y,

15 H-A-R-R-I-S, I'm Executive Vice President Chief Resource

16 Officer.

17 Q. Ms. Harris, do you have before you what has

18 been marked for identification as Exhibit Numbers

19 KJH-1CT through KJH-8HCT?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Do these exhibits constitute your prefiled

22 direct and rebuttal testimony and related exhibits in

23 this proceeding?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Were these exhibits prepared under your
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 1 supervision and direction?

 2 A. Yes.

 3 Q. Do you have any corrections to your exhibits

 4 at this time?

 5 A. I have one minor correction on my

 6 qualifications. That would be KJH-2, the very last

 7 sentence, I've been in my current position since 2007,

 8 and I believe it says 2003, so small correction.

 9 Q. Thank you, Ms. Harris.

10 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

11 Q. With that correction, are your prefiled

12 direct and rebuttal testimony and accompanying exhibits

13 true and correct to the best of your information?

14 A. Yes.

15 MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE offers Exhibits

16 KJH-1CT through KJH-8HCT into evidence and offers

17 Mr. Kimberly J. Harris for cross-examination.

18 JUDGE MOSS: All right, hearing no objection

19 those will be admitted as marked, and I'll just note for

20 the record that no cross-examination exhibits have been

21 identified.

22 Mr. ffitch, do you have cross?

23 MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

24

25
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 1 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N

 2 BY MR. FFITCH:

 3 Q. Good morning, Ms. Harris.

 4 A. Good morning, Mr. ffitch.

 5 Q. My questions will be quite brief this

 6 morning. In your rebuttal, specifically pages 6 and 7,

 7 you criticize Public Counsel witness Norwood for relying

 8 on the fact that Puget's Mint Farm analysis -- I'll

 9 pause and let you find it there, it's really a general

10 question, but I'm generally referring to pages 6 and 7

11 of your rebuttal, which is Exhibit KJH-8HCT. And there

12 you generally are criticizing Mr. Norwood for relying

13 upon the fact that Puget's analysis showed that other

14 resources were expected to provide higher portfolio

15 benefits and a higher benefit ratio than Mint Farm,

16 correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Can you please just define or explain what a

19 portfolio benefit is?

20 A. Well, I think that Mr. Elsea in his testimony

21 elaborates much more clearly on the analysis that is

22 used as far as the cost benefit analysis and the

23 portfolio benefit analysis and the levelized cost, so

24 he's probably a better witness to completely define that

25 aspect. What I believe my actual criticism is is
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 1 actually taking one of those aspects instead of looking

 2 at the quantatative and qualitative elements as a whole,

 3 just focusing in on one test in particular.

 4 Q. All right.

 5 A. Is the basis of my testimony.

 6 Q. And you also criticize him for relying unduly

 7 on the benefit ratio, correct?

 8 A. On I guess particularly just taking one

 9 element, so not necessarily -- if he had relied on

10 another single element, I believe my criticism would

11 hold true. It's just taking the -- I think you should

12 look at the totality of the quantitative and the

13 qualitative analysis.

14 Q. All right. And can you define or explain

15 what the benefit ratio is?

16 A. As I just in my answer previously, I think

17 that Mr. Elsea would be a better witness for that.

18 Q. And can you turn to page 11 of your rebuttal,

19 please. And do you have that?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. It's blue, but I'm not going to ask you

22 anything blue if I can help it.

23 JUDGE MOSS: Let's hope not.

24 A. I will try not to answer anything blue if I

25 can help it.
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 1 Q. Again generally here you're testifying that

 2 Puget Sound Energy did not consider shareholder returns

 3 as a factor in its decision to select Mint Farm,

 4 correct?

 5 A. Yes.

 6 Q. Who are the current shareholders of Puget

 7 Sound Energy?

 8 A. Well, if I may in the context, because this

 9 is kind of an interesting aspect of the questions in the

10 testimony, the current shareholders of Puget Sound

11 Energy were not the shareholders that made the decision

12 on the Mint Farm acquisition. So it's kind of

13 interesting in that aspect looking at the context of

14 when the Mint Farm decision was made, it was during that

15 time period where the merger had been filed and was

16 before the Commission, but it had not been approved, and

17 I don't believe it had been to hearing yet, so I don't

18 know if that --

19 Q. In transition?

20 A. We were definitely in transition.

21 Q. All right. Who are the current shareholders

22 of Puget Sound Energy?

23 A. The current shareholders of Puget Sound

24 Energy are a consortium of investors.

25 Q. And they are?
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 1 A. Macquarie Infrastructure Partners, CPPIB,

 2 AIMCo out of Alberta, and BC.

 3 Q. And so at this point Puget is privately held

 4 by those investors, and as we know the stock is no

 5 longer publicly traded, correct?

 6 A. At this time, but that was not the case at

 7 the time when this acquisition was approved.

 8 Q. As a Puget officer, do you consider it part

 9 of your job to identify ways to increase shareholder

10 earnings?

11 A. That's an interesting question. I don't know

12 that we specifically or I specifically as an officer of

13 the company identify ways of addressing shareholders

14 earnings. I would say that my focus and our focus

15 really is on, especially on the resource side, those

16 opportunities or those resources that are in the best

17 interests of our customers. I don't know if the

18 shareholder question really comes into play.

19 Q. So the sole consideration is customer

20 interest?

21 A. The analysis is always aimed at the long-term

22 needs of the customer consistent with basically our

23 planning criteria.

24 Q. Do you consider it part of your job when

25 evaluating major resource acquisitions in investment
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 1 alternatives such as Mint Farm to consider the impact of

 2 the investment on the company's earnings?

 3 A. I believe as is stated in the testimony of

 4 Mr. Garratt, we're always looking at any sort of

 5 financial impact on the company, because that would

 6 impact our customers in the long term.

 7 Q. So you do look at financial impact?

 8 A. We would look at things like imputed debt or

 9 credit ratings, and I believe those are set forth

10 clearly in Mr. Garratt's testimony.

11 Q. So you do look at the financial impact of an

12 investment on Puget's earnings?

13 MS. CARSON: Objection, asked and answered,

14 argumentative.

15 JUDGE MOSS: I'm going to overrule the

16 objection, it's a little more precise than his previous

17 question.

18 A. Could you please repeat the question.

19 BY MR. FFITCH:

20 Q. I was following up on your previous general

21 answer and trying to ask more specifically if you were

22 saying then in fact and agreeing with me that you and

23 Puget does look at the investment impact of an

24 acquisition like Mint Farm on the company's earnings?

25 A. I think your question just changed slightly,
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 1 so if I may, your previous questions were do we look at

 2 a financial impact for the shareholder. My answer would

 3 be no, not specifically for a shareholder. Your other

 4 question was do we look at the impact, and yes, we have

 5 to look at the credit ratings and even all the aspects

 6 revolving around the financial stability of the company.

 7 So if the question is do we look at financial impact,

 8 yes, but not for shareholder or customer, we're looking

 9 at it holistically. I guess that's why I'm having

10 problems with your question.

11 Q. Well, do you personally, first of all, do you

12 personally in your job specifically look at the earnings

13 impact of a resource acquisition as part of your

14 evaluation of that acquisition?

15 A. I personally do not look at that impact.

16 Q. Does Puget Sound Energy through any of its

17 officers or employees look at the earnings impact of an

18 investment in a resource acquisition?

19 MS. CARSON: Objection, foundation.

20 Q. As part of the analysis?

21 JUDGE MOSS: Overruled.

22 A. I couldn't speculate on every employee of

23 Puget Sound Energy. I will say from the resource side

24 and from the analysis that we set forth, all of the

25 qualitative factors and quantitative factors are looked
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 1 at when moving forward with any procurement, whether it

 2 be a PPA, whether it be a short-term agreement, whether

 3 it be an ownership opportunity.

 4 Q. Well, if you look at your testimony in pages

 5 11 and 12 of your rebuttal, you're speaking there for

 6 PSE, not for yourself, correct? For example, if we look

 7 at line 27.

 8 A. Yes.

 9 Q. And you're stating in those two pages of

10 testimony that Puget does not look at the earnings,

11 potential earnings impact of the investment when making

12 -- as part of its decision in making a resource

13 acquisition?

14 A. Well, I believe that my testimony on lines 27

15 and following on to page 12 really are looking at

16 categories of discussion versus specific elements. And

17 so I would think that some financial element like credit

18 and counterparty issues would be encompassed in risk

19 management and strategic and financial consideration.

20 So I guess in a broad sense, and I think those are more

21 set forth in Mr. Garratt and might be a good question

22 for Mr. Garratt.

23 Q. All right. You wouldn't disagree,

24 Ms. Harris, would you, that the acquisition of Mint Farm

25 has a financial benefit to owners, to the current owners
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 1 or to shareholders generally in terms of earnings,

 2 earnings on rate base that an acquisition of a purchase

 3 power agreement does not have?

 4 A. I would agree that the acquisition of Mint

 5 Farm has a positive financial -- I'm trying to follow

 6 your question, I'm sorry -- a financial -- a positive

 7 financial impact on both the company and the customers.

 8 Q. Maybe I can be a little more -- a little less

 9 obtuse, a little more clear. The purchase of Mint Farm

10 allows the company to earn a return on rate base,

11 whereas the acquisition of a power purchase agreement

12 does not allow the company to allow a return on rate

13 base. You would not disagree with that, would you?

14 A. The Chelan contract, which is a long-term

15 PPA, does have a different regulatory treatment, so I

16 would say currently other than the Chelan contract Puget

17 does not earn a return on current PPA's. I would also

18 make the point that we have never brought forth to this

19 Commission for approval or inclusion in any PPA, so a

20 sort of return. I will state that I believe in the

21 states of California and Colorado PPA's are afforded

22 that type of regulatory treatment. So I don't know that

23 it's a given, Mr. ffitch, but I would say currently

24 other than the Chelan contract we do not earn a return

25 on a PPA.
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 1 MR. FFITCH: All right, I don't have any

 2 further questions, thank you, Ms. Harris.

 3 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, Mr. ffitch.

 4 No other party has indicated cross for

 5 Ms. Harris, so I will turn to the Bench and see if we

 6 have questions from the Bench.

 7 Commissioner Jones.

 8

 9 E X A M I N A T I O N

10 BY COMMISSIONER JONES:

11 Q. Good morning, Ms. Harris.

12 A. Good morning, Commissioner.

13 Q. Some of my questions may be better answered

14 by Mr. Garratt or Mr. Elsea. I will try to keep this at

15 a fairly high level though.

16 A. Thank you.

17 Q. And recognizing as Public Counsel was

18 developing in its questioning that this -- the review of

19 this particular plant, Mint Farm, took place at a

20 transition project or a transition period.

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. Between the boards. So how long have you

23 been heading up resource acquisition for the company?

24 A. Since May of 2007.

25 Q. And who was the board at that point?

0203

 1 A. At that point we had -- would you like me to

 2 name them all?

 3 Q. No.

 4 A. Thank you.

 5 Q. But it was the full board?

 6 A. It was the former board of Puget Sound

 7 Energy.

 8 Q. And how many members were there?

 9 A. Now I'm going to have to count, approximately

10 9 to 12, 9, 10, 10.

11 Q. Okay. And what was the process that you

12 followed as head of resource acquisition to brief that

13 board on potential resource acquisitions? There's some

14 sort of committee, correct, that you head up?

15 A. Yes. Actually all of our acquisitions follow

16 through the same type of -- I would say procurement.

17 I'm not going to limit this to acquisitions because it's

18 the same process for PPA's, strategies, and so forth.

19 Once a month there is what we call an EMC, the committee

20 that is basically the Energy Management Committee. At

21 that time any type of strategies, PPA's, acquisitions,

22 were brought to the EMC for discussion, and from time to

23 time we also have updates at the EMC. The EMC then will

24 -- there's a recommendation made to the EMC to move any

25 sort of decision forward. Some decisions basically are
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 1 not of a certain level that move on to board approval,

 2 and so it would just stop at the EMC. Those

 3 acquisitions such as Mint Farm, the EMC then would make

 4 the recommendation for the acquisition team to brief the

 5 board. And so then a package is actually delivered to

 6 the board. And we follow the same process today with

 7 our new board as we did with the old board. A package

 8 is then delivered to the board, a recommendation is

 9 made, it is sent to the board ahead of time so that they

10 can read through the material and be prepped so that

11 they're able to I would say ask any questions or dive

12 into any areas that they may have concerns about. And

13 then we actually make a physical presentation to the

14 board.

15 Q. And you are head of the EMC, this particular

16 committee, as Vice President for Resource Acquisitions?

17 A. I believe that the EMC is actually -- I have

18 the Chair position at this point. Mr. Markell,

19 Mr. Valdman, Sue McLain, Paul Wiegand, and myself, and

20 Jennifer O'Connor, we are all members of the EMC.

21 Q. And when the Macquarie Consortium made an

22 offer for the company, did they start sitting in on the

23 board meetings when these resource acquisitions were

24 discussed?

25 A. No.
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 1 Q. They were kept separate from?

 2 A. They were. In fact if I may, because that

 3 was an interesting aspect of the Mint Farm discussion

 4 was that the Mint Farm discussion took place in the

 5 summer, I believe it was August of 2008, and it was

 6 during this transition period. The August board meeting

 7 is usually, or it deviates from July to September, but

 8 the summer board meeting is usually a two-day board

 9 meeting, more like a retreat where we try to really talk

10 about broad aspects. And how we approached this

11 retreat, because the transaction was about 9 months

12 since it had been released, we actually approached this

13 discussion with our board as a stand-alone discussion so

14 that what would happen if the transaction didn't move

15 forward.

16 Q. I see. So the owners or representatives of

17 the new owner consortium were not, it's your testimony

18 that they were not involved at all?

19 A. They were not --

20 Q. With the review of the Mint Farm?

21 A. That's correct, they were not involved with

22 the Mint Farm acquisition.

23 Q. Formally or informally or both?

24 A. Both.

25 Q. Okay.
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 1 This issue of the NAES report that you

 2 discuss on page 9 of your rebuttal testimony, and could

 3 you just state for the record your understanding of the

 4 Commission's standards on review of prudency?

 5 A. Yes, I believe that I reviewed a prudency in

 6 my direct testimony.

 7 Q. Yeah, I think on pages 33 or 34.

 8 A. Thank you.

 9 Q. The Chairman says 27, I'm sorry.

10 A. Yes. And I have to say I mean there's been

11 many different instances where the Commission has

12 elaborated on prudency, but basically the company must

13 identify a need. Once the need has been identified, the

14 company goes through a process to identify I would say

15 the lowest reasonable cost looking at all the different

16 factors and all the different alternatives out there.

17 Q. Right.

18 A. The company must make sure that its board of

19 directors is included in this discussion, and we must

20 keep contemporaneous documentation.

21 Q. And so you testify in your direct testimony

22 that you believe that all of these criteria have been

23 more than fully satisfied?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And just to clarify again, by the board and
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 1 contemporaneous records, you mean the publicly listed

 2 board as you just stated, not the new consortium owners?

 3 A. Yes.

 4 Q. Talking about this NAS report, NAES report,

 5 excuse me, was there much discussion of that? You sat

 6 in on the board meetings, did you not?

 7 A. Yes, I did.

 8 Q. Okay. Was there much discussion of the

 9 issues that the Public Counsel witness raises in the,

10 for example, the corrosion issue?

11 A. What there was discussion about in the board,

12 in fact we do, and Mr. Garratt sets forth the entire

13 packet of the 230 pages in fact that is brought forth to

14 the board, on specific details of the board that they

15 would have -- we gave an overview and a very robust

16 discussion on the condition of the plant. And in fact I

17 clearly remember a discussion of -- if you -- if you

18 look through the Mint Farm, there's actually a purchase

19 price and then there's an additional price for different

20 upgrades and conditions that we actually went into Mint

21 Farm and made additional investment. Partially with

22 that from any reports we talk about due diligence, and

23 then partial is because we had experience from the

24 Goldendale facility, and they are very similar. So we

25 had a robust discussion on O&M, about the GE maintenance
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 1 agreements, and about the synergies of Goldendale and

 2 Mint Farm. And in addition to that, I believe in the

 3 board presentation one of the next steps, the very first

 4 next step was due diligence, so we were talking about

 5 quite a bit of the due diligence in the work that we

 6 were still going through. As far as the NAES report, we

 7 talked about the different consultants we have, and as

 8 we -- as I set forth in my rebuttal testimony on page 9,

 9 we actually I think took a bit of a more conservative

10 approach taking all of the consultants into -- the

11 impact of all the consultants rather than just

12 delineating NAES.

13 Q. So there were a number of consultants who

14 weighed in on this issue, and your testimony is that you

15 presented the board with all that information, and the

16 board considered management's review of due diligence

17 and concluded that the plant was in reasonably good

18 condition?

19 A. Yes. In fact I specifically remember

20 questions on maintenance and plant condition from Bill

21 Ayer of Alaska Airlines who is now currently our Chair,

22 he always has very incredible insight as far as

23 maintenance and condition of facilities.

24 Q. So you're not disputing that the NAS report

25 specifically addressed the corrosion issue, but what
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 1 you're saying is that the Public Counsel witness takes

 2 it out of context or in a selective way?

 3 A. Yes. And in addition I think that given all

 4 of the aspects, what NAES has said, given all of these

 5 aspects, and I focus in on their paragraph that we have

 6 taken out on top of page 9, even given all of these

 7 aspects and move forward, and I think Roger Garratt can

 8 further elaborate on this, it was their recommendation

 9 that we move forward with the acquisition.

10 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay, that's all I have,

11 Judge, thank you.

12 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

13 Anything further from the Bench?

14 Apparently not.

15 All right, any redirect?

16 MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor.

17

18 R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N

19 BY MS. CARSON:

20 Q. Ms. Harris, you testified that one metric or

21 one aspect of acquisitions that the company looks at are

22 the financial aspects of the resource; is that right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Does Mint Farm have a positive financial

25 impact for the customers?
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 1 A. Yes, Mint Farm is in the long term, which is

 2 why we moved forward with the acquisition, it is a

 3 positive financial impact on our customers.

 4 Q. There have been questions for you about

 5 shareholders earning a return on Mint Farm versus a PPA,

 6 why do shareholders earn a return on a plant like Mint

 7 Farm?

 8 A. Well, as I stated, I mean it's basically a

 9 regulatory treatment of an acquisition versus a PPA

10 currently in the State of Washington.

11 Q. Do they put in capital for the plant?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Public Counsel has referenced a certain PPA

14 that was considered in the RFP process. Has PSE

15 rejected any of the three of the five short listed gas

16 fired bids that are referenced in your testimony at page

17 6, lines 15 through 19?

18 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, I'm going to object,

19 this is going beyond the scope of cross and just

20 eliciting further direct from the witness.

21 JUDGE MOSS: Sustained.

22 BY MS. CARSON:

23 Q. Has PSE rejected the PPA that Public Counsel

24 questioned you about?

25 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, I'm going to object
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 1 again. Your Honor, I believe this is just covering

 2 material that's already in the testimony of various

 3 Puget witnesses.

 4 JUDGE MOSS: I will overrule you on that one.

 5 She's asking specifically about page 11 of the witness's

 6 testimony as to which you inquired. Rebuttal testimony

 7 to be clear.

 8 A. We are still in conversation with that

 9 referenced party.

10 BY MS. CARSON:

11 Q. And do you anticipate that maybe part of the

12 PSE's current RFP may be bid into PSE's current RFP; is

13 that a possibility?

14 A. It is definitely a possibility.

15 Q. There were also some questions for you

16 regarding reported corrosion in some of the due

17 diligence reports. Does the board presentation, the 230

18 page report, reflect that that was reported? I guess if

19 I could turn you to Mr. Garratt's Exhibit 7HC, we'll

20 have to get that for you.

21 Do you have in front of you RG-7HC?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And what is this document?

24 A. I believe in its entirety it would be the

25 entire package that was mailed to the board, so the
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 1 referenced 230 pages from Mr. Garratt's testimony.

 2 Q. And when you say the entire package for the

 3 board, is that the entire package for Mint Farm

 4 regarding --

 5 A. Yes.

 6 Q. For the board?

 7 A. Yes.

 8 Q. And if you could turn to page 174. Are you

 9 you at page 174?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Is there any reference here on this page,

12 174, to the corrosion issue?

13 A. On this particular page? If you give me a

14 moment, please. And you're on page 174?

15 Q. Page 174, correct.

16 THE WITNESS: May I ask my counsel a

17 question?

18 JUDGE MOSS: No.

19 THE WITNESS: Okay.

20 JUDGE MOSS: I will say this, Ms. Carson,

21 this is already in the record. To the extent you want

22 to refer to it, you can. You don't need to have the

23 witness look at it and analyze it on the stand, because

24 it's taking an excessive amount of time I think for what

25 it's worth.
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 1 MS. CARSON: That's fine, thank you.

 2 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

 3 MS. CARSON: No further questions.

 4 JUDGE MOSS: All right.

 5 Anything further, Mr. ffitch?

 6 MR. FFITCH: No.

 7 JUDGE MOSS: All right, very good.

 8 All right, Ms. Harris, with that I believe we

 9 have completed your testimony, but I will release you

10 subject to recall if needed. Thank you very much.

11 And with that, we'll take our morning recess

12 and stay for a moment off the record, please.

13 (Brief recess.)

14 JUDGE MOSS: All right, Mr. Garratt, please

15 rise and raise your right hand.

16 (Witness ROGER GARRATT was sworn.)

17 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, please be seated.

18

19 Whereupon,

20 ROGER GARRATT,

21 having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness

22 herein and was examined and testified as follows:

23

24

25
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 1 D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N

 2 BY MS. CARSON:

 3 Q. Mr. Garratt, please state your name and title

 4 and spell your name for the court reporter.

 5 A. Roger Garratt, R-O-G-E-R, G-A-R-R-A-T-T, I'm

 6 the Director of Resource Acquisition and Emerging

 7 Technologies.

 8 Q. Mr. Garratt, do you have before you what have

 9 been marked for identification as Exhibit Numbers

10 RG-1HCT through RG-56?

11 A. I do.

12 Q. Do these exhibits constitute your prefiled

13 direct and rebuttal testimony and related exhibits in

14 this proceeding?

15 A. They do.

16 Q. Were these exhibits prepared under your

17 supervision and direction?

18 A. They were.

19 Q. Do you have any corrections to any of your

20 exhibits at this time?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Are your prefiled direct and rebuttal

23 testimony and accompanying exhibits true and correct to

24 the best of your information?

25 A. Yes.
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 1 MS. CARSON: Thank you.

 2 Your Honor, PSE offers Exhibits RG-1HCT

 3 through RG-56 into evidence and offers Mr. Garratt for

 4 cross-examination at this time.

 5 JUDGE MOSS: All right, hearing no objection,

 6 those will be admitted as marked.

 7 We also have Exhibits RG-57HC through RG-63

 8 that are the prefiled proposed cross-examination

 9 exhibits by Public Counsel, any objection from the

10 company?

11 MS. CARSON: No, Your Honor.

12 JUDGE MOSS: Any others?

13 All right, hearing no others, those exhibits

14 also will be admitted as marked.

15 With that, Mr. ffitch, I believe your witness

16 is -- the witness is available for your

17 cross-examination, and we also have a few minutes from

18 the Federal Executive Agencies, but you go ahead,

19 Mr. ffitch.

20 MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

21

22 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N

23 BY MR. FFITCH:

24 Q. Good morning, Mr. Garratt.

25 A. Good morning.
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 1 Q. In your rebuttal testimony, you acknowledge

 2 that Puget's acquisition of Mint Farm created surplus

 3 capacity on Puget's system in 2009 and 2010, correct?

 4 A. To be clear, the surplus capacity that this

 5 acquisition creates is surplus capacity from a planning

 6 perspective but not from an operating perspective.

 7 Q. But you don't disagree that there was surplus

 8 capacity in 2009 and 2010, correct?

 9 A. Again, it is from a -- only from a planning

10 perspective, and let me elaborate on that. The capacity

11 and needs that were identified take into account the

12 purchase of up to 1,200 megawatts of capacity from the

13 market, and so as a result of the acquisition the

14 company during the years 2009 and 2010 in fact relies a

15 bit less on the market, so in fact from an operational

16 perspective there is no surplus capacity.

17 Q. Can you turn to page 8 of your rebuttal

18 testimony. That's Exhibit 53, RG-53HCT.

19 A. You said page 8?

20 Q. Page 8 of your rebuttal.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. Can you look at the question on lines 10 and

23 11, and would you agree that that says:

24 Why did PSE purchase Mint Farm even

25 though the acquisition created a surplus
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 1 capacity need in 2009 and 2010?

 2 That's what that says, correct?

 3 A. That is the words of the question, yes.

 4 Q. All right. And this testimony was prepared

 5 by you, correct, as we've just heard?

 6 A. Yes.

 7 Q. Isn't it correct that you also state -- and

 8 let me back up a second here. Obviously we're looking

 9 at blue paper, we're talking about resource acquisition

10 alternatives, I'm not going to ask you for anything

11 confidential or highly confidential, and I would propose

12 to refer to -- let's do it this way. Can you go back to

13 page 7 of your rebuttal, please, the preceding page, and

14 if you look at line 12, there is a specific power

15 purchase agreement there mentioned, is there not?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And I'm going to -- I propose to refer to

18 that as the alternative power purchase agreement. When

19 I say that, that's what I'm referring to.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. And on this page actually at that line, you

22 state that alternative PPA was not suitable to meet

23 Puget's need in 2011, correct?

24 A. Yeah.

25 Q. It's true that from time to time Puget has to
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 1 rely on short-term purchases to meet its energy needs,

 2 correct?

 3 A. Yes.

 4 Q. Can you please turn to Exhibit 59C, that's

 5 RG-59.

 6 MS. CARSON: Your Honor, we object to the use

 7 of this exhibit for Mr. Garratt. This is a data request

 8 response prepared by David Mills of the company.

 9 JUDGE MOSS: Well, if he knows about it,

10 we'll let him answer. If he doesn't, he can say so.

11 MR. FFITCH: Pretty straightforward, Your

12 Honor.

13 BY MR. FFITCH:

14 Q. If you could turn to page 4 of the exhibit.

15 Again I'm not going to ask for confidential numbers here

16 in the open record. Do you have page 4? This is marked

17 page 4 on exhibit numbering, so it would be the second

18 page of Attachment A, it's actually the last page of the

19 cross exhibit of the data. Do you have that?

20 A. I believe so.

21 Q. Okay. If you could look in the -- there's 3

22 columns for the year 2011, correct, including dollars

23 per megawatt hour; do you see that?

24 A. I do see that. Again, I'm not familiar with

25 this exhibit.
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 1 Q. All right.

 2 MR. FFITCH: Perhaps it would be better to do

 3 this with Mr. Mills as I think about it.

 4 JUDGE MOSS: That's fine.

 5 MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

 6 BY MR. FFITCH:

 7 Q. Generally in your rebuttal, Mr. Garratt, you

 8 criticize Mr. Norwood, Public Counsel's power cost

 9 witness, for failing to consider the qualitative factors

10 which Puget considered in selecting Mint Farm, correct?

11 A. I'm not sure I would use the term criticize.

12 I think we try and point out that the acquisition

13 process, the evaluation process for acquisitions is a

14 very holistic process, and in that process we take into

15 account quantitative, qualitative factors and apply

16 management judgment to all of those factors.

17 Q. All right. So you don't disagree with this

18 analysis?

19 A. I'm not sure which analysis you're referring

20 to.

21 Q. All right, well, let's just continue on.

22 Isn't it correct that the alternative PPA was

23 evaluated to be very close to the Mint Farm project on

24 Puget's qualitative analysis of the key risk factors?

25 A. You appear to be looking at a particular
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 1 exhibit, so perhaps you could identify which exhibit

 2 that is.

 3 Q. Sure. Why don't you turn to Exhibit 3G,

 4 excuse me, RG-3 of your -- this is your direct

 5 testimony. It's a large exhibit.

 6 A. Okay.

 7 Q. And I'm looking at page 110 of that exhibit.

 8 A. Okay.

 9 Q. Okay. Again one of your differences with

10 Public Counsel witness Norwood was that he failed in

11 your view to consider the qualitative factors which

12 Puget considered in selecting Mint Farm; isn't that

13 correct?

14 A. I believe what we said was failed to consider

15 all of the factors.

16 Q. Let's take a look at this page 110 of Exhibit

17 RG-3. I don't believe the headings on this page are

18 confidential, are they?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Actually the other information is primarily

21 -- is marked highly confidential, so we'll have to be

22 careful here.

23 JUDGE MOSS: Ms. Carson, if you could confirm

24 for us, I think the only confidential information on

25 this page, Mr. ffitch, is the identity of various
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 1 options as highlighted in addition to being on blue

 2 paper.

 3 MS. CARSON: That's correct.

 4 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

 5 BY MR. FFITCH:

 6 Q. And if we take a look at the -- well, I guess

 7 let's just back up a second. What are we looking at

 8 here? This is a qualitative evaluation display or

 9 depiction showing 4 key risks and comparing different

10 types of resource acquisitions, correct, or different

11 specific resource acquisitions and comparing them to

12 Mint Farm, correct?

13 A. For the particular risks that are shown here.

14 Q. All right. And if we take a look at Mint

15 Farm and then compare it to the resource acquisition

16 immediately to the left of it, it's true, is it not,

17 that there's no distinguishable difference between the

18 risk level shown for those choices?

19 A. With respect to these particular risks.

20 There are differences in other areas.

21 Q. All right. Except for the lower right-hand

22 corner item where it appears that Mint Farm has a higher

23 risk, correct?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And could you please turn now to
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 1 Cross-Examination Exhibit 57HC. Do you have that?

 2 A. I do.

 3 Q. And in that data request, Public Counsel

 4 asked Puget to provide the numerical values for each of

 5 the rankings on this page, did we not?

 6 A. Yes.

 7 Q. And the response indicates that "risk factors

 8 are impossible to quantify", and therefore Puget's

 9 qualitative analysis "is only meant to convey a relative

10 difference in perceived risk between the different

11 options"; is that correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Now I'm going to direct you to pages 10 and

14 12 of your rebuttal just generally. In that section of

15 your rebuttal, you're criticizing Mr. Norwood for

16 focusing solely on portfolio benefits and on benefit

17 ratio results of the quantitative analysis; isn't that

18 right?

19 A. Again, I would not use the word criticize,

20 but.

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. The point of this section is to talk about

23 how we use a variety of metrics and evaluation criteria

24 to make a decision.

25 Q. All right, well, the testimony speaks for
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 1 itself.

 2 Let's talk about portfolio benefit for a

 3 moment. Can you define portfolio benefit, please, what

 4 does that measure?

 5 A. Well, as Ms. Harris said, Mr. Elsea is

 6 probably the best company witness to define that

 7 particular term, but in general it -- we run our models

 8 using a selected resource that we're evaluating, and

 9 then we run the model using what we call the wallpaper

10 of generic resources, and the portfolio benefit is the

11 difference in the total portfolio costs between those

12 two runs.

13 Q. All right.

14 Can we look at page 13 of your rebuttal,

15 please. That's Exhibit RG-53. Do you have that?

16 A. I do.

17 Q. And that shows a list of costs, a list of

18 costs at the top of the page from lines 1 through 17,

19 correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And it's true, isn't it, that the portfolio

22 benefit analysis considers all the costs of a resource

23 or portfolio including all of these costs that you have

24 listed here?

25 A. I would say it attempts to consider all of
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 1 those costs that are in its -- and it's because no

 2 particular tool or metric is perfect that we attempt to

 3 come at this through a variety of ways in a much more

 4 comprehensive process.

 5 Q. Can you turn, please, to Cross Exhibit RG-62.

 6 That's a response to Public Counsel Data Request 579.

 7 Do you have that?

 8 A. Yes.

 9 Q. In this request we actually refer to the

10 rebuttal page we were just looking at, and we asked

11 Puget to confirm that all the listed factors were

12 considered in evaluating the system production cost

13 benefits, and the answer is set out below with a couple

14 of exceptions stated where things are not applicable to

15 this type of plant. But in the final sentence it states

16 that Puget considered all other costs identified in the

17 list provided on page 13, correct?

18 A. It does say that, yes.

19 Q. All right. And is it also correct that the

20 lower levelized cost per megawatt hour of the Mint Farm

21 facility is in fact reflected in the results of Puget's

22 analysis of portfolio benefits?

23 A. I would say that that levelized cost is a

24 distinct and separate metric.

25 Q. So it's your testimony that that's not
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 1 included in the portfolio, in the costs that are

 2 included in the portfolio benefit analysis?

 3 A. Both the portfolio benefit and levelized cost

 4 are metrics that come out of the analysis, so some of

 5 this -- many of the same costs go into the equation, but

 6 what we're talking about is results that come out of an

 7 evaluation, so I don't think it's fair to say that

 8 levelized cost goes into a portfolio benefit

 9 calculation. I don't think that's a correct statement.

10 Q. I understand that Puget identifies these as

11 different metrics and that they are generally used as

12 different metrics, meaning portfolio benefit versus

13 levelized cost versus other metrics. My question is,

14 isn't it the case that the cost ingredients that go to

15 make up the levelized cost analysis are also

16 incorporated in the portfolio benefit analysis?

17 A. They are -- so I would say they are similar

18 cost ingredients, but the result is a different way of

19 looking at the evaluation. And it's a important way to

20 look at the evaluation, because we've said in our

21 testimony that we don't think it's proper to focus on

22 any one of these metrics, that it's important to focus

23 on all three of them as well as to focus on all the

24 qualitative evaluation criteria as well.

25 Q. Puget does not deny that the portfolio
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 1 benefit analysis showed that the alternative PPA was

 2 expected to provide significantly higher benefits than

 3 the Mint Farm project over a wide range of scenarios,

 4 does it?

 5 A. I would say the portfolio benefits numbers

 6 speak for themselves with respect to that particular

 7 ranking. That was not the reason that the alternative

 8 PPA is in the position that it's in.

 9 Q. Can I get you to turn to your Exhibit 3,

10 RG-3.

11 A. This is the rebuttal testimony, correct?

12 Q. No, this is your direct, and it's Exhibit 3,

13 it's the same large exhibit you were just looking at.

14 We were looking at page 110, we're going to move to page

15 119. It's highly confidential. Do you have that?

16 A. I do.

17 Q. And that says quantitative at the top of the

18 page?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Is that correct? And this, just to sort of

21 describe what we're looking at here, this page shows the

22 results of the three metrics we've been discussing,

23 levelized costs, portfolio benefit, and benefit ratio

24 under various scenarios such as current trends, Monte

25 Carlo, Green World, et cetera, correct?
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 1 A. Yes.

 2 Q. And if we look down for example under

 3 portfolio benefit and we look down in the second half of

 4 the page opposite, we see a line for the alternative

 5 PPA, do we not?

 6 A. Yes.

 7 Q. And then the very bottom shows the analysis

 8 result for Mint Farm, correct?

 9 A. Yes.

10 MR. FFITCH: And are those two numbers

11 confidential? I confess I copied this on white paper at

12 the office, this worksheet that I have.

13 MS. CARSON: The levelized cost number is

14 confidential, the portfolio benefit is not.

15 MR. FFITCH: All right.

16 BY MR. FFITCH:

17 Q. So we can see that the portfolio benefit of

18 the alternative PPA is 111.4 versus Mint Farm is 45,

19 correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And can you explain what that means in terms

22 of the definition of a portfolio benefit, or do we need

23 to ask Mr. Elsea that question?

24 A. I think again Mr. Elsea would be a better

25 witness to answer that question.
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 1 Q. Can you tell us if that indicates that the

 2 alternative PPA is a preferred choice or has a better

 3 number than Mint Farm or a worse number; do you

 4 understand the ratings to that extent?

 5 MS. CARSON: I would ask that you rephrase

 6 the question.

 7 Q. Which has the better number here in terms of

 8 choosing between the two, Mint Farm or the alternative

 9 PPA?

10 A. With respect to this particular --

11 Q. To this specific metric I mean. If you were

12 only looking at the specific metric. I understand you

13 have another argument.

14 MS. CARSON: And can we clarify which metric

15 you're talking about.

16 Q. Portfolio benefit.

17 A. With respect to this particular metric and --

18 the alternate PPA has a larger number, and a larger

19 number is better with respect to this metric.

20 Q. All right. And so we won't walk you through

21 all of these now, but if a reader walks through each of

22 these scenarios for each of these metrics, you can do a

23 comparison between the alternative PPA and Mint Farm for

24 each of these items, correct?

25 A. With respect to those metrics, that's true.
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 1 With respect to other metrics, it becomes much more

 2 subjective and requires much more management judgment to

 3 differentiate.

 4 Q. Okay. And just looking at this page and the

 5 next several pages where these metrics are shown, can

 6 you point me to any place where the Mint Farm, other

 7 than levelized costs, where the Mint Farm rating or

 8 number is better than the alternative PPA number?

 9 A. I think Mr. Elsea would be a better witness

10 for that question.

11 Q. Okay. You don't know?

12 A. Certainly Mr. Elsea has a lot more

13 familiarity with the quantitative evaluation than I do.

14 Q. All right. This was an exhibit to your

15 testimony, right?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. These same pages that we've just been looking

18 at also contain the benefit ratio metric, do they not?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And I could ask you to define what the

21 benefit ratio is, do you want me to direct those

22 questions to Mr. Elsea?

23 A. Yes, please.

24 Q. Are you contesting the fact that Puget's own

25 studies show that the alternative PPA had a
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 1 significantly higher benefit ratio than the Mint Farm

 2 facility?

 3 A. We do not -- I do not disagree with that.

 4 Again the point of my testimony is that there were other

 5 factors, particularly strategic and financial factors

 6 and compatibility with need factors that were the basis

 7 for the decisions we made.

 8 Q. All right. Is one of the factors that was

 9 considered by you the fact that the Mint Farm

10 acquisition provided the opportunity to earn a rate of

11 return on rate base which was not provided by the

12 alternative PPA?

13 A. Not in respect to earnings per se. As we

14 evaluate a resource, a potential acquisition such as

15 Mint Farm or any sort of acquisition where we would be

16 investing the company's money, what we do is create a

17 detailed pro forma for that particular project, and in

18 that pro forma we model all of the forecasted costs.

19 And so as part of that, we take into account returns as

20 a calculation that we're making to determine revenue

21 requirements associated with that particular

22 alternative. So in that respect, we do. But as between

23 say a PPA and an alternative, we don't give some

24 additional weight or credit to the fact that there is a

25 return. As Ms. Harris talked about, we really try and
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 1 focus all of our effort on looking at this from the

 2 perspective of the customer.

 3 Q. Has that pro forma analysis that you just

 4 mentioned been provided to any party as discovery in

 5 this case or offered as an exhibit in support of the

 6 prudence case that you've presented or the other

 7 witnesses presented, is that in the record?

 8 A. I know of at least one place that it's there,

 9 and it may be in other places as well. So in the board

10 of directors presentation, and I'm trying to find the

11 exhibit number.

12 Q. It's Exhibit 7 I believe.

13 MR. FFITCH: Is that correct?

14 MS. CARSON: Yes.

15 A. Yes, so in RG-7HC it is contained in there,

16 and it's within the context of the entire 230 page board

17 presentation, it is an exhibit to that, so not -- or we

18 use the term exhibit within our board presentation. So

19 that showed our pro forma analysis at the time that we

20 presented it to the board. It probably doesn't line up

21 perfectly with the numbers in this case just because I

22 suspect things evolved somewhat between when we prepared

23 the book in July and when we ultimately closed on the

24 transaction and then filed the general rate case.

25 BY MR. FFITCH:
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 1 Q. And you provided --

 2 A. But you could, I'm sorry, but just by looking

 3 at what we presented in the board of directors

 4 presentation, you could get a flavor for how detailed

 5 the analysis is that we do as we look at acquisitions.

 6 JUDGE MOSS: Do you have more than another

 7 couple of questions, Mr. ffitch? We need to break for

 8 our noon activities.

 9 MR. FFITCH: Actually, Your Honor, I think

10 that other than asking for a page reference for where

11 that report is, which counsel could provide, I don't

12 have any further questions for the witness.

13 JUDGE MOSS: Counsel can provide you that

14 during the break then. All right, let's do that.

15 And then Mr. Furuta, do you still have

16 questions for this witness?

17 MR. FURUTA: Yes, Your Honor. Well, I may be

18 very brief, and it concerned the exhibit identified for

19 Matthew Marcelia, MRM-12. I intended to cross

20 Mr. Marcelia about that, but on the -- it's a data

21 request response from the company, and it said the

22 witness knowledgeable is this witness, so I didn't want

23 this to become orphanned. If counsel could assure me

24 that Mr. Marcelia can answer questions regarding the tax

25 benefits to Wild Horse wind projects expansion, then I
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 1 can direct those questions to Mr. Marcelia.

 2 MS. CARSON: Yes, Mr. Marcelia can answer

 3 those questions.

 4 MR. FURUTA: With regard to this exhibit?

 5 MS. CARSON: Yes.

 6 MR. FURUTA: I have no questions then.

 7 JUDGE MOSS: Any questions from the Bench for

 8 this witness?

 9 All right, apparently not.

10 Any redirect? It has to be very brief though

11 if you have any.

12 MS. CARSON: I do have some redirect.

13 JUDGE MOSS: More than 3 minutes?

14 MS. CARSON: It may be more than 3 minutes.

15 JUDGE MOSS: All right, then we're going to

16 have to have Mr. Garratt back I think after the break,

17 because we're going to need to take a few minutes

18 between this and the public comment hearing at 12:00.

19 So with apologies to you, Mr. Garratt, have

20 to have you back after the lunch hour. I hope that will

21 not be a matter for indigestion.

22 This proceeding, the evidentiary proceeding

23 will be in recess until 1:30. If we finish early then

24 we'll all get something to eat. And if we don't, then I

25 will let you know when you return, but I would like you

0234

 1 all back by 1:30 to resume our evidentiary proceedings.

 2 (Hearing adjourned at 11:50 a.m.)
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