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BE IT REMEMBERED that on Monday, April 22, 2019, at 1:30 p.m., at 104 West Woodin Avenue, Chelan, Washington, the evidentiary hearing was taken before Dani White, Certified Court Reporter. The following proceedings took place:

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Good morning. Sorry, good afternoon. We're here today for an evidentiary hearing in Docket TS-180677, application for a commercial ferry certificate requested by Backcountry Travels LLC to operate on Lake Chelan. The time is approximately 1:30 p.m. on Monday, April 22, 2019.

My name is Andrew O'Connell, I'm an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. We are holding this evidentiary hearing in Chelan, Washington, because I moved the evidentiary hearing from Olympia to Chelan in order to facilitate greater participation by the public, including holding the public comment hearing to receive comments from the public on this matter.

We had that hearing this morning from about 9 in the morning until approximately 10:30. So this morning we heard from the public and I believe it's important to give the parties that same opportunity in this case.

Let's take appearances and because I believe all
parties are represented by counsel and I have a notice of appearance on file for all of the attorneys, short appearances are sufficient. Let's start with Staff and, Mr. Roberson.

MR. ROBERSON: Good afternoon. Jeff Roberson, R-o-b-e-r-s-o-n, I'm an Assistant Attorney General representing Staff in this matter.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for Backcountry Travels.
MR. MILLER: Jordan Miller, Your Honor, attorney at Jeffers, Danielson, Sonn \& Alyward, counsel for applicant Backcountry Travels.

MR. HITCHCOCK: And, Your Honor, Matt Hitchcock, H-i-t-c-h-c-o-c-k, of Jeffers Danielson appearing on behalf of Backcountry Travels.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
So at this point $I$ want to say something to the applicant. I've had a number of requests that I've issued throughout this proceeding and I wanted to show some appreciation for your responsiveness and helpfulness, and I can tell that you put thought into your answers and I appreciate that because it's going to help me make a decision in this matter so thank you.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Now as I believe I've indicated, I'm interested in hearing from the parties about the

1 economic viability of a second operator on Lake Chelan, and that being whether the issuance of a second certificate on Lake Chelan would ultimately -- my concern is would that result in the demise of both operators because the Commission is charged with evaluating whether the public convenience and necessity requires the second certificate, and what I'm quite certain is not in the public interest is that there end up being no ferry service on Lake Chelan so that's where some of my questions will be coming from.

I guess next I'd just like to emphasize that I'm taking this decision very seriously. I believe it's important for this community and the area of Lake Chelan and for visitors to Lake Chelan.

So I want to address exhibits first. Is there -well, first, let me address a couple of exhibits that I want to -- I have a couple questions about. Mr. Miller, Exhibits GH-3X and GH-4X, it's my understanding that those are duplicates of the application and of future number projections that is already sponsored by Mr. Courtney as Exhibit CCC-3; is that correct?

MR. MILLER: That is correct, Your Honor.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So as it pertains to those exhibits, I'm not going to admit those additional

1 exhibits into the record. I'm not striking the originals but just that $I$ don't need them in the record and I don't want to burden the record. So you can still -- if you have questions about the application or the future projections you can ask those, and if you intend to ask Mr. Hammond questions about those, you can ask referring to the originals.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. We just wanted to make sure everybody was aware of what documents we felt relevant for each witness so there was no surprise, if you will.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I understand that. Thank you.

Is there a stipulation as to exhibits other than those two?

MR. RICHARDS: Staff is happy to stipulate to Mr. Colter Courtney's testimony and exhibits, we have not seen the exhibits from for Ms. Luchini or Mr. Logan Courtney and we can't stipulate to something we haven't seen.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Correct.
Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER: Stipulations, yes, Your Honor, no objections. And we'll obviously introduce the testimony, Ms. Luchini is present and Mr. Logan

1 Courtney also present so we'll produce those materials 2 through their testimony.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Do you have copies that you can give to Staff too?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: You do, okay.
So while Staff is looking that over, I'd like to say it isn't typical that the Commission allows direct testimony at an evidentiary hearing like this one because we've had several rounds of written direct testimony.

Usually at these hearings we proceed by allowing for cross-examination and questions from the bench, but I believe there might be a reason to be a little lenient on that in this hearing and I wanted to ask you, Mr. Miller, a little bit about it.

The two witnesses that you've identified other than Mr. Courtney who have not yet testified in this case, judging from at least the titles of the exhibits you plan to offer, I am assuming that these witnesses are kind of in response to the question that I've said I would have at this hearing and that being the economic viability of a second operator.

Is that true that these witnesses are meant to be helpful in answering that question?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. That's precisely -and I apologize, $I$ don't know if Your Honor wants me to stand.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Oh, you don't need to stand. MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE O'CONNELL: It's a little more informal than an administrative hearing.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Roberson had mentioned that but $I$ just wanted to make sure.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sure.
MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor, the intent and the purpose of bringing particularly Ms. Luchini in to offer testimony today is to address the financial issues because, Your Honor, I thought that we heard you and it sounds like we did in your last notes and released information so that's the intent with respect to Ms. Luchini.

Mr. Logan Courtney was brought forward more to address his background, his experience as an operator, because that seemed to have been raised, it seemed that there were issues brought out during the course of the initial exchanges and testimony particularly from the former party, LCRI, so that was the purpose of his testimony and the intent of bringing him before the Commission today.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, I do have very few questions outside of the economic question about the operations of the ferry which Mr. Logan Courtney may have some insight and be able to answer.

With that understanding, $I$ feel like it is appropriate under these circumstances to allow these witnesses to testify. I think that their testimony is going to be helpful in making a decision in this matter. So even though they have not been identified for, you know, prior direct testimony, I think that allowing them to testify at this hearing will be helpful.

MR. MILLER: I appreciate it, Your Honor. And just if $I$ may add, this is an additional expense, obviously, having an expert witness certainly cost my client money, and to be blunt, it wasn't until Your Honor and the proceedings made it clear that that was a central focus that we kind of addressed the noneconomic component so she was brought on toward the end of the proceedings, and frankly, we didn't know -- it wasn't until then so that's another reason why she has not offered direct testimony prior to that point so we do appreciate the Court's allowing her to have the opportunity to speak here today.

If $I$ may, in speaking with Ms. Luchini coming in,

1 my expectation is her testimony will do her best to answer Your Honor's questions but it's somewhat hampered by the lack of data available from LCRI.

As far as their fiscal information and details, we've gleaned what Mr. Hammond was also able to review as far as the data available, but $I$ just want to let the Court know in advance that as far as her being able to say that this is economically viable, you know, she'll answer that question but limited access to the financial details of LCRI makes it somewhat difficult for us to offer a fully-informed opinion as to their viability moving forward.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I understand.
So Mr. Colter Courtney being the primary witness for Backcountry Travels, what I'd like to do is I have several questions.

MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: I don't expect them to take all that long but I'd like to have Mr. Courtney testify first, and then to the extent that he is unable to really give a full answer and he knows that Ms. Luchini or Mr. Logan Courtney can offer a better response, I'd like at that point then to have them come next and testify and kind of fill in those holes, does that make sense?

MR. MILLER: Certainly, Your Honor, absolutely.
MR. ROBERSON: Before we begin, Staff can stipulate to Mr. Logan Courtney's exhibits but we still don't have the report from Ms. Luchini.

MR. MILLER: She wasn't able to compile an actual report so it's really her testimony here today, Your Honor. Again, the timing was just -- so we apologize, we didn't know until this morning as well, sir.

MR. ROBERSON: Housekeeping, that's fine. So we can stipulate to all the exhibits, they're going to be exhibits, $I$ guess, with the exception of that report which does not exist. So Mr. Logan Courtney's exhibits Staff will stipulate to, sounds like Ms. Luchini doesn't actually have an exhibit so...

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Oh, I see. So what's been identified as MPL-1 is -- that, we don't have that.

MR. MILLER: Correct, Your Honor.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. That makes sense.
I did want to note -- well, so let's then address the exhibits other than $G H-3 X, G H-4 X$, and MPL-1. So that's regarding the pre-filed testimony of Staff, the application of materials and statements of support, the direct and rebuttal testimony and exhibits of Mr. Colter Courtney, Exhibit CCC-4 and Exhibit CCC-5 sponsored by Mr. Colter Courtney, and the
cross-examination Exhibits GH-2X and GH-5X as well as MPL-2, LC-1, LC-2, and LC-3, am I correct that there's a stipulation as to those exhibits?

MR. ROBERSON: Yeah. I will note that what is marked as $G H-5 X$ appears to be the same exhibit as CCC-4. I'm not sure if you want to admit that one twice.

MR. MILLER: That is correct, Your Honor.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. No, I'm not going to admit GH-5X then. Having it in as CCC-4 I believe is sufficient, and if you have questions for Mr. Hammond about it, you can ask him whether he's familiar with CCC-4 and then ask your questions.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. With that, the exhibits I named with the exclusion of $G H-5 X$ are admitted to the record.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Would the Court like a copy of the exhibits? I have another binder for Your Honor if you would like.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I would. Thank you.
And in addition, I noticed that the schedule for Lake Chelan Boat Company is one of the exhibits. I am going to take official notice of the Lake Chelan Boat Company current tariff. I believe it will be helpful.

Okay. With that, I'd like to start with the witnesses from Backcountry Travels. Would Mr. -- can we please start with Mr. Colter Courtney?

MR. MILLER: Certainly. Of course, Your Honor.

COLTER COURTNEY, being first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth,
testified as follows:

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Please be seated. Thank you.
I have a few questions but before I get started is there something -- any questions that you'd like to ask, Mr. Miller?

MR. MILLER: Well, Your Honor, certainly I have prepared my list of questions but as the Court has accurately pointed out with the exhibits being entered, the direct testimony, and the rebuttal testimony has been submitted so certainly Mr. Colter -- Mr. Courtney and I are more than prepared to walk through that.

But in the interest of judicial economy, and quite frankly, because I'm curious as to what Your Honor wants to know so that $I$ can try and guide my testimony, I'd be very happy if the Court would like to initiate the questions of Mr. Courtney and I can try to
follow-up as necessary on where the Court's gone. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Let's do that way. And perhaps my questions will spark some redirect that you'll want to make. MR. MILLER: Yes, sir. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay.

## EXAMINATION

BY JUDGE O'CONNELL:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Courtney. Thank you -- or afternoon, again, second time I made that mistake. I apologize. So I'm interested in hearing whether issuing a second certificate to operate on Lake Chelan will ultimately result in making either operation economically feasible. Can you tell me what evaluation you did, what your company did, and how you think Lake Chelan can support economically two operators?
A. Yeah. I don't have any specific data to back it up in front of me, but it's my experience in Stehekin that basically, you know, every time there has been more transportation offered, there has been more travelers who use it. The float plane is a good example of that. Lake Chelan Boat Company used to have a more extensive schedule and when they did, the ridership was increased.

And it's my belief in knowing everyone in Stehekin and all the business owners that their -- Stehekin can support it and will embrace it. And it's something that, you know, I didn't specifically come up with the schedule myself. It's an idea that many people have wanted.

And so when I put the proposal in, made the application, it was based on what $I$ felt would be most beneficial to Stehekin, what people wanted, and what would enable people to ride the boat more, use the transportation services more, and I ultimately believe it will actually help both, especially in the winter.

Many people don't come to Stehekin in the winter simply because it's not feasible or convenient to get there. I don't ride the boat often in the winter and I live there. I often take private boats when I have the opportunity because $I$ find them to be more convenient. Does that answer your question?
Q. Sure. You mentioned the seaplane service, can you tell me -- tell me about the seaplane service that's no longer running to your knowledge?
A. Yes. The seaplane service has had a few owners in my lifetime. When I was young, my Uncle Jim who testified this morning ran a seaplane service year around. People told him he was crazy to operate in the winter
and he did anyway and it worked out well for him. He since retired from that.

Parker Nolen who testified this morning, his dad operated a seaplane business for many, many years, I don't know how long. And Parker expressed his approval of our application even though $I$ know it is in his interest to bring the seaplane back to Lake Chelan and that's something I would fully support and think it would be good.

Recently, the seaplane has been more of a summer operation and then economically they couldn't sustain a base in Chelan as of two years ago I believe.
Q. Thank you. That's what $I$ was interested in learning about.

Do you know if there are any other seaplane businesses that are, you know, I guess coming to Lake Chelan or Stehekin?
A. Not that I know of. Chelan Seaplanes, they have partnerships or businesses over in the Puget Sound, I don't know what all they do over there but $I$ know it's a lot, and I have heard that they would like to come back but I have not heard anything specific or whether or not it's actually a reality any time in the near future. There again, Parker works for them or has worked for them.
Q. So I saw in your application that you have submitted a letter from the National Forest Service.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Can you tell me about the status of gaining access to docks and other services necessary for fueling and pumping, et cetera, are there conditions that you know of for obtaining these permits?
A. Yes. They've been very open to hearing about it, but the Forest Service, I'll address that first, they manage Fields Point Landing and the Forest Service has told me they will a lot of times have a lengthy process that they go through, but since the UTC already conducts that process in probably a more efficient capacity, they wanted to wait and see what the UTC's opinion was about our application.

But they told me that upon receiving a certificate they will start the process of giving me permission because Fields Point Landing was not designed for one carrier, it was designed for the public. So I have not been given any reason to believe why if I obtain a certificate to operate why they would not allow me to use the facility.
Q. I have a question about purchasing tickets. I notice in your application that you submitted all tickets are going to be buyable online or through an app. Have you
thought about what you're going to do for people who don't have access to the internet or an app and how can they book a ticket?
A. Yes, I have thought about that. And we intend to have a phone number that can be called for questions or ticketing. We do want to encourage people to use the online reservations because that's just going to be a lot more economical.

The previous seaplane business did use an online reservation service and it worked quite well I thought, and it kept people from standing out on the dock purchasing tickets and that's especially not fun in the winter for most people.
Q. So this morning I heard a lot of comments from people in the public asking -- who were commenting about flag stops, is that part of the service that you're proposing?
A. Yes. If reserved, we intend to stop anywhere that is safe for our vessel and that's why in our schedule we've attempted to leave a little bit of time to accommodate these kinds of stops. What I've told folks who have asked me is that we will evaluate each private dock based on a case-by-case basis to determine whether it's safe and that, of course, will change with water level. But there have been a couple who have
approached me that $I$ can definitely say I've been to their dock, yes, we'll stop at any time.
Q. So you mentioned your vessel, can you tell me about this particular vessel's ability to operate in winter conditions? And I'm thinking specifically about any operational limitations that it may have, for example, whether the engines are rated for the winter conditions here on Lake Chelan.
A. Yes, I believe that they are. It will be Suzuki engines and we -- I have consulted with them and the boat builder and designer to decide what power units we want to put on the vessel. Obviously, it's not my vessel, I've had a little bit of input on it but $I$ will be leasing it.

As far as limitations, $I$ don't know of any, and Logan Courtney can speak further to that, he will know more than $I$ do. But the vessel is a 50 -foot catamaran and there's already a 50-foot catamaran on Lake Chelan that was approved for use prior. This one varies in design, it's designed to go slower, it's designed to be more efficient, and it will be much smoother in rough weather.

Predominantly wind conditions are worst in the spring, and I have been out on Lake Chelan in many 20to 30 -foot boats and I've always felt quite safe. And
a 50-foot vessel which is specifically designed for this use, I'm 100 percent confident that it will be safe in all conditions.
Q. So that brings up my last question $I$ wanted to ask you about. Tell me about your plans for safety should something happen with this vessel. And I'm thinking about that you don't have a second vessel and the safety of having a second vessel might provide.
A. Yes. If it's okay, I'd actually have Logan Courtney answer that question. I can attempt to answer it if you'd like.
Q. Sure. To your knowledge and experience I'd like to hear from you but $I$ think $I$ can ask Mr. Courtney as well.
A. Logan owns a private boat which we plan to keep on standby basically for emergencies. The Lake Chelan Assist is a business here in Chelan that offers emergency services for boats who experience difficulties, the fire department and the Chelan County Sheriff's Department both operate vessels.

And it is my intention to seek a cooperative agreement with the Lake Chelan Boat Company that in the event that something happens to either of their vessels or mine that, given that it is safe, for passengers and vessel to go to the other one's aid. There's been no
specific agreement at this time but that is something that I will pursue given the opportunity. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Those are the questions I had. Mr. Miller, did that raise some questions that you'd like to recover?

MR. MILLER: You know, Your Honor, I was going through the various topics I had and Your Honor did cover several of them but $I$ do think there's some additional questions I'd certainly like to ask

Mr. Courtney and try to focus in more on the economics as Your Honor is interested in. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sure. MR. MILLER: Yeah, absolutely. MR. ROBERSON: Go ahead. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yeah, please go ahead. MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. MILLER:
Q. Colter, I'm just going to kind of try and fill in some of the ideas that we've talked about and discussed with Judge O'Connell.

Just thinking back to the boat design, I failed to cover this, is there anything about the design that's intentional with respect to allowing you to have access
to areas on the lake shore that the current boats really aren't suited for?
A. Yes. It's smaller, it will be more maneuverable just by nature of the catamaran. It's a shallower draft and I think mostly it's just a willingness to try to supply a service for those people, that's the main thing that will allow us to provide service to more people is the willingness to do so. But the vessel is -- it was our intent to make it as versatile as possible to serve everyone on the lake, not just Stehekin.
Q. You prepared future numbers projections, correct?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Is your assessment that it's necessary for Backcountry to rely on cannibalizing the Lake Chelan Boat Company's ridership in order to sustain your own?
A. No, absolutely not. And I think that's well documented in history that we can go back and show that when there is more options, there are more travelers, and that the owner of Lake Chelan Boat Company -- the previous owner, I guess, has stated activity creates activity and that's certainly the case with Stehekin, and that is my belief and it's not just mine. It's these people you saw testify -- heard testify this morning.

There are many new plans in Stehekin, people attempting to start new businesses, make new ways for
themselves to be able to make a living in Stehekin and provide more opportunities for tourism. And those things are happening but $I$ believe that a service like this will really, really help them especially shorter and off seasons but just the consistency of having a year-round boat will really help them.
Q. Do you, then, agree it sounds like with the public testimony that by increasing the amount of persons who can get up the lake you increase not only the economic viability of Stehekin but also provide additional persons for the Boat Company to transport back?
A. Yes, absolutely, and specifically in the winter. Because the Lake Chelan Boat Company, their prices are lower than the prices that I've proposed, if it's more convenient for passengers to ride with Lake Chelan Boat Company, I'm sure they will do that often.

And my service is, by nature of a daily service, it will be more convenient more often, but when it is not the most convenient service I'm sure that many people will be riding the Lake Chelan Boat Company. Plus, when there is a large number of people, we cannot accommodate more than 32 and that is the case I can't say the number of days but almost every day in the summer and most every day in the winter.
Q. Are you one of those persons who's considering economic
opportunities that could be dependent upon these additional riders and additional options for potential visitors to Stehekin?
A. Yes.
Q. In what way?
A. My wife and I have been looking into other opportunities in Stehekin, deciding whether that's really where we want to put down our roots, whether that's where we want to put our effort and grow our family. I'm half owner in a guide service in Stehekin currently that for the last five years I have been, I'm a half owner and manager of Stehekin Outfitters.

My parents own and operate Stehekin Valley Ranch, and they have expressed interest in passing that along to my brother and myself. And we have considered it but we want to know that there is going to be more opportunity, that opportunity is not going to be closing in on us, it's going to be expanding and getting better if that's where we're truly going to put our effort as a family.
Q. In your future numbers projections, that's CCC-3, you discuss the difference between ridership in two date ranges, 1996 through 2006 and 2007 through 2017, what did you find noteworthy about comparing those time periods?
A. 1996 through 2006 numbers were significantly higher. And I believe that the numbers were if I averaged those numbers, they were -- they actually were higher than what the numbers are currently today plus the numbers I have projected. So -- and that was when there was more opportunities to travel to Stehekin and that has been my belief all along, that with the opportunity the numbers will come back with more expanded opportunity not just in transportation but the excitement and growth in Stehekin that people will get onboard in pretty short notice and that those numbers will come back like they were in the late '90s.
Q. So I guess is it then your position that it's not a lack of persons available to ride the boat but rather a lack of options for those persons to take a boat to Stehekin that's driven this reduction in ridership?
A. Yes. As the testimony of somebody this morning, I can't remember who talked about how Chelan I believe the Chamber of Commerce said that it has increased tourism in the last 15 years to 78 percent or something like that. And yes, Stehekin has remained flat and actually declined. And it's just inexplicable to me after growing up there and how amazing of a place it is and how many opportunities there are for recreation there that the numbers would actually decline.
Q. Do you believe that there's a built-in clientele that your service can capitalize on?
A. Yes. I think that people staying the night in Stehekin will far prefer my service because of convenience and many of the support statements that we received said that very thing, just because if you have to drive a few hours over the passes to get here, it'd be far nicer to start after it gets light, be able to make the boat, and be in Stehekin in time to check into your room before dinner rather than as the current case where you have to either get up very early in the morning or leave the day before which often requires a whole extra day of vacation which sometimes people don't have.
Q. Is this one of the reasons that you believe it is economically viable for your service to operate and also not cause kind of the Boat Company to go under?
A. Yes, because it's different and that was the intention when we applied, is that it was different than the current service. It is not a head-to-head competition, it is here to enhance what we currently have and to just make it better, that was my intention all along. It was never to take anyone away from the Lake Chelan Boat Company.

Plus, you know, our price point will be higher, so

1 if anybody leaves the Lake Chelan Boat Company it will be because it is more convenient or a higher quality. It's not because they don't have other options or because of price.
Q. So you're not trying to undercut the --
A. No. I think that's -- yeah, that would be a ridiculous thing to try.
Q. Do you know Reed Courtney?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you know Reed?
A. Reed's my cousin.
Q. To your knowledge, is Reed a member of the entity that's seeking to acquire the certificate?
A. Yes, he is.
Q. Okay. Is it correct that he submitted a statement in support when you filed your initial application?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Have you had any conversations with him subsequent to it becoming known that he was -- I guess that his entity was seeking to acquire the Boat Company's assets?
A. Yes, I have had many.
Q. And you heard his testimony here this morning?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Do you believe that his testimony in support is
indicative of the likelihood that he believes the Boat Company is economically viable even if your certificate is issued?
A. Yes. Actually, I had already applied, to the best of my knowledge, he didn't tell me exactly the date in which he started speaking to the Lake Chelan Boat Company, but I had already applied for the certificate and he knew that full well, I've been transparent throughout this whole process with my friends and family.

And obviously, he believes that that company is still viable even if the certificate is issued just because they went ahead with their plans to purchase despite knowing exactly what we were doing. And he --
Q. Please.
A. He hasn't -- as seen this morning, he is not in opposition of it and that remains to this day so I think that's very telling.
Q. You mentioned another catamaran that had previously been operating, was that the Lady Cat?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Your earlier testimony was that based on your personal experience having seen additional options, did the operation of the Lady Cat bring additional persons up the lake?
A. It seemed to. I was fairly young when the Lady Cat stopped operating but it seemed to. When we looked back at the historical numbers, I don't think it failed due to lack of people, $I$ think it was design.
Q. Are there any other, I guess, design characteristics or attributes of your boat that would allow certain persons, specifically handicapped or other mobilityrestricted persons, to travel that's not available to your knowledge on the current operator?
A. We have done the best we can with a small vessel to accommodate people with disabilities.
Q. How?
A. Just by making the aisleways, the doorways wide enough to accommodate a wheelchair. And the aisleways and as well as the restroom, there will be handrails in the restroom. And so that has been our goal, it is not -as far as I know, there is no specific criteria for handicap-accessible vessels but we have attempted to make it as close as we can.

We're working with a small vessel. I believe it will be better. There are no flights of stairs to go up. One issue with the Lady Cat or the Lady Express too is oftentimes you board the vessel on one floor and you have to depart the vessel on another, and the only way to get from floor to floor is the stairs, and that
is an extreme problem for many people with disabilities.

Stehekin already offers many problems, just navigating docks and things like that, so we want to accommodate those folks the best we can.
Q. Do you have kids?
A. Yes.
Q. How old are they?
A. My son is 14 months and we have another baby due in August.
Q. Congratulations. Do you intend for them to go to school in Stehekin?
A. Yes. I was homeschool -- or I was in the Stehekin school up till the third grade and then I was homeschooled until after that so it will be one or the other.
Q. You heard the testimony today about difficulty and kids traveling. As a lifelong resident of Stehekin, do you have any personal knowledge of whether that's accurate or not?
A. Yes, absolutely, especially after I believe it was 2007 when the Lake Chelan Boat Company stopped their winter Sunday run despite objection from the local community. And that's why -- one reason why I think things like this are so important, giving the community an
opportunity to make their opinions known in a forum like this is -- it became really difficult for families with children in schools to go out for the weekend. If they did, they had to miss at least one day of school and perhaps part of another, that was if they left on Friday and came back on Monday.

MR. MILLER: Okay. I don't think I have any further questions that will not cover the things that are covered in the direct and rebuttal testimony so I don't want to stray too far from what the Court's looking for today regarding the public necessity and convenience testimony.

So I'll just let the Court know that the additional testimony would be focusing on that and I don't want to be redundant for Your Honor today as it seems like that's an important aspect of it and I agree.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
Mr. Roberson.
MR. ROBERSON: It seems like it would be friendly cross, Your Honor, so Staff has nothing. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Courtney, you can step down.

Can we please hear from Ms. Luchini next? MR. MILLER: That's our intent, yes, Your Honor. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.

MARIETTA LUCHINI,

> being first duly sworn to tell
> the truth, the whole truth and
> nothing but the truth,
> testified as follows:

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Please be seated.
Mr. Hitchcock, I believe --
MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes, Your Honor.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Is it okay if I --
Mr. HITCHCOCK: Yes, similar to what we did with Mr. Courtney, I think it would be appropriate for you to begin and then I'll redirect with any additional information.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: That was my intent.

## EXAMINATION

BY JUDGE O'CONNELL:
Q. So, Ms. Luchini, thank you for being here this afternoon. You heard what I asked to Mr. Colter Courtney about the economic viability of having a second operator on Lake Chelan. Can you tell me what evaluation you did and what your determination was?
A. Well, I had limited information, right, I'm working
from projections. And so economic viability of his entity based on the information that I've reviewed depends on the timeframe, $I$ was told specifically if 12 months -- is he going to remain in operation for 12 months, is he a going concern, and my answer would simply be yes based on my analysis of the information provided to me.

You know, economically speaking, I can't speak to the competitor company because I don't have any information. I have very little ridership information and all $I$ was given was an exhibit marked $D$ that spoke to their loss -- potential loss of revenue but it doesn't show me anything like their bottom line, their cash reserves, a balance sheet, or any kind of statement information. So simply put is Backcountry Travels economically viable? Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed any of the public comments submitted by Lake Chelan Boat Company in this proceeding?
A. I was -- I don't believe I was provided with that information. I don't think so.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Hitchcock. MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That's really all the questions I have for Ms. Luchini. I'll turn it over to you.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. HITCHCOCK:
Q. So you just testified that you have reviewed Backcountry's application and their projections, have you reviewed Mr. Hammond's testimony and written analysis and his recommendation?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And what is your opinion of Mr. Hammond's financial review?
A. Yeah, I looked at it pretty closely, I looked at his testimony and his report, and I would say that I largely agree with him. I had some minor areas where I might disagree in opinions and perhaps that might be because of my location.

He just made a comment that the wage rates are relatively stable in this area, and $I$ would argue that, yes, one could argue that, however, we are in a phasing-in period of an increase in the minimum wage so right now we're at $\$ 12$ an hour minimum wage, we are facing a 13.50, which is the largest increase over the last three years, minimum wage starting January 1 , 2019 .

That said, he's likely not going to have minimum wage jobs, but being a small business owner myself with 40 employees in a sort of an end-of-the-road kind of
business, my husband and I own a grocery store in Manson with 40 employees. We do feel what we call wage parody, that means as you increase your minimum wage employees you have to have some sort of parody to your longer-standing employees so everybody in the store isn't at minimum wage.

And so I think there will be some effects of that but that's such a minor issue in terms of total work hours because he doesn't have a lot of work hour demand. So that's not really an issue but some small disagreements in terms of that, but otherwise, I really agree with Mr. Hammond's assessment.
Q. And have you reviewed the projections prepared by Mr. Courtney and Backcountry Travels?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your opinion as to the reasonableness of those projections?
A. Well, $I$ would tell you upon first glance before speaking with Mr. Courtney, I always hesitate to -- I wonder where round numbers come from. There's a lack of precision indicated when large round numbers are used.

But in speaking with Mr . Courtney, he did what a lot of people who just do a business plan or projection do, I have reviewed a number of them, and they
basically estimate the cost based on the facts that they have available to them and then they round to the nearest large number so they kind of remove the significant digits.

In that case, having spoken with him in person and asking him where he kind of determined his estimates, I'm comfortable with his numbers. They do appear reasonable based on my knowledge of small businesses in the area so I believe that his estimates are quite reasonable.
Q. And you had previously testified that you would have some challenges in determining whether two ferry operators are viable. What would you need to determine whether they were viable, what additional information would you require?
A. So generally speaking, when $I$ look at something like that I'm going to need an economic background, I could get that information largely on my own, but $I$ also need then specific information. All of Mr. Courtney's stuff was either provided or $I$ could kind of research some of it myself, but the other entity $I$ don't have any data.

So I would need a balance sheet, an income statement, ideally a cash flow statement. Typically, when I look at those I like a historical five years, three would be okay. Less than that and I just -- I
can't really make a basis for my judgment as to knowing what their economic viability is in terms of competition.

I would say just based on the Exhibit D that they provided, they're looking at complete cannibalization of ticket numbers which $I$ would think would be unreasonable to expect in this situation. So it just was not enough information for me to determine dual economic viability.
Q. And why do you think it would be unreasonable for there to be complete cannibalization of ticket numbers?
A. Well, I mean, there's a number of reasons. One of which is this is an unknown quantity at this point, nobody knows it exists or plans to exist, maybe the local community does but $I$ had never heard of it and I live in this area so it will take some time in order to build up a ridership.

And then $I$ also agree with Mr. Courtney in that the more availability will increase because Stehekin is a desired area and the economics of our local community, I'm also on the Chelan Chamber of Commerce Board, and we've had strong economic vitality in recent years. So I believe that the economics of the whole situation is well positioned.
Q. And now moving on to the quality of service, are you
able to determine that the competition will not result in diminished levels of service?
A. I'm not just because I don't have data. I mean, if we're talking about diminished levels of service, is somebody going to have to offer fewer scheduled rides, well -- or will they have to pull one of their, you know, boats from service, $I$ can't tell because I don't know what they're doing. I don't have any information on theirs.

Common sense tells me that with the availability of this one, if this one is financially viable and that dials back, at the very least we will have one that remains financially viable. It's, you know, I don't really like to base things on common sense, but short of anything else, if you're asking me for my opinion, I would say that, yes, it appears to be economically viable but $I$ wouldn't be able to prove that or document with any kind of numbers.
Q. And it might be a different rephrasing of the question that may have kind of already been asked but just to be clear, is there anything in the data, the information that you've reviewed, that indicates it will not be economically viable?
A. No. No. I looked at a number of things, if you don't mind me expanding, I looked at their working capital

1 ratios, I even went very conservatively calculating very high cash flow requirements for those three months of summer and at the worst based on the cash they already have, working capital, which is in case you're wondering, it is the entity's ability to pay its current debts as they come due. So on a month-to-month basis, do $I$ have enough cash in my pocket to pay my monthly debts.

They have a minimum of 1.25 to 1 , which means they have $\$ 125$ for every $\$ 100$ they owe on a monthly basis at the very worst. Starting out they have over I believe a 2.3, 2.4. If you're looking just from a basic standpoint, any kind of working capital situation under 1.0 to 1 is poor and anything over 2 is great, and so I don't have any concerns in that regard.

MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. Your Honor, I think that covers it for Backcountry Travels. If the Staff has any questions for Ms. Luchini.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Roberson.
MR. ROBERSON: Again, we're not really adverse in terms of parties so it doesn't seem like a process necessary or appropriate.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: I understand. Thank you.
I guess then I have no further questions for you. So thank you, Ms. Luchini, for coming and testifying.

You're excused.
Mr. Logan Courtney, if you would, please, come take the stand.

LOGAN COURTNEY,

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Please sit down.

## EXAMINATION

BY JUDGE O'CONNELL:
Q. So a couple of the questions I asked for Mr. Colter Courtney, he said that you might have some more information on them. Let me ask about the vessel, the 50-foot catamaran, that is being proposed. Are there any concerns for operating in winter conditions here at Lake Chelan, what is its capability in that low temperatures?
A. I do not believe that winter operations are going to be a problem for it. It shouldn't be. It's set up to do that. Even the current provider occasionally does not run a trip, they basically leave it up to their captains to say is it safe to go, and I believe that

Backcountry Travels will have the same policy. If you get out there and something -- your heater quits, you're not having good visibility, it's really high winds, I believe they'll have the same policy that if the captain says, I don't feel comfortable, we turn around. But as far as the vessel goes, I believe that it is completely capable.
Q. And can you please recap your experience with vessels on Lake Chelan?
A. On Lake Chelan for the previous two years I was the captain for Mountain Barge Services operating the barge on the lake, I have also owned my own boat that I have had for also the last two years, and before that my dad has always owned boats that $I$ have ran up and down Lake Chelan. That's, yeah, my basic experience on Lake Chelan.
Q. And I'm unsure about whether you're going to know the answer to this question but maybe Mr. Miller can help explain because I don't recall, are you going to be the captain for this boat?
A. Yes, I believe for at least the first year. I am at least going to be operations manager for the company for two years. And I will be the primary captain for at least the first year here to get through all the testing phases and making sure that the boat is set to
go and then we will start training -- hopefully training new operators.

And my Uncle Jim, who testified this morning, also has told me that he will be a back-up operator and help with training and get people set up.
Q. Okay. I think that might answer another question that came to my mind which was if you're the captain for the boat and the schedule is a daily schedule, what happens if you get sick or something happens to you?
A. Yeah. So my uncle is -- he has formerly been licensed, he is going to be licensed again, and said he will assist. Colter Courtney has also applied for his license and they have given him -- he's already passed his application with Labor and Industries so he just has to -- I believe he's waiting on his test results right now. I have another cousin that is also currently licensed. I think we have back-up operators that are available right now, basically.
Q. Okay. And from your experience operating on Lake Chelan, are you familiar with any conditions or permits for getting authority to use docks, for example, at Fields Point or other places?
A. Colter has basically been the one that's been dealing with that and I have not dealt with that personally. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Mr. Miller,

Mr. Hitchcock, I don't have any other questions. MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. MILLER:
Q. You provided a resume, correct?
A. Yes.

MR. MILLER: And that's, Your Honor, for purposes of reference, LC-1, Mr. Courtney's resume's just available.
Q. I noted in that that you have some background in operating equipment. As the captain of the boat, do you believe that the engines are appropriate and suitable for navigating Lake Chelan that are going to be installed in this vessel?
A. Yes, I think that they are perfectly adequate. My boat has outboard motors, I'm used to being around them, working on them, $I$ do my own maintenance, so I believe they are completely adequate. And they have actually been slightly oversized for what the boat designer said that they have to be to make this vessel performs properly. And he told us that it will just enhance its performance and will just be better so that's what we hope.
Q. Is it able to operate functionally if one of the
engines goes down?
A. Yes. Most of the systems, fuel systems, batteries, they're all separate. So if one motor quits, the other motor should be completely operational. And it changes its handling characteristics but that's something that as an operator you're always watching for and tinkering with so it changes the way you do things but does not cause safety concerns.
Q. Based on your experience and background, do you have any capacity to identify, diagnose, and/or potentially fix a problem if the motor goes kaput on the way up lake?
A. Yes. If I -- if the -- if it's reasonable, depending on the situation, then $I$ would definitely feel comfortable going back and checking the motor and, you know, if we're near a port to pull in, stop, check things over, and I think I would have a good chance of figuring out the problem because I own my own boat, do my own maintenance, did a lot of maintenance for Mountain Barge Services before so...
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the safety plan or is there a safety plan for Backcountry?
A. Yes. There's a -- it's limited, there's not a complete overview, but there have been -- there's a couple starts to the safety plan.
Q. Does that include maintenance?
A. Yes. There is also a maintenance plan that has been -just a general guideline, it's not completed until the manufacturer of the motors gives us all the information on what they want and the boat designer gives us everything they want but we have general overviews, yes.
Q. So the safety plan that's been compiled is subject to supplementation and refinement?
A. Yes.
Q. Didn't take anything off the list that you already put on there?
A. I don't believe that there's anything that will be taken off, no. I believe that's all very basic stuff that's going to be included.
Q. What are you going to do if you're out in the middle of the lake, nasty weather, and the mechanics start to go sideways? Where do you start as a captain of the vessel, you lose power?
A. Like I said before, most systems are redundant so the chances of losing the whole boat or the mechanical systems or most systems on the whole boat are very slim.

If you did, then it would probably be something like a fuel contamination problem and you would
basically contact whoever the nearest help was, let them know what your situation was. You'd make sure that your passengers were informed of what was going on, get them into life jackets, make sure everybody was ready to depart the vessel or something if it collided with the shore, but that's a scenario that we don't see ever happening. And then you would start looking at the motors and trying to see what your actual problem was.
Q. Do you have communication devices that are going to be installed and operational on the boat?
A. Yes. We'll have VHF Radio, Marine 16, and the local Stehekin channels. I believe we're going to have a Garmin inReach onboard that is satellite based that will be able to contact Stehekin and probably Lake Chelan for emergency services.
Q. Are the persons that you and/or Colter have identified as back-up, do they have access to those same communication devices?
A. Yes, I believe -- yeah, I believe they all have access to all of those.

MR. MILLER: Just one second, I apologize. If I could just confer with Mr. Courtney. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sure. MR. MILLER: Thank you, sir.

I think we're, Your Honor, satisfied so no further questions for this witness. Thank you.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Courtney. You're excused.

Oh, Staff, am I assuming that your response is the same?

MR. ROBERSON: It is.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: I apologize for skipping you.
MR. ROBERSON: No worries.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: All right. Well, let's hear
next from Mr. Hammond.

GREG HAMMOND,
being first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Please be seated.
Now, Mr. Miller and Mr. Hitchcock, in this case, I think it's probably appropriate since he's not one of your witnesses that you go ahead and ask your questions and if there's something that I think I'm still curious about I'll go after you.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. HITCHCOCK: Certainly, Your Honor. I'll
begin.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. HITCHCOCK:
Q. Mr. Hammond, my name is Matt Hitchcock. I'll ask you a few questions. I don't think I have a ton of questions.

One of the things, the recurring theme of the Ms. Luchini's testimony and also Mr. Courtney's testimony first was this concept of financial viability of two options, the Court has requested that we discuss that, and no one has been able to give a definite answer so I'll ask -- I'll start by asking you are there particular challenges in this case that hinder precisely determining the financial viability of two commercial ferry operators on Lake Chelan?
A. So just to clarify, I reviewed the financial viability of Backcountry Travels so $I$ wasn't looking at LCRI in that sense. I would say that, yes, there is challenges especially with Backcountry and that's because it deals with a lot of projections especially of ridership that may not be known and measurable. I feel the applicant did a good job and I found that what they had put was reasonable.
Q. And what would you need to see, what additional
information would you need in order to feel confident in a determination that the two operators were or were not economically viable?
A. I don't know that $I$ could make that determination with future projections and that's really not the focus of my testimony.
Q. Certainly. So you would need an operating history from both companies in order to determine -- to have confidence in such a determination?
A. I would say yeah.
Q. And now sort of moving on to in follow-up with some of your pre-filed testimony, when you were reviewing the ridership and revenue forecast, what information were you reviewing in that analytical process?
A. For the ridership and revenue, I looked at the incumbent's annual reports, I looked at $I$ think it was 2017 that I based my analysis off of which was the total capacity of the boats that were used in a given year. I found that Mr. Courtney's projection was in line with what we would see with LCRI.
Q. And what was that projection?
A. I believe it was about 38 to 40 percent of the total capacity would be used on average over the year for both companies.
Q. And that was based upon LCRI's 2017 numbers and

Backcountry Travels' projections?
A. That's right.
Q. And is there a particular methodology that you used to analyze those comparisons and those two document sets?
A. As far as what?
Q. Did you evaluate numbers based on a weighted average from season to season or did you just do a calendar year, any seasonal and/or special instances where travel may be exceptionally high or exceptionally low?
A. I would say in general I looked at the year as a whole. I believe in my financial review memo I do mention the different seasonality ridership as a percentage of total capacity between the two companies.

I believe I said that Backcountry may have gone a little bit on the high side in the winter and a little bit on the low side in the summer when compared to LCRI, but in general, no, $I$ was looking at a full 12-month period.
Q. Okay. And now based on the information that you've been tasked to review and the questions that you were specifically tasked to answer which was Backcountry Travels' financial viability, how confident are you that your analysis of their numbers is accurate and will likely play out the way you predict it?
A. I am confident that what $I$ stated in my testimony is
accurate.
Q. And why are you confident, what gives you that confidence?
A. Well, I looked at LCRI's -- basically, I scaled down their total expenses in proportion to the amount of ridership that Mr . Courtney was projecting and I feel that his expense numbers are possibly high on the conservative side. I would say with the balance sheet he has plenty of cash to cover a loss for a 12-month period, a pretty substantial loss, and so that's what I'm basing that opinion on.
Q. Okay. Now, you mentioned cost of service and other numbers that you factored in, specifically to cost of service, what information did you review to determine that cost of service?
A. So I looked to see that the accounts were all there so I looked at incumbent's income statement, making sure that the applicant had the correct accounts, and I would compare amounts in there based on the level of ridership just to get a general idea.

There were times when I would just look at the applicant's projections and, you know, those projections are given under penalty of perjury, I believe, so there are instances where I would take the judgment of the company at face value.
Q. And did you compare their projected cost of service to Lake Chelan -- the existing Boat Company or to any other commercial ferry operators?
A. Like I mentioned, I did look at LCRI's 2017 annual report and scaled it down based on $I$ think it was a 15 percent factor which was the ridership that Mr. Courtney is projecting, and then like I said, I thought expenses were possibly overstated on the high side, they were conservative, and they seemed reasonable.
Q. And that balance that Backcountry Travels has, I believe they did attempt to strike that balance through kind of overestimating costs and taking a conservative approach to their business plan, is that the reason that you have confidence in your conclusion about the cost of service and the viability of -- the financial viability of the operation?
A. Yes.

MR. HITCHCOCK: Your Honor, that does it for my questions. I reserve if something comes up with your direct, with your questions, if I may redirect, I'll secede the floor to you.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Any redirect?
MR. ROBERSON: I don't think I have any redirect as yet. I may have some.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Then I do have a couple questions for Mr. Hammond.

## EXAMINATION

BY JUDGE O'CONNELL:
Q. I realize that $I$ indicated I had some questions for you regarding the economic viability analysis, I also have a couple other questions that I'm hoping that you thought about. What does Staff think about the issue of having only one vessel?
A. Well, I think it -- I would say, you know, there really isn't a precedent for it so it's hard to determine the effect. I think if it were an instance where the pie -- let's say the pie is the demand -- stays the same, the incumbent would certainly see a decrease in revenue, but $I$ don't know that that is the case in this case. I think the pie could grow in this instance and that there is a possibility that both could be viable, but I think there are a lot of factors at play so...
Q. Okay. So I think what I'm hearing is and the testimony you heard earlier, you're saying that it's possible that demand may grow with supply in this instance?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you assume that the incumbents -- that the existing certificate holder would maintain its current level of
service and levels of equipment?
A. Yes.
Q. In your determination of whether public convenience and necessity -- or Staffs' determination, did you consider the impact to the public if the existing certificate holder is unable to continue operations or intends to increase its rates?
A. No, that was not considered.
Q. Okay. Is there a reason why it wasn't considered? Was it thought about and not done or what was the reason?
A. So to clarify, I did not testify to that portion. I think the reason, it was basically the overwhelming support with the comments that I believe that determination was made.
Q. Do you know if -- pertaining to docks and facilities, do you know of any conditions that the facilities and docks -- any conditions they may have that are necessary for service in this case?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Do you know of whether there's any new seaplane service coming to Lake Chelan?
A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
Q. So about purchasing tickets, what does Staff think regarding whether there's a need for another method of purchasing tickets other than through an app online?

```
1 A. I believe Mr. Courtney mentioned telephone purchasing.
    I do want to clarify that I don't really know much
    about the consumer rules regarding ticket purchasing so
    I'm not sure if there's some WAC requirements that may
    not meet, I'm not certain.
    Q. And for the court reporter, I believe you're referring
        to the Washington Administrative Code as WAC?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So I noticed that Staff has recommended that the
        issuance of the certificate should be conditioned on
        the provision of documentation meeting the insurance
        requirements by Commission rule, are there any other
        conditions that Staff believes would be appropriate
        should the certificate be issued?
    A. I believe there was some minor formatting issues on the
        tariff that would need to be fixed. I am not
        recommending any other conditions.
        JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Hitchcock, did any of my
        questions bring up something for you?
        MR. HITCHCOCK: No, Your Honor.
        MR. MILLER: No, Your Honor.
        JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Roberson.
        MR. ROBERSON: I have just a couple.
        JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead.
```


## EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. So you were here this morning, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You heard, I guess, she's the operations manager of the incumbent talk about possible rate pressures of a competitive ferry, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did she mention that she was afraid that the current ferry would go out of business?
A. I did not get that sense, no.
Q. Do you think she might have mentioned that, that she thought that that was a possibility?
A. Probably, yes.
Q. And you're aware that the incumbent was a party to this case, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the incumbent had the opportunity to protest so -well, you're aware of that opportunity to protest, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And if they had maintained their protest, there could have been no certificate absent certain findings by the Commission, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So if the incumbent really wanted to veto the certificate, they could have done that, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But they did not?
A. Correct.

MR. ROBERSON: I think that's all I have, Your Honor.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Mr. Hammond, you're excused. Thank you very much.

So at this point, I'd like to invite and give the opportunity to the attorneys, if you'd like, to make any closing statements.

MR. MILLER: Briefly, Your Honor, I'd appreciate that.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead, Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER: Your Honor, Mr. Courtney and his family came to this proceeding and made this application -- I apologize, I'm just used to standing when I'm making a closing argument.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Whatever you're comfortable doing.

MR. MILLER: To our mind, the case has been simple from the beginning. The public, the members of this community, the people who value and utilize Stehekin have overwhelmingly and at an unprecedented level

1 supported this application.

Today Your Honor asked and was provided the opportunity to hear from these people directly. I believe we counted 30 persons who actually spoke here today, 29 of which were strongly in support, one of which offered concerns and best wishes effectively to the purchaser of her business. And I agree, I think that Mr. Hammond testified accurately, she didn't say, We're going down if you let this happen, it's going to end.

And I agree with Mr. Courtney's logical inferences. Reed Courtney is the principal, they have invested significantly. Nobody gave a firm number but, I mean, to be blunt, there's seven figures, probably multiple of seven figures that are being invested in this process, a process that he's known from beginning to end and where it's at, a process that they continue to pursue the acquisition after knowing that the Commission comes before and says, you know, the Commission say, Yeah, we think this should be issued.

He comes here today and -- I'm sorry. And that's an excellent point. It's not even that they're not going to take them down, it's supplemental, there's a hand-in-glove theory, and I appreciate my colleague pointing that out. The testimony -- the overwhelming

1 testimony is that this is not a danger, this is an opportunity for everyone to grow, this provides services that can't be provided.

If someone -- and the testimony I think was fairly clear, if someone brings more people up to Stehekin, the Stehekin Valley benefits. As Mr. Nolen testified, hey, if they get people up there and they don't have a ride back or they have a different timing they want to come back, perfect, then I've got another ride from Stehekin down lake.

The logic behind the desperate -- the logic behind the explanation of the desperate economical development of Chelan versus Stehekin, there's really just one variable: People can get here. They can drive here, they can train here, they can take a bus here, they've got options. They've got the ability to make a choice and to determine what is the best thing for their intended use of this unique slice of the world that is inaccessible but for this type of service particularly now. At best, it sounds like a seaplane in a year but even that person is akin coming before the Court and saying, you know, I want to provide a competitive service.

And I think this service that's to be provided by Mr. Courtney, it's not competitive, it's supplemental,

1 it's an addition to. It provides opportunities.

The rising tide floats all boats, there's a lot of very simple, straight forward ways of looking at this and I appreciate Ms. Luchini saying, I kind of hate testifying based on common sense but $I$ think the common sense, when it comes to it, the economic viability, I think the Court can apply that.

And as Mr. Roberson has pointed out, if it wasn't viable and they really believed it wasn't viable, they'd be here. They'd be cross-examining witnesses, they would have provided a financial expert rather than just a simple opinion statement, Mr. Luchini looking over the materials they provided, it doesn't show what needs to be shown.

We have overwhelming public support, the testimony regarding the various conveniences or lack thereof are numerous. They involve school children, they involve disabled persons, they involve people who have to make a healthcare decision based on the ability to go down lake or not. These are not, boy, you know, I'm really rich and I would like to have somebody to take me around and drop me off on my boat. These are real people with real problems with real business concerns with real investments that they can't even make.

And Mr. Courtney and his family, other people in

1 the valley, they want to see it grow, they want to see it thrive, and they can't because they don't know that the people that they will rely on to grow this -- the demand to grow this valley, to grow the opportunity for the entire public to reach and get access to this unique place, they don't know that it's available because right now it's not. Because the services that exist today don't provide them that certainly and don't provide them that knowledge that they'll have the opportunity to realize those dreams.

Mr. Courtney's case is very simple and we believe the evidence certainly supports the determination by this Court that it is necessary for the public convenience that the current provider is not meeting, they're refusing to meet in one instance. In all candor, I'm a Miller too so, you know, I can speak to all of the persons who testify and the Court can hear them, and the message is the same message Mr. Courtney gave when he submitted the application.

I know this place, I've lived here, I breathe here, I believe that I have a unique opportunity this point in time, this unique slice, today and looking forward, the time is right to provide something to people that I care about, to his family, to all of those persons who wish to build on the -- well, the

1 opportunity the place like Stehekin provides but you can only provide them if you allow them to get there and enjoy it.

So for every possible reason, Your Honor, I submit that the evidence demonstrates the Court should agree with the Commission, agree with Mr. Courtney, and issue the certificate understanding the conditions. I think Mr. Courtney addressed the insurance, it's just a matter of you don't write the check until you know you have something to insure.

They're ready, they're willing, they're able. I hope you'll give them a chance, Your Honor. Thank you. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Mr. Roberson, do you have --

MR. ROBERSON: Sure.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Please go ahead.
MR. ROBERSON: RCW 81.84.020 authorizes the Commission to enable commercial public ferry service upon making two findings, the first is a finding of public convenience and necessity. Mr. Dotson's testimony is in the record, the striking thing from it is that he testifies he'd never seen so many comments in support of an application before.

This is my way of noting that the Commission normally measures public convenience and necessity by a
filled out form to that extent that goes with the application. There was voluminous public testimony this morning as to the necessity and the convenience both in terms of, you know, sometimes it's nice to get out of the valley, sometimes you really need to get out of the valley, you know, this service seems like it would enable people to do both.

The second finding is a finding that the applicant has the financial resources to provide service for 12 months. Mr. Hammond's review is in the record, you've heard from him. The striking thing there is that it appears that all of Backcountry Travels' estimates are conservative, which means that, you know, even in their almost worst case scenario they're more than able to provide service. So Staff submits that the evidence necessary to make the findings the Commission has to make is in the record.

The one thing $I$ would address is there is a way to measure public convenience and necessity by having a boat on the lake, that's certainly probably an important factor in public convenience and necessity. The testimony that $I$ would direct you to is Mrs. Luchini's testimony that there's no way both boats would go out of business if there's competition. So it seems like the Commission should make the requisite
findings and issue a certificate.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
So directed at Staff, I'm going to make a venture request right now that you please work with the Commission's Consumer Production Staff, Mr. Andrew Roberts, to compile another bench exhibit made up of any comments received by the Commission or Staff that have not already been included in Exhibit BE-1, that would be those that have been submitted up until the end of this week, April 26, 2019. So I would like to leave the public comment period open until the end of this week for people to submit any further comments.

With that in mind, how much time does Staff need in order to compile, work with Mr. Roberts, and submit that exhibit?

MR. ROBERSON: I think that there are four comments in the record that are not yet compiled plus one of the Mr . Courtneys had written comments today. It should go pretty fast.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So how about sometime next week; is that reasonable?

MR. ROBERSON: Yeah. Wednesday.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So by Wednesday, May 1st, please submit that bench exhibit.

Next thing I want to talk about is post-hearing

1 briefs. Currently the procedural schedule indicates that they're due on May 27th, and as I indicated, the Commission's closed that day so their due date's actually the day after, May 28th.

But I want to hear from the parties as to two questions, first, do the parties think post-hearing briefs are still necessary, and second, if you do think they're necessary, can they be done sooner than May 28th? Let's start with Staff.

MR. ROBERSON: Given the non-adversarial nature of the proceeding, it doesn't seem like briefing is necessary but if you feel like it would be informative or helpful we're more than happy to provide briefing. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: I think it would be redundant, Your Honor. We've made our argument, the facts are clear, the law has been correctly stated so we believe it's unnecessary.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I'm not going to require post-hearing briefs and so I am removing that from the procedural schedule given that both parties have agreed that they're unnecessary.

Is there anything else we need to address today? MR. MILLER: Not for the applicant, Your Honor, no. Thank you.

MR. ROBERSON: Not from Staffs' perspective.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you all for your efforts and your work in this proceeding. I will issue an initial order in this proceeding soon, and with that, we are adjourned. Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Discussion held off the record.)
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Back on the record for one moment. My apologies. One thing that $I$ forgot to mention that we need to discuss, Mr. Miller, Mr. Hitchcock, I am without electronic versions of certain exhibits, the ones for Ms. Luchini and Mr. Logan Courtney and also CCC-5.

I realize that that is a Commission report but if you could please submit it as you were sponsoring it, would you please do that as soon as you can submitting them electronically?

MR. MILLER: We'll do that immediately, Your Honor.

MR. ROBERSON: That addresses my question. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. With that, we are adjourned and we'll close for the day. Thank you. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 3:00 P.M.)
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