# Docket No. UE-141335 - Vol. II

In the Matter of the Petition of: King County, Washington, et al.

May 27, 2015

STATE OF THE B.
UTILL JAID THAT B.

LEARTH SOUDDER



1325 Fourth Avenue • Suite 1840 • Seattle, Washington 98101

206.287.9066

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



P	age 12				Page	14
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		1 2	APPEARANCES	(Continued)		
In the Matter of the ) Petition of: )	<del>_</del>	3	FOR AT&T:			
King County, Washington;  BNSF Railway; Frontier ) Docket UE-141335 Communications Northwest, ) Inc.; Verizon Wireless; and ) New Cingular Wireless PCS, ) LLC ) For a Declaratory Order )		4 5 6	CINDY MANHEIM General Attorney PO Box 97061 Redmond, Washing 425.580.8112 cindy.manheim@att			
i or a becaracity order		7 8				
EVIDENTIARY HEARING - VOLUME II		9				
Pages 12 - 99		11	÷			
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GREGORY J. KOPTA		12 13				
9:29 A.M. MAY 27, 2015		14 15				
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest Olympia, Washington 98504-7250		16 17 18 19				
REPORTED BY: SHERRILYN SMITH, CCR# 2097 Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue Suite 1840		20 21 22 23				
Seattle, Washington 98101 206.287.9066   Seattle 360.534.9066   Olympia 800.846.6989   National www.buellrealtime.com		24 25	-000-			
P	age 13			and an order of the control of the c	Page	15
1 APPEARANCES 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:		1	EXAMINATION INDEX			
3 GREGORY J. KOPTA Washington Utilities and		2	LYNN F. LOGEN P	AGE		
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW P.O. Box 47250 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.664.1136		4 5	Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett Cross-Examination by Mr. Stokes Examination by Judge Kopta Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett	25 27 47 50		
FOR COMMISSION STAFF:		6	JASON M. SANDERS	PAGE		
PATRICK J. OSHIE  9 Attorney General's Office of Washington PO Box 40128  10 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.664.1188		7 8 9	Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett Cross-Examination by Mr. Brooks Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett	51 52 58		
poshie@utc.wa.gov  FOR KING COUNTY, BNSF, FRONTIER, and VERIZON:  TOMMY A. BROOKS		10 11 12	KATHERINE J. BARNARD Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett Cross-Examination by Mr. Brooks	PAGE 59 60		
14 CHAD M. STOKES Cable Huston, LLP		13	DAVID NIGHTINGALE	PAGE		
15 1001 Southwest Fifth Avenue Suite 200		14	Direct Examination by Mr. Oshie	70		
		15	Cross-Examination by Mr. Stokes Examination by Judge Kopta	71 95		
503.224.3092 17 tbrooks@cablehuston.com		16	Redirect Examination by Mr. Oshie	96		
503.224.3092 tbrooks@cablehuston.com cstokes@cablehuston.com  18  FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY:		17				
503.224.3092 17		17 18 19	, ,			
503.224.3092 tbrooks@cablehuston.com cstokes@cablehuston.com  18 19 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: 20 DONNA L. BARNETT Perkins Coie, LLP 21 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Suite 700		17 18 19 20 21	<b>, ,</b>			
503.224.3092 tbrooks@cablehuston.com cstokes@cablehuston.com  18 19 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: 20 DONNA L. BARNETT Perkins Coie, LLP 21 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Suite 700		17 18 19 20	-000-			

#### Docket No. UE-141335 - Vol. II - 5/27/2015

			Page 16				Page 1	8
1 2 3 4	EXHIBIT:	INDEX OF EXHIBITS OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION: PETITIONERS: ANTHONY MINOR, GREGORY L. BRITZ, GEORGE BAKER THOMPSON, JR., MICHAEL MATHISEN, JENNIFER FIRESTONE,		1 2 3		Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions (excerpts)(effective		
6 7 8 9	JOT-1T JOT-2	24 Joint Opening Testimony - 24 Seattle Times article: "Cities push for King County levy to replace emergency radio system", by Daniel Beekman (December 14, 2014) (PSE Cross)		5 7 8 9	LFL-7 24	May 2, 1985) and Schedule 85, Line Extensions (effective June 6, 1991) 4 PSE Electric Tariff G Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions (excerpts)(effective Aug. 1, 2006) and Schedule 85, Line		
11 12 13	MPG-1T MPG-2	PETITIONERS: MICHAEL P. GORMAN  - 24 Opening Testimony of Michael P. Gorman - 24 Qualifications of Michael P.		10 11 12	LFL-8 24	Extensions and Service Rules (effective Dec. 23, 2006)		
14 15 16	MPG-3	Gorman 24 Excerpts from Subchapter C - Accounts, Federal Power Act, Part 101		13 14 15	LFL-9T 2 LFL-10 2	24 Cross Answering Testimony of Lynn F. Logen		
17 18 19	MPG-4	24 Impact of \$8 Million Investment in Maloney Ridge Line to Total Utility Revenue Requirement 24 Annual Change in Net		16 17 18	LFL-11 2	Data Request No. 1 4 Impact of \$8 Million Investment in Maloney Ridge Line to Total Utility Revenue		
20 21 22	MPG-6T	Distribution Plant Calendar Years 2010-2013 - 24 Cross-Answering Testimony of Michael P. Gorman PSE: JASON M. SANDERS		19 20 21 22	LFL-12 2 LFL-13 2	Petitioners Data Request No. 006 4 PSE Response to WUTC		
23 24 25	JMS-1T	24 Direct Testimony of Jason M. Sanders		23 24		Staff Data Request No. 007 (Petitioners Cross)		
				25				
10000mil 10000mil 10000	enganian oo oo ahaan oo oo oo oo oo oo		Page 17	25			Page 1	. 9
1 2 3 4	EXHIBIT: JMS-2 JMS-3	NDEX OF EXHIBITS (Continued) OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION: 24 Professional Qualifications 24 Photographs of Maloney Ridge Area	Page 17	1 2 3	EXHIBIT: OFD: LFL-14 – 24		Page 1	9
2	EXHIBIT: JMS-2	OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION: 24 Professional Qualifications 24 Photographs of Maloney Ridge	Page 17	1 2 3	EXHIBIT: OFD: LFL-14 - 24 LFL-15 - 24	AD: DESCRIPTION: PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 008 (Petitioners Cross)	Page 1	. 9
2 3 4 5	EXHIBIT: JMS-2 JMS-3	OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION: 24 Professional Qualifications 24 Photographs of Maloney Ridge Area 24 Maloney Ridge Electrical Service Next Steps Meeting	Page 17	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	EXHIBIT: OFD: LFL-14 - 24  LFL-15 - 24  PSE:  KJB-1T - 24	AD: DESCRIPTION: PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 008 (Petitioners Cross)  Advice No. 2012-029 Electric Tariff Filing (Petitioners Cross)  KATHERINE J. BARNARD  Cross Answering Testimony of Katherine J. Barnard	Page 1	. 9
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	EXHIBIT: JMS-2 JMS-3 JMS-4 JMS-5 JMS-6 JMS-7	OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION:  24 Professional Qualifications  24 Photographs of Maloney Ridge Area  24 Maloney Ridge Electrical Service Next Steps Meeting Notes  24 Letter to Jason M. Sanders re: Degraded Service to Customers via Puget's Maloney Ridge Line  24 Summary Results 30 Years  24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 005 (Petitioners Cross)	Page 17	1 2 3 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	EXHIBIT: OFD: LFL-14 - 24  LFL-15 - 24  PSE: KJB-1T - 24  KJB-2 - 24  KJB-3 - 24	AD: DESCRIPTION: PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 008 (Petitioners Cross)  Advice No. 2012-029 Electric Tariff Filing (Petitioners Cross)  KATHERINE J. BARNARD Cross Answering Testimony of Katherine J. Barnard Professional Qualifications  Gross Plant (FERC Form 1 Page 207)	Page 1	. 9
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	EXHIBIT: JMS-2 JMS-3 JMS-4 JMS-5	OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION:  - 24 Professional Qualifications  - 24 Photographs of Maloney Ridge Area  - 24 Maloney Ridge Electrical Service Next Steps Meeting Notes  - 24 Letter to Jason M. Sanders re: Degraded Service to Customers via Puget's Maloney Ridge Line  - 24 Summary Results 30 Years  - 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 005 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 018 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE First Revised Response to	Page 17	1 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	EXHIBIT: OFD: LFL-14 - 24  LFL-15 24  RJB-1T 24  KJB-2 24  KJB-3 24  JAB-1T 24  JAB-1T 24	AD: DESCRIPTION: PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 008 (Petitioners Cross)  Advice No. 2012-029 Electric Tariff Filing (Petitioners Cross)  KATHERINE J. BARNARD  Cross Answering Testimony of Katherine J. Barnard Professional Qualifications  Gross Plant (FERC Form 1 Page 207) JENNIFER A. BOYER Direct Testimony of Jennifer A. Boyer Professional	Page 1	. 9
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	EXHIBIT: JMS-2 JMS-3 JMS-4 JMS-5 JMS-6 JMS-7 JMS-8	OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION:  - 24 Professional Qualifications  - 24 Photographs of Maloney Ridge Area  - 24 Maloney Ridge Electrical Service Next Steps Meeting Notes  - 24 Letter to Jason M. Sanders re: Degraded Service to Customers via Puget's Maloney Ridge Line  - 24 Summary Results 30 Years  - 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 005 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 018 (Petitioners Cross)	Page 17	1 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	EXHIBIT: OFD: LFL-14 - 24  LFL-15 - 24  KJB-1T - 24  KJB-3 - 24  JAB-1T - 24  JAB-1 - 24  JAB-1 - 24	AD: DESCRIPTION: PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 008 (Petitioners Cross)  Advice No. 2012-029 Electric Tariff Filing (Petitioners Cross)  KATHERINE J. BARNARD  Cross Answering Testimony of Katherine J. Barnard Professional Qualifications  Gross Plant (FERC Form 1 Page 207) JENNIFER A. BOYER J. Direct Testimony of Jennifer A. Boyer Professional Qualifications Summary of Faults on Maloney Ridge Line	Page 1	. 9
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	EXHIBIT: JMS-2 JMS-3 JMS-4 JMS-5 JMS-6 JMS-7 JMS-8 JMS-9	OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION:  - 24 Professional Qualifications  - 24 Photographs of Maloney Ridge Area  - 24 Maloney Ridge Electrical Service Next Steps Meeting Notes  - 24 Letter to Jason M. Sanders re: Degraded Service to Customers via Puget's Maloney Ridge Line  - 24 Summary Results 30 Years  - 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 005 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 018 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE First Revised Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 018 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE First Revised Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 039 (Petitioners Cross)  - 25 PSE: LYNN F. LOGEN  - 24 Direct Testimony of	Page 17	1 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	EXHIBIT: OFD: LFL-14 - 24  LFL-15 - 24  KJB-1T - 24  KJB-3 - 24  JAB-1T - 24  JAB-1 - 24  JAB-3 - 24  JAB-3 - 24	AD: DESCRIPTION: PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 008 (Petitioners Cross)  Advice No. 2012-029 Electric Tariff Filing (Petitioners Cross)  KATHERINE J. BARNARD  Cross Answering Testimony of Katherine J. Barnard Professional Qualifications  Gross Plant (FERC Form 1 Page 207) JENNIFER A. BOYER IDirect Testimony of Jennifer A. Boyer Professional Qualifications Summary of Faults on Maloney Ridge Line PSE Response to Petitioners Data Request No. 008 (Petitioners	Page 1	. 9
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	EXHIBIT: JMS-2 JMS-3  JMS-4  JMS-5  JMS-6 JMS-7  JMS-8  JMS-9	OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION:  - 24 Professional Qualifications  - 24 Photographs of Maloney Ridge Area  - 24 Maloney Ridge Electrical Service Next Steps Meeting Notes  - 24 Letter to Jason M. Sanders re: Degraded Service to Customers via Puget's Maloney Ridge Line  - 24 Summary Results 30 Years  - 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 005 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 018 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE First Revised Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 039 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE First Revised Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 039 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 PSE First Revised Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 039 (Petitioners Cross)  - 24 Direct Testimony of Lynn F. Logen	Page 17	1 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	EXHIBIT: OFD: LFL-14 - 24  LFL-15 - 24  KJB-1T - 24  KJB-3 - 24  JAB-1T - 24  JAB-3 - 24  JAB-3 - 24  JAB-3 - 24  JAB-3 - 24	AD: DESCRIPTION: PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 008 (Petitioners Cross)  Advice No. 2012-029 Electric Tariff Filing (Petitioners Cross)  KATHERINE J. BARNARD  Cross Answering Testimony of Katherine J. Barnard Professional Qualifications  Gross Plant (FERC Form 1 Page 207) JENNIFER A. BOYER Direct Testimony of Jennifer A. Boyer Professional Qualifications Summary of Faults on Maloney Ridge Line PSE Response to Petitioners Data Request No. 008 (Petitioners Cross)	Page 1	. 9

<sup>2 (</sup>Pages 16 to 19)

	Page 20	Dawa 22
1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS (Continued)	1490 22
2	EXHIBIT: OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION:	1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; MAY 27, 2015 2 9:29 A M
	Staff Data Request	0.20 /
4	No. 023 (Petitioners Cross)	3 -000-
5	JAB-8 – 24 PSE Response to WUTC	4 5 JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be on the record in
6	Staff Data Request	TO TO THE LEGIS BE ON THE TECONOMIN
7	No. 024 (Petitioners Cross)	
8	JAB-9 – 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request	Tallway,
9	No. 035 (Petitioners	8 Frontier Communications Northwest, Inc.; Verizon
10	Cross)	9 Wireless; and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, For a
11	JAB-10 24 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request	Declaratory Order." We are here today for the
	No. 036 (Petitioners	evidentiary hearing in this proceeding. I am Gregory
12 13	Cross)  JAB-11 – 24 PSE Response to WUTC	Kopta, the administrative law judge who will be
14	Staff Data Request	13 presiding.
	No. 037 (Petitioners Cross)	Let's begin by taking appearances, starting
15	COMMISSION STAFF: JASON L. BALL	15 with petitioners.
16		MR. STOKES: Good morning, Your Honor.
17	JLB-1T – 24 Testimony of Jason L. Ball	Chad Stokes for the petitioners, from the Cable Huston
18	JLB-2C 24 Confidential Economic Feasibility Analysis	law firm, representing King County BNSF Railway,
19	· •	Frontier Communications, Verizon Wireless. And with
20	the Maloney Line	me is Tommy Brooks, from the same law firm.
21	JLB-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony of Jason L. Ball	MS. MANHEIM: Hi, Cindy Manheim with
22		22 AT&T.
23	COMMISSION STAFF: DAVID NIGHTINGALE	JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.
24	DN-1T – 24 Testimony of David Nightingale	And for the Company?
25		25 MS. BARNETT: Donna Barnett with Perkins
	Page 21	Page 23
1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS (Continued)	Coie representing Puget Sound Energy.
2 3	EXHIBIT: OFD: AD: DESCRIPTION: DN-2 24 PSE electric Tariff G,	2 JUDGE KOPTA: And for Staff?
5	Schedule 85, Line	3 MR. OSHIE: Patrick Oshie representing
4	Extensions, Fourth	4 Commission Staff.
5	Revised Sheet No. 85-f	5 JUDGE KOPTA: And does anyone else wish
6	(effective June 6, 1991)	5000L KOFTA. And does anyone else wish
	DN-3 24 PSE Electric Tariff G	6 to make an appearance?
	DN-3 24 PSE Electric Tariff G, Schedule 80, General	The state of the state with the state with the state with the state with the state of the state
7	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions,	6 to make an appearance?
	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an
7 8	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions,	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.
	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)	6 to make an appearance? 7 Hearing none, we will proceed. In an 8 off-the-record 9 MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF 10 Railway. 11 JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.
8 9	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance? Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway. JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Would you repeat that, please?
8	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)	to make an appearance? Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Would you repeat that, please? MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda
8 9 10 11 12	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.
8 9 10 11 12 13	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF  Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific  Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF  Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific  Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.  JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We are having a
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific  Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.  JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We are having a little trouble hearing you over the phone. Can you
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific  Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.  JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We are having a little trouble hearing you over the phone. Can you give those appearances one more time and get real
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific  Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.  JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We are having a little trouble hearing you over the phone. Can you give those appearances one more time and get real close to the mike and speak loudly and as clearly as
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific  Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.  JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We are having a little trouble hearing you over the phone. Can you give those appearances one more time and get real close to the mike and speak loudly and as clearly as you can.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific  Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.  JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We are having a little trouble hearing you over the phone. Can you give those appearances one more time and get real close to the mike and speak loudly and as clearly as you can.  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Sure. LaRhonda,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific  Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.  JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We are having a little trouble hearing you over the phone. Can you give those appearances one more time and get real close to the mike and speak loudly and as clearly as you can.  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Sure. LaRhonda, L-A-R-H-O-N-D-A, Brown-Barrett, B-A-R-E-T-T, for
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony of David Nightingale	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.  JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We are having a little trouble hearing you over the phone. Can you give those appearances one more time and get real close to the mike and speak loudly and as clearly as you can.  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Sure. LaRhonda, L-A-R-H-O-N-D-A, Brown-Barrett, B-A-R-E-T-T, for BNSF Railway in Fort Worth, Texas.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Schedule 80, General Rules and Provisions, Fourth Revised Sheet No. 80-d (effective Aug. 1, 2006)  DN-4 24 Cross Answering Testimony of David Nightingale	to make an appearance?  Hearing none, we will proceed. In an off-the-record  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Barrett, BNSF Railway.  JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.  Would you repeat that, please?  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: LaRhonda  Brown-Barrett, BNSF Railway.  MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, Pacific  Northwest Real Estate Manager, Verizon Wireless.  JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We are having a little trouble hearing you over the phone. Can you give those appearances one more time and get real close to the mike and speak loudly and as clearly as you can.  MS. BROWN-BARRETT: Sure. LaRhonda, L-A-R-H-O-N-D-A, Brown-Barrett, B-A-R-R-E-T-T, for

Page 26 Page 24 MR. MATHISEN: Mike Mathisen, 1 1 MR. MATHISEN: I'm sorry, is the 2 M-A-T-H-I-S-E-N. I'm the Pacific Northwest Real 2 witness's microphone on? We are having trouble 3 Estate Manager for Verizon Wireless. 3 hearing him over the phone. 4 JUDGE KOPTA: I'm sorry. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you. 4 All right. While we were off the record this 5 THE WITNESS: Now it is. 5 6 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Good. morning, we discussed exhibits. The parties have 6 7 THE WITNESS: Should I repeat any of 7 stipulated to the admission of all prefiled testimony 8 8 and exhibits, as well as the designated those corrections? 9 JUDGE KOPTA: I think just the last one. 9 cross-examination exhibits, so they will be admitted. I will list them now. They are Exhibit JOT-1T, JOT-2, 10 10 A Exhibit LFL-9T, Page 7, Line 3 should be 11 MPG-1T through MPG-6T, JMS-1T through JMS-9, LFL-1T 11 changed from 8.1 million to 5.3 million. And then 12 through LFL-15, KJB-1T through KJB-3, JAB-1T through 12 Exhibit LFL-9T, Page 7, Line 10 should be changed from 13 JAB-11, JLB-1T through JLB-4, and DN-1T through DN-4T. 13 8.12 million to 5.3 million. And in the same exhibit, the same page, Line 14 should also be changed from 8.1 So all of those exhibits are admitted into the record. 14 14 15 million to 5.3 million. Exhibit LFL-10 should be 15 I understand that Puget Sound Energy has no based on 5.3 million rather than 8.1 million. And 16 16 cross-examination for petitioners' witnesses, so they Exhibit LFL-11 should also be based on 5.3 million 17 have been excused from participating in the hearing. 17 We will move, then, to cross-examination of Puget 18 rather than 8.1 million. 18 19 Sound Energy witnesses. I believe Mr. Logen is first 19 These changes are all due to a correction in 20 up; is that correct, Ms. Barrett? 20 the response to Staff Data Request No. 39. My 21 MS. BARNETT: That's correct. 21 testimony should be read considering these changes. 22 22 Exhibits LFL-10 and LFL-11 have not been 23 revised, but the change in the amount is not expected 23 JUDGE KOPTA: Barnett. I'm sorry. 24 to have a significant impact on the findings supported 24 MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, would you like 25 25 to issue the oath? by these exhibits. Page 25 Page 27 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, I will. 1 Q Thank you. 1 2 MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, PSE offers 2 Will you stand and raise your right hand, 3 Mr. Logen for cross-examination at this time. 3 please. 4 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Mr. Stokes. 4 5 MR. STOKES: Thank you. 5 LYNN F. LOGEN, witness herein, having been 6 6 first duly sworn on oath, was 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION 7 examined and testified as follows: 8 8 BY MR. STOKES: 9 Q Good morning, Mr. Logen. JUDGE KOPTA: Ms. Barnett. 9 MS. BARNETT: Thank you. 10 A Good morning. 10 Q So in your prefiled testimony, you opined on 11 11 12 the meaning of certain service agreements executed by 12 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 13 BY MS. BARNETT: 13 the Maloney Ridge customers after the original Q Mr. Logen, please state your name and spell it 14 agreement with GTE. Is it safe to assume that you 14 15 have reviewed those agreements? 15 for the court reporter, please. 16 16 A Lynn F. Logen. That's L-Y-N-N, F., last name A Yes, it is. 17 Q Were you involved in the negotiations of those 17 is Logen, L-O-G-E-N. 18 Q And you heard that the testimony and exhibits 18 agreements? A I handled the administrative end, as I recall, 19 were already admitted. Do you have any corrections or 19 20 but I didn't negotiate with the customers. That was 20 changes to those exhibits? 21 A Yes, I do. Those would be to Exhibit LFL-9T, 21 done by the -- at that time the division manager or 22 22 branch office manager. I can't remember. the footer on all pages should be changed from Exhibit 23 Q As far as the drafting goes, you weren't 23 LFL-8T to Exhibit LFL-9T. Exhibit LFL-9T on Page 7, 24 24 Line 3 should be changed from 8.1 million to 5.3 involved in that? A My recollection is that they were drafted by 25 25 million.

Page 28 Page 30 1 Perkins. 1 A That's correct. 2 Q Okay. 2 Q Can you point out where in the service 3 A And I handled them, passed them on to the 3 agreements the parties addressed what would happen in 4 appropriate company people. 4 the event that the Maloney Ridge line needs to be 5 Q Okay. Is your testimony, then, based on the 5 replaced? 6 text of the agreements? 6 A It's inferred in Paragraph 4, operating costs. 7 A Yes. 7 The last sentence in there says, Operating costs shall 8 Q Okay. Did you review any other documents that 8 include any repair and maintenance costs incurred by 9 purport to interpret the meaning of the service 9 Puget pursuant to Section 3 above and costs in 10 agreements? 10 connection with securing or maintaining operating 11 A During this process I have reviewed our tariff 11 riahts. 12 and discussed the meaning of the agreements. 12 Q Does the agreement use the word "replace" 13 Q Okay. Can you turn to Exhibit 21, which is 13 anywhere? 14 LFL-4. 14 A Not to my knowledge, in the context that you 15 A (Complies.) 15 are describing. 16 Q Let me know when you get there. 16 Q Okay. Can you point to anything in the 17 A I'm there. 17 agreement that references the useful life of the line? Q So what is this that you are looking at? 18 18 A I don't believe that the useful life is 19 A It's a service agreement. There is --19 referred to. 20 actually, there are four service agreements between 20 Q I would like you to turn to Paragraph 8 of the 21 the four customers that PSE serves on Maloney Ridge 21 service agreement. 22 and Sobieski. 22 A (Complies.) 23 Q Are they all the same? With exception of the 23 Q Does this paragraph allow Puget to terminate 24 names, the terms are the same? 24 service if the right to access a line terminates or is 25 A Yes, and the dates signed. 25 not renewed? Page 29 Page 31 1 Q Okay. I would like to ask you a question 1 A Yes, it does. 2 about Paragraph 10 of the service agreement. The way 2 Q Can you point to any other provision in the 3 that I understand your testimony is that Schedules 80 3 agreement that expressly allows Puget to terminate 4 and 85 are the primary tariffs that cover the Maloney 4 service under the agreement? 5 Ridge customers; is that correct, in addition to the 5 A There is no specific provisions in the 6 service agreement? 6 agreement, however, Schedule 80 is incorporated, which 7 A In addition to the service agreement, 7 includes provisions on termination of service. 8 Schedules 80 and 85 are -- Schedule 80 would apply; 8 Q Okay. We will address that later. 9 Schedule 85 applies in certain situations. 9 Let me ask you a question about Paragraphs 2 10 Q Okay. And Puget or its predecessor entered 10 and 3 of the service agreement. Under Paragraph 2, 11 into these agreements as a way to modify those tariffs 11 does Puget own the line? 12 to cover the unique circumstances associated with this 12 A Yes. 13 line? 13 Q Under Paragraph 3, does Puget have the 14 A Yes, that was the reason for entering into the 14 responsibility to maintain the line? 15 agreements, is the unique situation. 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. And does Paragraph 10 state what was to Q Do customers perform any maintenance 16 17 occur in the event that there is a conflict between 17 activities on the line? 18 the service agreement and the tariffs? 18 A No, they do not. 19 A Yes, it states that any conflict between this 19 Q Referring to your testimony, Exhibit 18, 20 agreement and Puget's Schedules 80 and 85 shall be 20 LFL-1T, you state, and I'll summarize, that the 21 resolved in favor of such tariff provisions. 21 customers are in a better position than Puget to 22 Q Okay. So in your testimony, which is 22 figure out when preventive maintenance is appropriate 23 Exhibit 18, LFL-1T, you indicate that Puget interprets 23 and necessary. 24 the service agreements to include replacement costs; 24 That's at Page 6, Lines 17 through 20. 25 is that correct? 25 A I stated at that point that because the

Page 32

customers on Maloney Ridge are responsible for the costs of operation, that PSE believes that the decision regarding preventive maintenance should best fall with those customers.

# Q Are they in a better position than Puget to determine when the maintenance is necessary and appropriate?

A I don't think I know enough about the customers to respond to that, whether they're in a better position or not. They are the one receiving service, so they are the ones that experience the outages. It would depend on a customer's toleration of those outages. They all have generation in place, so they are prepared for outages.

Q But between Puget, who is an electric provider, electric service provider, and these customers, who have facilities up there, who is in the better position to determine when maintenance is appropriate on that line?

A If we are speaking just preventive maintenance, I believe that the customers are in the best position.

Q Can you tell me anywhere in the service agreement where customers agreed to take on that responsibility?

Page 34

A At one time that was the case. However, now there is -- the WAC rules provide that the customers have the right to discuss that with the Commission.

Q Okay. And that provision of Schedule 80 is why Puget, in your view, can refuse to replace the line?

A Well, first off, Puget isn't refusing to replace the line. We are discussing when it will be done and -- and that type of thing, rather than just replacing it without discussing it with customers. If we were to -- we will continue -- as I stated earlier, we will continue to maintain that line and service will continue for the foreseeable future. Now, the cost of that maintenance may dramatically increase at some point, we just don't know.

Q But this is a cost-driven issue, correct? You either replace the line or not. In other words, it's not because of a safety issue, correct?

A There's -- there's no safety considerations, that is correct.

Q And there's no issue regarding the lack of right-of-way, correct?

A To do any work there, we would have to get a new permit from the Forest Service. The customers there would also have to have permits. Without those

Page 33

A I don't believe it was -- it's stated in the service agreement. It was done from a customer service standpoint rather than PSE starting a program of replacement of the line at the customers' expense. They chose to approach those customers and started that process several years ago.

# Q But Puget has a responsibility to maintain that line, correct?

A That's correct.

Q Okay.

A And Puget will continue maintaining the line.

Q Okay. Let's turn to Schedule 80 for a second. So according to your testimony, Schedule 80 allows Puget to refuse service if doing so is not economically feasible, correct?

A You are referring to the version of Schedule 80 that was in effect in '94 and '95 or the present version?

Q No, the present version. And right now I am just referring to your testimony. In general, you state that Schedule 80 allows Puget to refuse service if not economically feasible, correct?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. And is it your testimony that Puget can unilaterally make that decision?

permits, I would think Puget wouldn't want to replace the line --

Page 35

#### Q At least some of the customers --

A — because we wouldn't be assured of having a customer there.

Q But at least some of the customers have rights to be there through 2031, correct?

A Not to my knowledge.

Q I believe that you have attached to your testimony...

#### (Pause in the proceedings.)

A That would be my Exhibit LFL-8, I believe you are looking for.

Q Correct.

A And this was a data request to the petitioners. The response is that King County is in the process of renewing its permit and that Frontier has -- the permit has not expired, but Frontier anticipates a permit renewal by the end of 2014. The other two customers in this response are silent as to their permit status.

# Q Well, the Maloney Ridge Users Association has rights through 2031, correct?

A It does not state that in this response.

Q If you look at the bottom of the response.

	Page 36		Page 38
1	A It says that Verizon, through the Maloney	1	_
2	Ridge Users Association, has a lease for its	2	services provided by petitioners and available to
3	facilities on Maloney Ridge. My understanding of that	3	Puget customers and Washington public in general?
4	is that Verizon has an agreement with the Maloney	4	A It does not, and we haven't taken anything like that into account on service to
5	Ridge Electronic Users Association to have their	5	
6	facilities on their tower and they are leasing space		Q Okay.
7	there. It has nothing to do with the permit.	6 7	A hospitals or any other customer.
8	Q Okay. Moving on. You are not refusing	8	Q Did that analysis include an assessment of the
9	service because a customer has a legally procured	9	impacts on other ratepayers?  A It did not.
10	service because a customer has a legally procured service, correct? Meaning so back to my question	10	
11	about whether or not this is economically-driven. So	11	Q Let's turn to LFL-9T, which is Exhibit it's
12	Puget is not taking the position that they won't serve	12	your cross-answering testimony. On Page 9 and Page
13	these customers because they illegally procured	13	10, you talk about Mr. Gorman's analysis and you
14	service, correct?		didn't agree with his calculation of the impact to
15	A That is correct.	14 15	Schedule 24 customers; is that correct?
16		16	A That's correct.
17	Q Okay. Can you turn to Exhibit 29, which is LFL-12? Let me know when you get there.	16 17	Q Okay. And so Mr. Gorman, using the
18	A Yes, I'm there.	18	\$8.1 million number came up with a .4 percent rate
19	· ·	19	impact for Schedule 24 customers, correct?
20	Q Okay. So here you have identified Washington Code Section 480-100-056 as a rule-based authority for		A That's correct.
21	refusing service when it is economically unfeasible;	20	Q And you came up with 1.2 percent rate impact?
22	is that correct?	21 22	A That's correct as well.
23	A That is correct. That rule is in effect until	23	Q Okay. Let's turn to LFL-10; which is your
24	January 3rd, 2002.	23	exhibit, on Page 4.  A Yes.
25	Q Okay. So is it your testimony that the rule	24 25	
2 J	Gray. 30 is it your testimony that the rule	23	Q Okay. Is it correct to assume is it
	Page 37		Page 39
1	Page 37  you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service	1	Page 39 correct that your analysis begins by identifying the
2	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?	1 2	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital
	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is		correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue
2 3 4	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this	2	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million
2 3 4 5	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.	2 3	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue
2 3 4 5 6	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T,	2 3 4 5 6	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a
2 3 4 5 6 7	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that	2 3 4 5 6 7	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?	2 3 4 5 6	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse service today?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number that you used for your modeling, and not the 1.6
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse service today?  A Yes, it does.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number that you used for your modeling, and not the 1.6 million or 1.5 million that shows up later on?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse service today?  A Yes, it does.  Q Okay. I would like to talk to you about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number that you used for your modeling, and not the 1.6 million or 1.5 million that shows up later on?  A The 1.8 million is a calculation performed by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse service today?  A Yes, it does.  Q Okay. I would like to talk to you about the economic feasibility analysis that you guys performed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number that you used for your modeling, and not the 1.6 million or 1.5 million that shows up later on?  A The 1.8 million is a calculation performed by the model based on the inputs, which the inputs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse service today?  A Yes, it does.  Q Okay. I would like to talk to you about the economic feasibility analysis that you guys performed. Is it correct that Puget has performed an analysis to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number that you used for your modeling, and not the 1.6 million or 1.5 million that shows up later on?  A The 1.8 million is a calculation performed by the model based on the inputs, which the inputs were the 1.8 million are allowed rate of return,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse service today?  A Yes, it does.  Q Okay. I would like to talk to you about the economic feasibility analysis that you guys performed. Is it correct that Puget has performed an analysis to determine if replacement of the line is economically	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number that you used for your modeling, and not the 1.6 million or 1.5 million that shows up later on?  A The 1.8 million is a calculation performed by the model based on the inputs, which the inputs were the 1.8 million are allowed rate of return, taxes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse service today?  A Yes, it does.  Q Okay. I would like to talk to you about the economic feasibility analysis that you guys performed. Is it correct that Puget has performed an analysis to determine if replacement of the line is economically feasible?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number that you used for your modeling, and not the 1.6 million or 1.5 million that shows up later on?  A The 1.8 million is a calculation performed by the model based on the inputs, which the inputs were the 1.8 million are allowed rate of return, taxes Q Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse service today?  A Yes, it does.  Q Okay. I would like to talk to you about the economic feasibility analysis that you guys performed. Is it correct that Puget has performed an analysis to determine if replacement of the line is economically feasible?  A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number that you used for your modeling, and not the 1.6 million or 1.5 million that shows up later on?  A The 1.8 million is a calculation performed by the model based on the inputs, which the inputs were the 1.8 million are allowed rate of return, taxes  Q Right.  A things like that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you cite here authorizes Puget to refuse service today?  A 480-100-056 is not in effect today. There is a replacement rule that I didn't cite in this response.  Q So turning back to your testimony, LFL-1T, Page 10, you cite 480-100-123. Is that the rule that you refer to?  A I don't have the rules in front of me, but I believe that's about the right number.  Q Okay. Let's turn to your testimony, LFL, Page 10 at Line 18. Let me know when you get there. Does that look like the rule that you are referring to?  A Yes.  Q Does that give you the authority to refuse service today?  A Yes, it does.  Q Okay. I would like to talk to you about the economic feasibility analysis that you guys performed. Is it correct that Puget has performed an analysis to determine if replacement of the line is economically feasible?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	correct that your analysis begins by identifying the revenue requirement for an \$8 million capital investment and that you calculated the revenue requirement for such investment to be 1.8 million annually?  A The model is a model that I have used for a number of years, but I did not build. It was built by one of our experts in modeling. In 2013, it does show regulated revenues of 1.8 million.  Q Okay.  A Those regulated revenues declined over time as the assets depreciate. This is just a tool to determine the revenue needed to cover an investment.  Q Okay. So does that \$1.8 million number so starting off, is the \$1.8 million number the number that you used for your modeling, and not the 1.6 million or 1.5 million that shows up later on?  A The 1.8 million is a calculation performed by the model based on the inputs, which the inputs were the 1.8 million are allowed rate of return, taxes Q Right.

	Page 40		Page 42
1	Schedule 24 customers and not	1	impact to Schedule 24 customers, using your number,
2	A If you are referring to my Exhibit	. 2	the \$1.8 million number, if I'm correct here, you
3	Q 11.	3	first subtract the O&M from the revenue requirement to
4	A LFL-11	4	get the 1.25 million; is that correct?
5	Q Yes.	5	A That's correct.
6	A that was prepared at my direction to find	6	Q And then you divide by the next line, which is
7	the impacts, to see if Mr. Gorman was correct or not	7	\$104 million?
8	in his .4 percent. That was prepared by both our	8	A That's correct.
9	revenue requirements group and our cost of service	9	Q Now, what does that \$104 million represent?
10	group, and they prepared that independently, based on	10	A It's labeled as Schedule 24 revenue
11	the 8.1 million investment.	11	requirements. I believe that's the revenue
12	Q But the okay. So looking at	12	requirement for all Schedule 24 customers.
13	A In other words	13	Q Okay. So let's turn to Page 4, the next page,
14	Q LFL-11, would you agree with me, if you	14	Page 4 of 8 on the same exhibit.
15	look at Page 2, that and in the grade-out column is	15	A (Complies.)
16	your corrected revenue requirement, right here. You	16	Q So if you look down at Line 33, the rate
17	used the \$1.8 million number, and that's the same	17	scheduled revenue requirement, okay? LFL-11, Page 4
18	number that shows up in 2013?	18	of 8.
19	A Yes.	19	A Yes.
20	Q Which would assume that you filed a rate case	20	Q Okay. So you used 104 million, do you see
21	that year and that those rates you are assuming by	21	that, in the fourth column, correct?
22	this that that \$1.8 million stays constant over the	22	A Yes.
23	life of this line?	23	Q So does that is that number representative
24	A Yes	24	of the Schedule 24 revenue requirement, or is that
25	Q And then Mr. Gorman used an average over the	25	only a component of the Schedule 24 revenue
200-200-200-200-200-200-200-200-200-200	Page 41	***************************************	Page 43
			<del>-</del>
1	life of the line, correct?	1	requirement? In other words
1 2	life of the line, correct?  A I don't recall.	1 2	requirement? In other words A That's
	A I don't recall.		
2		2	A That's
2 3	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that	2	A That's Q I'm sorry.
2 3 4	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity	2 3 4	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the
2 3 4 5	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?	2 3 4 5	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the
2 3 4 5 6	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to	2 3 4 5	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for
2 3 4 5 6 7	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.	2 3 4 5 6 7	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.  Q Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million? A The 245
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.  Q Okay.  A But when rates are set, it's the investment at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million? A The 245 Q And that's what Mr. Gorman did, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.  Q Okay.  A But when rates are set, it's the investment at the time and —	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million? A The 245 Q And that's what Mr. Gorman did, correct? A I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.  Q Okay.  A But when rates are set, it's the investment at the time and —  Q But that changes over time?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million? A The 245 Q And that's what Mr. Gorman did, correct? A I don't know. Q Well, you have it here in Exhibit 2. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.  Q Okay.  A But when rates are set, it's the investment at the time and —  Q But that changes over time?  A Right, we would have subsequent rate cases.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million? A The 245 Q And that's what Mr. Gorman did, correct? A I don't know. Q Well, you have it here in Exhibit 2. So Exhibit 2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.  Q Okay.  A But when rates are set, it's the investment at the time and  Q But that changes over time?  A Right, we would have subsequent rate cases.  Rates would change, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million? A The 245 Q And that's what Mr. Gorman did, correct? A I don't know. Q Well, you have it here in Exhibit 2. So Exhibit 2 A Yes, he did use the 245
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.  Q Okay.  A But when rates are set, it's the investment at the time and  Q But that changes over time?  A Right, we would have subsequent rate cases. Rates would change, yes.  Q So you looked at it at the absolute highest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million? A The 245 Q And that's what Mr. Gorman did, correct? A I don't know. Q Well, you have it here in Exhibit 2. So Exhibit 2 A Yes, he did use the 245 Q And he came up with the .4 percent?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.  Q Okay.  A But when rates are set, it's the investment at the time and  Q But that changes over time?  A Right, we would have subsequent rate cases.  Rates would change, yes.  Q So you looked at it at the absolute highest point and that's how you calculated this number?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million? A The 245 Q And that's what Mr. Gorman did, correct? A I don't know. Q Well, you have it here in Exhibit 2. So Exhibit 2 A Yes, he did use the 245 Q And he came up with the .4 percent? A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A I don't recall.  Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree that that maybe could account for part of the disparity between your calculation and his?  A I would like to defer that question to Ms. Barnard.  Q Okay. Well, is the \$1.8 million number the highest point? It goes down from there, correct?  A That's correct.  Q So if you use any other number on here, the rate impact would go down to the other Schedule 24 customers, correct?  A Right.  Q Okay.  A But when rates are set, it's the investment at the time and  Q But that changes over time?  A Right, we would have subsequent rate cases.  Rates would change, yes.  Q So you looked at it at the absolute highest point and that's how you calculated this number?  A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A That's Q I'm sorry. A That's the total revenue retirement. Q The 104- or the 245-? I believe the 245,829,144 would be the total revenue requirement for Schedule 24. A This is a excuse me. It's in Column 4, so it's a distribution revenue requirement. Q So you looked at the impact to only one component of Schedule 24 rates, not the total rate. If I asked you to compute the impact on the total 24 rates, would you divide it by the 104 million or the 245 million? A The 245- Q And that's what Mr. Gorman did, correct? A I don't know. Q Well, you have it here in Exhibit 2. So Exhibit 2 A Yes, he did use the 245 Q And he came up with the .4 percent? A Yes. Q Okay. And if you take and this was based

Page 44 Page 46 1 Q So if I asked you to calculate this based on 1 Q I'm sorry, maybe I misunderstood you. So 2 the revised 5.1 number, what would the rate impact for 2 ignoring this case, in general, if you have to replace 3 Schedule 24 customers be? 3 a distribution line that's been in service, that A It would be somewhat less, but still higher 4 serves customers, is replacement of that line governed 5 than Mr. Gorman's. 5 by your line extension policy? 6 Q It would be somewhat less? Oh, I see. Okay. 6 A Yes. To some extent it is, yes. 7 So assuming --7 Q "To some extent it is." What does that mean? 8 A Somewhat less than the 1.2. 8 A The timing and whether it is replaced or there 9 Q Okay. Right. 9 is some other action taken, it is not dictated in the 10 So it would be five-eighths of your 1.2 -- I'm tariff. The Schedule 85 simply says we will maintain 10 11 sorry, no, it would be -- if we took your number, the 11 lines that are installed under Schedule 85. 12 \$1.8 million, and you subtract out the O&M, you get 12 Q So if you've got a group of residential 13 the 1.252 number. You divide that by -- it would be 13 customers that have been served for 25 years and the the 245 million, right? 14 14 distribution lines need to be replaced, that's going 15 A Yes. 15 to be covered under your line extension policy, or is 16 Q And that would be approximately .75 percent, 16 that done just as a matter of replacing 17 does that sound about right, using your calculation? 17 infrastructure, which you do as a matter of course 18 A That seems within the range of what it would 18 under a capital improvement plan? 19 be, yes. 19 A There's the general obligation under our line 20 Q Okay. And if you used Mr. Gorman's analysis, 20 extension policy, but the timing and everything else 21 his .4 percent would go to about a .23 percent, 21 of those replacements and whether or not they are 22 correct, subject to check? 22 replaced is decided by our engineering group, which 23 A Yes. 23 tracks outages, frequency and duration of outages, and 24 Q Okay. The other provision that you cite is --24 evaluates all distribution circuits on the system. 25 it's Schedule 80, where a party requests a change to 25 Q So your line extension policy applies to the Page 45 Page 47 1 electric facilities. You cite that as authority for 1 whole system at all times? 2 charging the Maloney Ridge customers the cost of the 2 A Yes, except when there is a special agreement. 3 line: is that correct? 3 Q Okay. So is replacement of the Maloney Ridge 4 A I cite that as one of the options if the 4 line governed by Schedule 85? 5 Commission decides the service agreements do not 5 A It's governed by the special agreement. 6 apply. 6 MR. STOKES: I have nothing further, 7 Q And are the customers moving the location of 7 Your Honor. 8 their facilities? 8 JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you, Mr. Stokes. 9 A No, they are not. 9 Mr. Oshie, do you have any questions? 10 Q Okay. Would the customer load be the same 10 MR. OSHIE: No. Your Honor. 11 before and after the replacement of the line? 11 JUDGE KOPTA: I have a couple. 12 A To the best of my knowledge, yes. 12 13 Q Okay. And would the voltage be the same? 13 EXAMINATION 14 A Yes. 14 BY JUDGE KOPTA: 15 Q Okay. Can you turn to LFL-13. 15 Q Mr. Logen, would you turn to Exhibit LFL-10? 16 A (Complies.) 16 A (Complies.) 17 Q So this response indicates that the Maloney 17 Q As I understand it, this is the model that you 18 Ridge line was originally constructed as a line 18 used, or output of the model that you used to 19 extension; is that correct? 19 determine how much of a revenue requirement you would 20 A That's correct. 20 need to recover a particular investment? 21 Q So ignoring this proceeding, in general is 21 A That's correct. 22 replacement of a distribution line on Puget's system 22 Q And you use this model by feeding into it, for 23 governed by your line extension policies? 23 lack of a better term, the amount of the investment. 24 A Yes, it is, absent any kind of an agreement 24 and the output is the calculation of the revenue 25 such as we have in this case. 25 requirement?

	Page 48		Page 50
1	A That's correct.	1	A Uh-huh.
2	Q Did you use the \$8.1 million input in this	2	Q So as Bench Request No. 2, I would ask you to
3	exhibit or the 5.3?	3	calculate that amount.
4	A Lused the 8.1.	4	A All right.
5	Q So if you fed in 5.3, it would be different?	5	JUDGE KOPTA: Those are all my
6	A That's correct.	6	questions.
7	Q Can you calculate can you use 5.3 as an	7	Ms. Barnett, do you have any redirect?
8	input?	8	MS. BARNETT: Yes, just a couple.
9	A Yes.	9	INIO. BAINIVETT. Tes, just a couple.
10	Q Okay. As a bench request, I am asking you to	10	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
11	rerun this model using the \$5.3 million figure that	11	BY MS. BARNETT:
12	you gave us this morning, as the actual investment	12	Q Mr. Logen, has PSE refused service to
13	amount.	13	petitioners?
14	A All right.	14	A No.
15	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	15	
16	Q Okay. And the other set of questions I have	16	Q And regarding Mr. Gorman's economic analysis, if PSE and all the parties in this case accepted
	are in your opening testimony, LFL-1T, Page 11,		·
17 18	specifically beginning with the text on Line 15, where	17 18	Mr. Gorman's analysis without any corrections, would
	you are discussing a margin allowance. Would you		replacement of the would that make replacement of
19	explain to me what a margin allowance is?	19	the Maloney Ridge line economically feasible?
20	A A margin allowance is the amount under our	20	A No, it would not.
21	line extension policy. It is based on the estimated	21	Q And regarding Mr. Stokes' questions on
22	kilowatt hours to be used by the customer to be	22	Schedule 85, how, in your understanding, would
23	connected, or customers, and we subtract that amount	23	Schedule 85 apply to the petitioners if this line is
24	from the cost of the job. This is so that customers	24	not a new line or a line extension per se, but a
25	in effect don't double-pay for their distribution	25	replacement line? Why would Schedule 85 apply?
	Page 49		Page 51
	- 490 - 10		1age 31
1	services.	1	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to
1 2		1 2	
	services.		A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to
2	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were	2	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.
2 3	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to	2 3	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your
2 3 4	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?	2 3 4	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service	2 3 4 5	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you,
2 3 4 5 6	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.	2 3 4 5 6	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?
2 3 4 5 6 7	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would	2 3 4 5 6 7	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this particular line extension, but is one based on what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.  JASON M. SANDERS, witness herein, having been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this particular line extension, but is one based on what you have in the tariff?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.  JASON M. SANDERS, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this particular line extension, but is one based on what you have in the tariff?  A That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.  JASON M. SANDERS, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this particular line extension, but is one based on what you have in the tariff?  A That's correct.  Q Have you done any calculation on what the cost	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.  JASON M. SANDERS, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this particular line extension, but is one based on what you have in the tariff?  A That's correct.  Q Have you done any calculation on what the cost would be for this to be an economic project?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.  JASON M. SANDERS, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:  JUDGE KOPTA: Thanks. You may be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this particular line extension, but is one based on what you have in the tariff?  A That's correct.  Q Have you done any calculation on what the cost would be for this to be an economic project?  A I have not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.  JASON M. SANDERS, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:  JUDGE KOPTA: Thanks. You may be seated.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this particular line extension, but is one based on what you have in the tariff?  A That's correct.  Q Have you done any calculation on what the cost would be for this to be an economic project?  A I have not.  Q Is that something that could be done?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.  JASON M. SANDERS, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:  JUDGE KOPTA: Thanks. You may be seated.  Ms. Barnett.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this particular line extension, but is one based on what you have in the tariff?  A That's correct.  Q Have you done any calculation on what the cost would be for this to be an economic project?  A I have not.  Q Is that something that could be done?  A Yes, I would think it could be.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.  JASON M. SANDERS, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:  JUDGE KOPTA: Thanks. You may be seated.  Ms. Barnett.  DIRECT EXAMINATION
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	services.  Q And the petitioners in this case, if you were to reconstruct the line, would they be entitled to this margin allowance?  A If the Commission found that the service agreements don't apply, and if Schedule 85 does apply specifically as a line extension, then, yes, it would be eligible for the margin allowance.  Q And how is the margin allowance calculated?  A There is based on Schedule 24, in Schedule 85 there is a table. It says Schedule 24, so many cents per kilowatt hour, based on your estimated kilowatt hours for a year.  Q So this is not a calculation specific to this particular line extension, but is one based on what you have in the tariff?  A That's correct.  Q Have you done any calculation on what the cost would be for this to be an economic project?  A I have not.  Q Is that something that could be done?  A Yes, I would think it could be.  Q I'm just interested in the delta between how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Schedule 85 also applies to modifications to an existing line.  MS. BARNETT: No further questions, Your Honor.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Logen. You are excused. We appreciate your testimony.  Who is next?  MR. BROOKS: I believe it will be Mr. Sanders.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right.  You might as well stay standing. Raise your right hand.  JASON M. SANDERS, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:  JUDGE KOPTA: Thanks. You may be seated.  Ms. Barnett.  DIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. BARNETT:

Page 52 Page 54 Q Would you please state your name and spell 1 did the revised calculations, the overhead percent was 1 2 your name for the court reporter, please? 2 reduced from 20 percent to 16 percent to reflect more 3 A Jason M. Sanders, J-A-S-O-N, M., 3 accurately our overheads. Also in the revised 4 S-A-N-D-E-R-S. estimates, we had both a high and a low cost and we 4 5 Q And you heard your testimony and exhibits were 5 took the average of those costs. That reflects for 6 admitted. Do you have any changes or corrections to 6 the majority of the errors. 7 those? 7 Q Thank you. 8 A I do. I have a correction to JMS-1T. Page 4. 8 Do you have Exhibit JMS-9 in front of you? 9 Line 4, in reference to \$8.1 million for the estimate. 9 10 The correct value is \$5.3 million. 10 Q And this appears to be Puget's revised 11 Q Thank you. estimates of those costs you just discussed; is that 11 12 Anything else? 12 correct? 13 13 A That's correct. 14 MS. BARNETT: With that, Your Honor, PSE Q And are these numbers still accurate? 14 15 offers Mr. Sanders for cross-examination. 15 A Yes, they are, 16 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Brooks. Q Thank you. 16 17 17 Turning back to your testimony. Still on CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 Page 4, actually. Here you have indicated that Puget 18 19 BY MR. BROOKS: 19 has performed an economic feasibility study; is that 20 Q Good morning, Mr. Sanders. 20 correct? 21 A Good morning. 21 A That's correct. 22 Q Your correction probably took care of a couple 22 Q What time period did you use to conduct that 23 of questions I had, just to establish that, so 23 analysis? 24 thank you for making those. 24 A So if I understand your question right, the 25 Since you have that part of your testimony 25 feasibility study was done in August 2013, as I Page 53 Page 55 1 open, on Page 4, where you had Line 4, you just 1 stated, and then on Line 19, that we base that on the indicated that, since the drafting of this testimony, 2 2 2011 power consumption revenue. 3 the estimated cost of replacement went from 8.1 to Q And what was the horizon for the analysis, how 3 4 5.3 million, correct? 4 far out did you look at the economic impacts? 5 A Correct. 5 A My understanding -- as a sponsor of this Q What change reduced that estimated cost by 6 6 study, my understanding is they went out 28 years. 7 more than 35 percent? 7 Q And has that number changed at all in other 8 A There are several factors that resulted in the 8 analyses that Puget has done? 9 correction. As we stated with the customers earlier 9 A My understanding of that, these are the 10 on, through all of our conversations, these are 10 numbers. That's the depreciable plant life that we -conceptual estimates. We haven't had any 11 11 we typically use. 12 opportunities to actually go out and do what would --Q Do you know how long the Maloney Ridge line 12 13 in most cases we would have an engineering service 13 has been in service? 14 agreement, where we would actually get out into the 14 A Since 1971. 1.5 area and walk the site and do a number of studies. 15 Q And would the materials used to replace the 16 These were all conceptual estimates. existing line be expected to last longer than the 16 17 There was -- there have been several folks who materials that were used in 1971? 17 18 were involved in the estimating over the two years 18 A I'm really not an expert to be able to say how 19 that we been meeting with the customers. We did find 19 long the cables would last for. 20 that in the original estimate that there were some 20 Q So the 28 years, then, was based purely just 21 errors in which -- rounding errors, they rounded up in 21 on the depreciable life of those assets? 22 a number of occasions. They also, in the original 22 A For the study the 28 years was, yes. 23 estimate, only took the high values for the 23 Q Does your economic feasibility analysis calculations. And also in the original estimate, we 24 include any consideration of the importance of the 24 25 used an overhead percentage of 20 percent, so when we 25 services that are provided by the petitioners, both to

	Page 56		Page 58
1	Puget's customers and to the Washington public in	1	JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Oshie?
2	general?	2	MS. BARNETT: No questions, Your Honor.
3	A No, it does not.	3	JUDGE KOPTA: I have none.
4	Q I want to turn to a different topic. Does the	4	Ms. Barnett, any redirect?
5	continued maintenance of the Maloney Ridge line pose	5	MS. BARNETT: Just one, Your Honor.
6	safety concerns for Puget?	6	
7	A The safety I'm sorry. The safety concerns	7	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
8	for both Puget and for our service provider, Potelco,	8	BY MS. BARNETT:
9	are related to access of the mountainous terrain	9	Q Mr. Sanders, you said that the economic
10	during the wintertime. Those kinds of things are the	10	analysis PSE performed did not consider the importance
11	only are the only times that we have said that	11	of the service. Why didn't the economic analysis
12	there were safety concerns.	12	consider the source or I mean the use of the power?
13	Q Could you turn to what has been labeled as	13	A My understanding, when we do any of the
14	Exhibit JMS-7?	14	feasibility studies and we are taking considerations
15	A Okay.	15	for all our customers, we don't look at what the use
16	Q And this is a pretty long exhibit, so if I	16	of the system will be for them. I think to
17	could get you to turn to Page 38 of 73.	17	Mr. Logen's point earlier, whether we are working
18	A Okay. I have that.	18	with everything from hospitals to refineries to any
19	Q Is this an e-mail from you to the Maloney	19	number of customers and and that piece of the risk
20	Ridge customers that explains the concerns that you	20	does not play into a feasibility study.
21	just described here?	21	MS. BARNETT: Thank you. No further
22	A Yes, it is.	22	questions, Your Honor.
23	Q Is it also Puget's position that, without	23	JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you, Mr. Sanders.
24	replacement of this line, that the cables will	24	You are excused. We appreciate your testimony this
25	ultimately fail and service will not be provided?	25	morning.
		Mikhini manakan kan menteri	D
	Page 57		Page 59
1	A Our position is as we talked to the	1	Who would you like to talk to next?
2	customer as well, I don't think we have any way of	2	MR. BROOKS: Ms. Barnard, please.
3	of saying for sure when that system will fail, that	3	JUDGE KOPTA: Before you sit down too
4	the number of faults on the system over time that	4	late.
5	we do believe that that there is a life expectancy	5	
6	on that, that we anticipate that it will probably	6	KATHERINE J. BARNARD, witness herein, having been
7	continue to have more outages, more splices, and at	7	first duly sworn on oath, was
8	that point will I think it would effectively fail.	8	examined and testified as
9	Q Could you in this same Exhibit, JMS-7,	9	follows:
10	could you turn to Page 64 of 73?	10	HIDOE KOSTA TI I
11	A Okay.	11	JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.
12	Q Can you describe what this document is?	12	DIDEOT EVANUATION
13	A These are the meeting minutes from the	13	DIRECTEXAMINATION
14	October 30th customer meeting.	14	BY MS. BARNETT:
15	Q And this is a meeting you were in attendance?	15	Q Good morning, Ms. Barnard. Could you please
16	A Yes, this was. And I'm not I believe it's	16	state your name and spell it for the court reporter?
17	2013.	17	A Yes. My name is Katherine, K-A-T-H-E-R-I-N-E,
18	Q I see that it doesn't have the year on it.	18 19	Barnard, B-A-R-N-A-R-D.
19	A Yeah.		Q Do you have any corrections to your already
20	Q Does this document reflect the concern that	20	accepted/admitted testimony or exhibits?
21	you just acknowledged regarding the Maloney Ridge line	21 22	A There are no direct corrections, however, I do
22	needing to be replaced and its ultimate failure?	23	have a reference on Page 2, Lines 11 through 13,
23 24	A Yes, it does.  MR RECOKS: Thank you. That's all the	23 24	referencing Mr. Logen's. To the extent the costs were reduced from 8.1 million to 5.3, there would be an
25	MR. BROOKS: Thank you. That's all the questions we have for you.	25	impact on that as well.
23	questions we have for you.	۷.	impact on that as well.

	Page 60		Page 62
1	Q Thanks.	1	
2	Anything else?	2	the testimony of both Mr. Sanders and Mr. Logen.  Q Based on the response of your earlier
3	A No.	3	questions about the ownership and the operation of the
4	MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, with that, PSE	4	line, what is the basis of your testimony that the
5	offers Ms. Barnett Ms. Barnard for	5	line is not part of Puget's system?
6	cross-examination.	6	A The Schedule 24 customers the line
7	JUDGE KOPTA: I'm glad I'm not the only	7	extension for the Maloney Ridge is the eight and a
8	one.	8	half miles beyond our base system. The way that we
9	MS. BARNETT: To make that clear,	9	look at this particular issue is that up to the the
10	Barnard.	10	basic distribution charge, or basic distribution
11	JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Brooks.	11	system is covering their Schedule 24. Anything beyond
12	BODGE NOT TA. WII. BIOOKS.	12	that is that eight and a half mile line is beyond
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION	13	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
14	BY MR. BROOKS:	14	our base system.
15	Q Good morning, Ms. Barnard.	15	Q All right. So is it fair to say that the
16	A Good morning, Ms. Barnard.	16	basis of your conclusion that it is not part of your
17	Q I would like to start with some questions	17	system is that there is a service agreement and that
18	based on your prefiled cross-answering testimony,	18	this was constructed by through the line extension
19	which is Exhibit KJB-1T. Do you have that in front of		policy instead of something else?  A Yes.
20	you?		· · · · <del>- ·</del> ·
21	A Yes, I do.	20 21	Q Are you aware of any agreement by the
22	Q I would like to point you to Page 2 of that		customers that would have acknowledged that fact, that
23	testimony. It's the same page you just made the	22	the line is not part of Puget's system?
24	correction on.	23	A I believe that the line being built in the
25	A Yes.	24	first place and the customers fully reimbursing for
23	A Tes.	25	that, as discussed in Mr. Logen and Mr. Sanders'
	Page 61	<del></del>	Page 63
1	Q On Line 8 you make a statement that the	1	testimony, was what supported that statement.
2	Maloney Ridge line is not part of PSE's distribution	2	Q Are you aware of any other lines that Puget
3	system; is that correct?	3	serves that it considers not part of its system?
4	A I do.	4	A That would be a question better answered by
5	Q Does Puget own the facilities that make up the	5	one of the other witnesses. I'm not aware.
6	Maloney Ridge line?	6	Q I want to move to a different part of your
7	A I believe, according to Mr. Logen's testimony,	7	testimony, and specifically on Page 3. In response to
8	they do.	8	Mr. Gorman's testimony, the witness for the
9	Q To your knowledge, has Puget agreed to deliver	9	petitioners, you conclude on Line 7, and this is just
10	electric service over those facilities?	10	your conclusion, that there has not been a reduction
11	A Via the service agreement, yes.	11	in Puget's net plant investment; is that correct?
12	Q And is Puget responsible for the maintenance	12	A That is correct.
13	of those facilities?	13	Q And is it correct that you base that
14	A We do provide the maintenance operation and	14	conclusion on the fact that some of the company's
15	maintenance cost, however, that is fully reimbursed by	15	investment, identified in its earlier rate cases, was
16	the customers on that line.	16	reclassified from distribution plant to transmission
17	Q Are you familiar with Puget's Schedule 85	17	plant?
18	governing line extensions?	18	A Could you repeat your question?
19	A Not really.	19	Q Your conclusion that there has not been a
20	Q Are you familiar with the service agreements?	20	reduction in Puget's net plant investment, is that
21	A I have not reviewed them in detail.	21	based on your assertion that some of the company's
22	Q So your testimony on this page that speaks to	22	investment and distribution, or plant investment and
23	the customers' obligations under the service	23	distribution was reclassified as transmission?
24	agreements, what is that based on?	24	A Correct. Mr. Gorman, his his exhibit only
25	A It's based on a high level understanding of	25	looked at the distribution classification. That

Page 66 Page 64 amount had dropped significantly. However, it was 1 includes all of the basic service to get to our 1 2 because of that reclassification. 2 general distribution system. And I mean that in its 3 3 entirety, including the generation assets, the A and Q Your testimony is based on an overall 4 investment that adds both distribution and 4 G, and all of those costs that are included in the 5 transmission together in a lump sum? 5 revenue requirement. 6 A Correct. 6 Q And just to clarify, though, your testimony 7 Q Can I get you to turn to Exhibit KJB-3? 7 does not take into account how those costs are 8 A Yes, I'm there. 8 actually allocated to the customer class -- the Q Am I correct that this is the table that you 9 9 customers in that customer class? 10 used to illustrate those points that we just 10 A That is correct, it does not consider that. discussed? 11 11 Q Were you in the room earlier when Mr. Logen 12 A Yes. 12 graciously deferred a question to you regarding some 13 Q And just so I can follow along, the column 13 of the analysis? that is third from the right shows the net plant from 14 14 A I was in the room, but I don't quite recall. Q I don't know if you will have the exhibit, but 15 the years 2010 through 2013? 15 16 A Yes. 16 it's an exhibit that was attached to Mr. Logen's 17 Q And if you are looking at just the 17 testimony. 18 distribution amounts, it shows a reduction from 18 A I have grabbed his copy, but it has a lot of 19 approximately 2.2 billion to 2.05 billion during that 19 writing. It's LFL-11, I believe. 20 time period? 20 Q So we were working with both LFL-10 and 21 A Correct. 21 LFL-11. If you could turn to LFL-11. The model that 22 Q But your testimony is that that row labeled 22 Mr. Logen was describing, he used as an -- when he was 23 Combined has actually increased because of the 23 calculating his 1.2 percent, he indicated he was using addition of transmission plant? 24 24 the 1.8 as an annual number. Is that your A Correct. 25 25 understanding of how that works? Page 65 Page 67 1 Q Are transmissions costs allocated to 1 A Will you -- where? 2 Q Oh, sorry. LFL-11. If you look in the gray 2 Schedule 24 customers on an identical basis that 3 column. It's Page -- sorry, it's Page 2 of 8. 3 distributions costs are allocated to those customers? 4 4 A That's really a cost of service question and A Okay. And which line? 5 Q If you look at Line 1. 5 that is not my area of expertise. 6 Q Would you -- based on the testimony that you 6 A Okav. 7 provided in this proceeding, would you expect low load 7 Q My understanding was that 1.8 was the first 8 year cost of the 8.1 million estimated to replace the 8 customers, like Schedule 24 customers, to be allocated 9 a lower percentage of transmission costs compared to 9 line. Is that your understanding? 10 distribution costs? 10 A I believe so. A Would you repeat your question? 11 Q And if you go back to LFL-10, and Page 4 of 11 12 Q Sure. Would you expect customers, like those 12 that. 13 13 on Schedule 24, who have relatively low loads, would A Page 4. 14 Q There should be a table. If you look at the you expect them to have -- to be allocated a lower 14 second or third column it is labeled 2013. The 1.8, 15 portion of transmission costs than they are at 15 16 distributions costs? 16 the number appears in that column at the top, that's 17 A That's a cost of service question and that is 17 based on 8.1 million input for the rate base? 18 not my area of expertise. 18 A Yes. 19 Q So your testimony doesn't contain any analysis 19 Q All right. Sorry to bounce around. Back to 20 of the difference between how those costs are 20 LFL-11, then, on Page 2 of that, in that gray column, 21 allocated among the customers? 21 did Puget use the 1.8 number for every year during --22 22 for the economic analysis, rather than, opposed to say A No, my - my testimony is just looking at the 23 23 an average of those numbers that appear back on total plant investment and recognizing that 24 24 LFL-10? Schedule 24 includes more than just distribution or 25 25 transportation; that is, it includes production, it A It appears that LFL-11 is looking at the first

Page 68 Page 70 1 year's impact on revenue requirement - or, yes. 1 will hopefully finish with our last two witnesses. Q If you use a different number, say an average 2 2 MR. STOKES: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 of those -- of the regulated revenues that appear in 3 JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you. 4 that column on Page 4 of LFL-10, so if you didn't use 4 (A brief recess.) 5 1.8 every year but you used an average over that 5 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. We are back on 6 entire time period, would that number be lower? 6 the record after our morning break. As I understand 7 A It would be lower, however, it would still be 7 it, that concludes the cross-examination of Puget 8 well over \$1 million. 8 Sound Energy's witnesses, which brings us to Staff. I 9 Q Could that account for some of the discrepancy 9 believe the only questions are for Mr. Nightingale, so 10 between Puget's analysis and Mr. Gorman's analysis? 10 I would ask you to stand and raise your right hand. 11 A It may. 11 12 Q And then one more question on LFL-11. We 12 DAVID NIGHTINGALE, witness herein, having been 13 heard Mr. Logen describe how the calculation in that 13 first duly sworn on oath, was 14 gray column works, starting with the 1.8, subtracting 14 examined and testified as follows: 15 out the 547,000 that's the O&M expense, and that 15 16 yields the 1.2 number. And then 1.2 was then divided 16 JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you. 17 by the distribution-only number of 104, which yielded 17 Mr. Oshie? 18 the 1.2 percent. Was that your understanding of how 18 MR. OSHIE: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 this table worked? 19 20 A State your question again. 20 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 21 Q Sure. In order to get the bottom number, the 21 BY MR. OSHIE: 22 1.2 percent, that number was derived by dividing 22 Q Mr. Nightingale, would you please spell your 23 Line 4, which was the Schedule 24 revenue requirement, 23 name and state -- spell your last name, state your 24 by Line 5 of the previous column, the 24 25 distribution-only amount of 104, and that 1.2 divided 25 A David Nightingale. Nightingale is Page 69 Page 71 1 by 104 yielded 1.2 percent? 1 N-I-G-H-T-I-N-G-A-L-E. 2 A I believe that's correct. 2 Q And you are the same Mr. Nightingale that has 3 Q And on Page 4 of LFL-11, the same exhibit, the 3 testified in prefiled testimony, I believe the 4 104 million number comes from the distribution column, 4 exhibits are DN-1T through DN-4; is that correct? 5 which has a 4 in parentheses under it, down at the 5 A Correct. 6 bottom? 6 Q Do you have any changes that you would like to 7 A Yes. 7 make, or modifications or clarifications that you 8 Q So this 1.2 percent is based on the revenue 8 would like to make in your testimony, as to the 9 requirement of only a component of Schedule 24's rates 9 prefiled testimony? 10 and not full revenue requirement that appears on 10 A Yes, I have one small correction. On DN-1T, 11 Page 4 of LFL-11; is that correct? 11 Page 6, Line 1, currently it says Mr. Baker Snoqualmie 12 12 A It would appear that it is utilizing the National Forest. It probably should say Mt. Baker 13 information from the distribution column, which is, I 13 Snoqualmie National Forest. I'm not sure who believe, a function from the cost of service study. 14 14 Mr. Baker is. 15 MR. BROOKS: Thank you. No further 15 MR. OSHIE: Thank you, Mr. Nightingale. 16 questions. 16 The witness is tendered for cross-examination, 17 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Oshie? 17 Your Honor. 18 MS. BARNETT: No questions, Your Honor. 18 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you. 19 JUDGE KOPTA: I have none. 19 Mr. Stokes? 20 Ms Barnett? 20 21 MS. BARNETT: No, Your Honor. 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION 22 JUDGE KOPTA: Ms. Barnard, you are 22 BY MR. STOKES: 23 excused. Thank you for your testimony this morning. 23 Q Good morning, Mr. Nightingale. 24 It is now 20 minutes to 11:00, so let's take a 24 A Good morning. 25 break and be back at 5 minutes until 11:00, and we 25 Q So in your prefiled testimony you opined on

Page 72 Page 74 notes the economic feasibility requirement for 1 the meaning of certain service agreements executed by 1 2 the Maloney Ridge customers after the original 2 service; is that correct? 3 3 agreement with PSE. Is it safe to assume that you A Yes. reviewed these agreements thoroughly? 4 Q Would you agree that reading this provision, 4 5 that this talks about how the line was originally 5 A Yes. 6 Q Okay. If you can turn to Exhibit 21, LFL-4. 6 constructed? 7 I believe that's a copy of the service agreements. 7 A Yes, it does describe the line and where it A Okay. That's the -- is that the current 8 8 was constructed. 9 9 agreement? Q So it is written in the past tense, so this 10 refers to how it was originally constructed? 10 Q I'm sorry, is that -- it is the current. A Correct. 11 A Okay. 11 12 Q So I would like to ask you a question about 12 Q Okay. And that was done under Schedule 85? 13 Paragraph 10 of the agreement. The way that I 13 A This agreement wasn't done under Schedule 85, understand your testimony, and correct me if I'm 14 14 15 wrong, Schedule 80 and 85 apply to the Maloney Ridge 15 Q What does pursuant to the economic feasibility 16 provisions of Electric Tariff G Schedule 85 mean? 16 customers because they are mentioned in the service A Okay. The -- there -- if you have a -- I mean 17 agreements; is that correct? 17 18 A Yes, they -- they are referenced in the 18 Schedule -- it refers to that section of Schedule 85 19 agreement. 19 that talks about economic unfeasibility. That 20 Q Okay. And is that why they apply to the 20 reference is for situations like this, where a line to 21 21 be constructed is not economically feasible, in customers? 22 A I need to back up and conceptualize what the 22 case -- then you can have an exception to the normal 23 23 application is, and that is that in normal application of Schedule 85. 24 circumstances, 80 and 85 both apply to a line 24 Q So is it your testimony that this line was not 25 extension. However, in this situation, this agreement 25 constructed under Schedule 85, even though it says Page 75 Page 73 1 effectively substitutes for the line extension part of 1 pursuant to? 2 2 that because it is uneconomic. So not all of it, A It is -- it is actually pursuant to that part 3 3 especially the line extension, does apply because the of Schedule 85. 4 agreement supersedes it. 4 Q Okay. So it was constructed under Schedule 5 5 Q Schedule 85, doesn't the agreement incorporate 85? 6 6 Schedule 85? A Yes. In that specific paragraph, yes. 7 7 A It does, yes. And in Schedule 85 it actually Q Okay. So at the time it was constructed, 8 says, you know, things apply, and specifically in the 8 Schedule 85 applied to this line. That was the line 9 9 extension policy? line extension context, unless there is a contract, 10 and this is the contract that then takes precedence. 10 A Parts of it did, yes. 11 so for that part of the Schedule 85. 11 Q Right. The line extension policy is a big 12 policy. It talks about residential line extensions, 12 Q So is it safe to assume that -- and I think 13 nonresidential --13 this is actually what Paragraph 10 says, that the 14 14 A Correct. service agreement applies, except to the extent -- I'm 15 sorry, is it safe to assume that the service agreement 15 Q -- line extensions for mobile home parks, so 16 applies unless there is a conflict with Schedule 80 16 the whole thing doesn't apply. So parts of it apply? 17 17 and 85? A Yes. 18 A Yeah. It's what the contract says, yes. 18 Q Okay. Let's turn to your cross-answering Q Okay. I would like to ask you a question 19 testimony, which is DN-4T, and go to Page 2 and 3. 19 20 about the recital in Paragraph B of the agreement. 20 A Which page, excuse me? 21 A The current agreement? 21 Q 2 and 3. A 2 and 3. 22 Q Yes, the current agreement. 22 23 A Okay. 23 Q Start with the question, your first question. 24 Q In your testimony, I think you said reference 24 You respond to Mr. Gorman's testimony, where he states 25 25 that the electric facilities were installed under this to the recitals was telling and that it specifically

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Page 76

schedule and including replacement of such facilities is necessary so long as such replacement is not inconsistent with this schedule or a contract governing such facilities.

So in your answer, you state that Maloney Ridge was not installed under this schedule, referring to Schedule 85. So I would like to ask you, which is it? Was the line constructed under Schedule 85, as recitals in your opening testimony appear to state, and that you rely on to incorporate the economic feasibility test, or was it installed outside of Schedule 85, as you state here in your testimony?

A My testimony says I do not agree that this part of Schedule 85 applies. Not in whole.

Q You say, However, the language in this section, including replacement, only apply when a distribution line was installed under this schedule.

A Correct.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q That Maloney Ridge line was not installed under this schedule. So you're saying it wasn't installed under Schedule 85?

A Correct.

Q Even though the contract says, Pursuant to this provision of Schedule 85, we are entering this agreement?

Page 78

Page 79

A No. However, it's I believe clear in the intent of both the original contract in '71, as well as the subsequent contract in '94, that the responsibility for maintaining, installing, and similar actions is the responsibility of the petitioners. This is a normal lifecycle, where at the beginning of it you've got a new need, as identified, in 1971 there was specific requirements to install a new line, and then maintain it. And then in 1994. when the contract was then renewed, the installation part of the language was missing, only the maintenance and operation is continuing on in the contract. And now we are to the last phase of this project, and the question is are you going to remove that line or are you going to replace that line.

The basis of the costs for all of those things, the installation, the maintenance, and now, the final phase, there's never been any variance in the contracts or any of the evidence provided that anybody except the petitioners should be responsible. with the caveat that as long as the line remains uneconomic.

Q Does the agreement use the word "replace" anywhere?

A It does not.

Page 77

A My understanding of the contract reference was to specifically site a provision in Schedule 85 that allowed lines to be constructed that were not economic. That's -- and then beyond that, then, everything else regarding maintenance, operation, what have you, is in the contract.

Q So --

A Essentially, you are pointing to the appropriate schedule, and in citing an exception of where you allow yourself to have that contract, for the parties to -- to actually build the line that they needed to be built.

Q Right. And in a schedule such as Schedule 80 or 85, there is a lot of provisions and sometimes provisions apply and sometimes they don't, correct?

Q Okay. So in your testimony, in your opening testimony, DN-1T, you indicate that you interpret the service agreements to require the Maloney Ridge customers to be responsible for replacement cost; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Flipping back to LFL-4, can you point anywhere in the service agreement that states the customers have that responsibility?

Q Okav.

A None of the agreements did.

Q Do you believe that the Maloney Ridge line has exceeded its useful life and should be replaced?

A It is right at that point now, yes. It's -- I would agree with the testimony that says it's -- it's maybe a couple more years, but it's getting dangerous to maintain that line and something needs to be done differently.

Q Okay.

A And let me also add that replacing the Maloney Ridge line is not the only option available to the petitioners. They can, as they did in the recitals in the very first 1971 agreement, identified that General Telephone Company was already operating a microwave site there. They were powering it somehow, with probably a diesel generator that was already there. So they could revert back to that. They could -exploration in -- in this case looked at alternative energy. So there's other options for the company. They don't have to rely and they don't have to continue with PSE.

Q Okay. So you don't consider them customers?

24 A Excuse me?

Q Do you consider them customers?

Page 80 Page 82 A Absent a service agreement, I would -- I mean 1 1 A They are customers under Schedule 24, which is 2 that's not the case before us, but I would -- I would 2 a separate -- it's a separate piece from the line 3 be surprised if that was normally their practice. I 3 extension piece, and they are normal customers in that 4 4 mean once you have established as -- you know, your 5 Q Okay. So in addition to Schedule 85 that we 5 distribution system, absent a special agreement like just talked about, your testimony indicates, I think, 6 we have here, that typically there is no incentive for 6 7 that Schedule 80 applies to this line. 7 people to, you know, not maintain the system it 8 needs -- you know, as necessary. 8 9 Q Well, that language applies to all customers, 9 Q Would you agree with that? 10 A Yes. right? 10 Q So Schedule 80 applies? 11 A Yes. 11 12 Q So theoretically Puget can say this -- these 12 A Uh-huh 13 Q So looking back at your testimony, your 13 residential customers over here are imposing costs on 14 opening testimony, which is DN-1T, Page 9 -- actually, 14 all the other residential customers, that's not 15 I'm sorry. So Exhibit 51, Page 9, you quote language 15 economic to serve them, and we can no longer serve that says, PSE shall not be required to provide 16 16 them. 17 A Well, that's not the way the systems work and 17 service if not economically feasible. get maintained. I mean there's -- PSE has a process 18 A Excuse me, I'm not at your location. 18 19 19 Q You state -by which they evaluate all their distribution lines 20 20 and -- and -- for what needs to be updated when, and A What's the page? 21 they have a ranking system, and they invest every year 21 Q On Page 9. 22 22 in capital replacements, upgrades, what have you, so A 9. Which lines? 23 Q Well, you state the -- you state the 23 that that would not become an issue if they are doing 24 economically -- economic feasibility provisions of 24 their job appropriately. 25 Schedule 85 on Page 18 and 19. 25 Q But that language either applies to all Page 83 Page 81 1 A Lines 18 and 19? 1 customers or it doesn't. Does it apply to all 2 2 Q Yes. customers? A Okay. 3 A Maybe I'm not understanding your question. 4 Q That's 85. But I think we heard previously 4 Q Can Puget refuse service to current customers that the language that used to be in 85 regarding 5 if it is not economically feasible? 5 economically feasible, that's been taken out, and 6 A The economic feasibility I believe applies 6 7 that's now included in the broader language in 7 only to new customers. I don't think it applies to 8 Schedule 80? 8 existing customers, but I don't know for sure about 9 A That's correct. 9 10 Q So looking at that language, does Schedule 80 10 Q So it only applies to new customers? 11 apply to all customers? 11 A I believe so. Q So is a customer that's been served for 40 12 A Yes. 12 13 Q Okay. And would the economic feasibility test 13 years a new customer? 14 apply to current customers? 14 A Now you are outside of what - then the 15 15 special agreement comes into play in this case, so it A Yes. 16 Q So assuming that there is no service agreement 16 is not that situation. 17 in place, can Puget refuse service to current 17 Q So let's turn to your exhibit -- let's turn to 18 customers in a rural area if a substation serving them 18 Exhibit LFL-15, which is the advice filing 2012-029. 19 needs to be replaced, and the load is too small to pay 19 A Yes. 20 for that replacement, therefore resulting in the 20 Q Sorry, I'm getting there. 21 21 (Pause in the proceedings.) remaining ratepayers of that class incurring costs to 22 replace that substation? Can Puget say we're not 22 Q And then you can also reference your 23 going to replace that substation, and let those 23 testimony, DN-1T at Page 13. So here you quote language from Schedule 80 that -- and this, in your 24 customers go, just wait until it fails and say you are 24 25 no longer customers, absent a service agreement? 25 view, I think justifies imposing these charges on the

	Page 84		Page 86
1	Maloney Ridge customers. It states that when a change	1	Q Okay. So you don't know the answer. If a
2	in electric facilities is requested by a requesting	2	customer wants a change in a in the location of
3	entity, that the cost of that change is imposed on	3	Puget's lines that served them, to accommodate a new
4	that customer. I'm not reading the language verbatim,	4	building, you don't you don't know whether or not
5	but that's in general what it says, right?	5	that falls under this requesting entity language that
6	A Yes.	6	you quoted in your testimony?
7	Q And you think that that applies here?	7	A It may also it may also I mean this is a
8	A Yes.	8	hypothetical, so, you know, it doesn't really apply
9	Q And this is an alternative to	9	here. But in a hypothetical sense I would also look
10	A Yes.	10	at the service drops, and if it you know, if it was
11	Q refusal of service under	11	just a service drop change of location, it may not
12	A Correct. Yes, exactly.	12	even fall into this whole area.
13	Q Okay. So if a customer wants to change the	13	Q So let's look at DN-1T, the language you have
14	location of Puget's facilities, let's say to	14	in your testimony, quoted and underlined. Can you
15	accommodate a new building, would that kind of a	15	read that first sentence for me?
16	request fall under this schedule?	16	A Where a change in the existing electric
17	A What part of Schedule 80 are you referring to?	17	facility is required required by a requesting
18	Q 34, Section 34.	18	entity, the requesting entity shall pay the company
19	A But a subsection there?	19	for the cost due to such change.
20	Q Well, it's the one that you quote in your	20	That's the end of the underlined part.
21	testimony on DN-1T, Section 34. It's in the advice	21	Q So it's fair to say if the company is asking
22	filing that I referenced. That's the whole provision,	22	for a change in the location, that that would probably
23	if you would like to look at it.	23	fall under this provision?
24	A What's germane to this proceeding is in the	24	A It could.
25	34, Subsection D, which is – let's see here, in the	25	Q Okay. And if a customer wants to add capacity
	Page 85	**************************************	Page 87
1	advice it's the tariff sheet one, two it's the	1	or increase the voltage of the line, reasonable to
2	third tariff sheet in, and it is 80NN, and little	2	assume that that would fall under this provision?
3	double "i" there, and the second to the last sentence.	3	A It could.
4	Where a requesting entity requests a project that	4	Q Okay. If I'm a ship manufacturer and I want
5	replaces an existing facility or facilities, the	5	to ensure continued service, and I want to make sure
6	requesting entity shall pay the company for all its	6	that the plant never goes down, and I ask for
7	costs. And then it goes on.	7	redundant facilities to serve my plant, would that be
8	Q Okay.	8	covered by this provision?
9	A That's on target for this particular case.	9	A I believe so because it also in in this
10	Q Okay. So let's go back to the question I	10	paragraph speaks about reliability.
11	asked you. So if a customer wants to change the	11	Q Right.
12	location of Puget's facilities, let's say to	12	A That would be a reliability issue, as you
13	accommodate a new building, would that kind of request	13	described just now.
14	fall under this provision?	14	Q In fact, you state in your testimony that
15	A I didn't look at at this and analyze it for	15	if you look at Page 15, that this provision would
16	that particular case. I would have to take some time	16	apply to these customers because they are asking to
17	and look through to see if that was something that was	17	enhance the reliability.
18	allowed or not.	18	A Correct.
19	Q Did you review this tariff?	19	Q Okay. So can you turn to Exhibit let's
20	A Yes.	20	see, can you go to JMS-7, please.
21	Q Thoroughly?	21	A I don't have all the other testimony here with
22	A Yes, I did.	22	me.
23 24	Q Okay.	23	(Pause in the proceedings.)
24 25	A Not in the last few days. I was focusing on	24	A Okay. Where?
23	parts that would apply to this case.	25	Q On Page 64.

Page 90 Page 88 filing. That's LFL --1 1 2 2 Q Can you read for me the -- this summary A I've got it. 3 contained in that first paragraph there, under Maloney 3 Q You have got it? 4 Ridge Sobieski outage history? 4 A It's October 24th, 2012? 5 A Yes. Mary and Jenny shared PSE and Potelco's 5 Q Yes. 6 safety concerns, especially with accessing the site. 6 A Yes. 7 The number of outages has been increasing over the 7 JUDGE KOPTA: Just for the record, 8 years, and it is anticipated the frequency and 8 that's LFL-15, correct? 9 duration will continue to increase. Weather, 9 MR. STOKES: LFL-15, yes. Thank you. 10 environmental conditions, age and cable splices 10 BY MR. STOKES: 11 degrade system reliability and without a replacement 11 Q So would you agree that this is a cover letter that the company -- Puget's advice filing that added 12 12 of the system, the cables will ultimately fail and Section 34 that we are talking about? 13 service will not be provided. Weather and snow make 13 it increasingly difficult to respond to outages. A 14 14 A Yes. 15 system map showing outages to date has been 15 Q Okay. Do you know if this line is above 16 distributed to the group. 16 50,000 volts or below 50,000 volts? 17 Q So in that provision that you just read, PSE 17 A Yes, it is below. 18 is telling the parties that the line will fail; is Q Okay. So this was a letter that Puget filed 18 to explain the reasoning behind its advice filing. It 19 that correct? 19 A Yes. says that for facilities operating below 50,000 volts, 20 20 21 Q So is that how you view increase in 21 that are requested to be located or changed, that this 22 reliability? If Puget is telling the customers the 22 tariff would apply. Are the customers asking for the 23 facilities to be relocated? 23 line is going to fail, is that an increase in 24 reliability? 24 A No. 25 A Can you rephrase that? I'm not understanding 25 Q Okay. Is it your view that they are asking Page 89 Page 91 1 what you are asking. 1 for the facilities to be changed? 2 Q Well, you testified that the petitioners are 2 A Yes. 3 requesting entities, requesting to enhance the 3 Q Okay. So you view that -- you view replacement of distribution lines as a change in 4 reliability beyond the existing level of reliability. 4 5 You state that at --5 service? 6 A Yes. 6 A No, it's not a change. I mean there's the 7 Q -- DN-1T, Page 15 and 16. 7 electrical service, which is provided under 24. 8 A Yes. 8 That's not the change we are talking about. We are 9 Q So is that a fair analysis to -- does that 9 talking about physical change to the facilities. That provision apply to a customer that's being told that 10 is - I would -- I would -- I would call a replacement 10 the line is going to fail and service will no longer of a line removal or removal of a line a change in the 11 11 be provided? 12 facilities. 12 13 Q So in your view, can Puget use Paragraph 34 of 13 A Yes. Schedule 80 to allocate the cost of failing electric 14 Q Okay. So if the line goes down completely and 14 facilities to only the residential, commercial or 15 cannot be repaired --15 industrial customers and take service from those 16 A Yes. 16 17 Q -- reliability is at zero? 17 facilities? 18 A Correct. 18 A First you would have to go over the hurdle of 19 Q That this would apply --19 the fact that there's a contract in place. 20 20 Q Ignore the contract --Q -- because they are asking to enhance 21 A Okay. 21 reliability of the system? 22 22 Q -- for the sake of this --23 23 A Yes. A So this hypothetical, if the contract didn't 24 exist, then I don't -- I don't -- then -- if the 24 Q Okay. Can you turn to the cover letter of 25 25 the -- let's see, Exhibit 32, I believe, the advice contract didn't exist, then this line would not exist,

Page 92 Page 94 1 so your hypothetical doesn't make any sense. You 1 But a special request -- to have, for can't get there. The line wouldn't exist then. 2 2 instance, a higher level of quality, like you said 3 Q My hypothetical had nothing to do with this 3 earlier, for a ship manufacturer, that would be a 4 line 4 customer request. It would be not on the regular 5 A Oh, I'm sorry. 5 schedule of how Puget maintains their distribution 6 Q My hypothetical was -- or my question to you 6 system, and so it would be a customer obligation to 7 was can Puget use Paragraph 34 of Schedule 80 to 7 pay for that, whatever customer it was that was 8 allocate the cost of failing electric facilities to 8 requesting that. 9 only the residential, commercial or industrial 9 Q Okay. Can you turn to Page 18 of your opening 10 customers served by those facilities? 10 testimony? 11 A Let me see if I understand your question. Are 11 A 19? 12 you asking if, without the contract, just looking at 12 Q Paragraph 18 of your opening testimony. 13 this Schedule 80, these provisions in 34, could Puget 13 A Which page? reasonably allocate the cost of changing the Maloney 14 14 Q 18. I'm sorry. Yeah. 15 line --15 A Page 18? 16 Q I'm not talking about --16 Q Yes, Page 18. 17 A -- to those --17 A Okay. And where? 18 Q -- this line. I'm talking about -- my 18 Q Line 10. question has nothing to do with the Maloney Ridge 19 19 So you recommended that the Commission, as 20 line. 20 part of this proceeding, order modifications to the 21 21 service agreements; is that correct? 22 Q So I'm talking about Puget's system in 22 A Yes. 23 general. 23 Q Could you read Lines 12 through 15 out loud? A Okay. 24 24 A Yes. Yes, I recommend that the Commission 25 Q Ignore the --25 order the parties to amend the successor contract to Page 93 Page 95 1 A In that case, they would not be allocated to 1 incorporate a condition stating that any costs for 2 those specific customers. 2 replacement of any or all sections of Maloney Ridge 3 Q And why is that? 3 distribution line shall be paid for by the customers 4 A Well, now -- now I was thinking of it in the 4 served on that line, so long as the Maloney Ridge line 5 general -- in the regular schedule. If they made a 5 remains economically unfeasible. 6 request under here, as in this part of Schedule 34, 6 Q Thank you. 7 then the customers would pay for it. 7 A Uh-huh. 8 Q So if I pick up the phone and say, This 8 MR. STOKES: I have nothing further, 9 line -- I've been told by Puget that this line is 9 Your Honor. going down, and I pick up the phone and say, Hey, I 10 10 JUDGE KOPTA: Ms. Barnett, anything from 11 would really like to have this replaced, I'm deemed a 11 you? 12 requesting entity under this tariff, and if I stay 12 MS. BARNETT: No. 13 silent then -- and Puget replaces it, then the costs 13 JUDGE KOPTA: I have do one question. 14 don't come to me? 14 I'm not quite sure how to frame it. A You could look at it that way. I mean 15 15 16 there's -- there's an initiative here that -- the 16 EXAMINATION 17 point where a customer -- under this section of 17 BY JUDGE KOPTA: 18 Schedule 80, the customer requests a change, an 18 Q Is it your understanding that in Puget's 19 increase in service, reliability, whatever, then they 19 system there is a distinction between its general 20 are on the hook to pay for that. If the company 20 distribution system and any line extension customers? 21 determined, through their own methods, part of the 21 A In general, no. Most line extensions are done 22 regular system, not part of a special contract, they 22 within the distribution system, if there's a distribution extension required to get there. 23 would probably get to it, but that might not be on the 23 customer's schedule to do that, and then it would be 24 24 Q And in this case? 25 part of the system cost. 25 A In this case it's different because there's a

Page 96 Page 98 and when it arises. 1 contract in place that covers historically the 1 2 2 And I believe Ms. Barnett had a clarification installation and now the ongoing maintenance and 3 operation of that line. That's outside of the normal 3 that she wanted to make. MS. BARNETT: Thank you. Just a minor 4 distribution system. 4 5 5 change to Exhibit JAB-2, which is Jennifer Boyer's Q So the company's approach in terms of 6 professional qualifications. On Page 1 there is a 6 replacing facilities within the distribution system is 7 reference to her undergraduate work at 7 different than replacing facilities that are outside 8 Seattle University. It should be Seattle Pacific 8 that distribution system? 9 University. That's the only change. 9 A Correct. 10 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. We don't want any 10 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Thank you. 11 resume tampering. 11 Any redirect? MS. BARNETT: No. 12 12 MR. OSHIE: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE KOPTA: And I assume there is no 13 13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 14 objection to that clarification? 14 15 MR, STOKES: No, Your Honor. 15 BY MR. OSHIE: JUDGE KOPTA: Good. 16 16 Q Mr. Nightingale, Mr. Stokes was asking you a 17 All right. Is there anything else that we 17 number of questions about Schedule 80 and its 18 need to deal with this morning? 18 applicability. Just a follow-up question. I would 19 Hearing nothing, we are adjourned. Thank you. 19 like you to answer, if you know, whether or not the 20 (Evidentiary hearing concluded 11:41 a.m.) 20 provisions, the economic feasibility provisions that 21 21 are contained in Schedule 85, supersede the provisions 22 22 Mr. Stokes was referring to in Schedule 80? 23 23 A Well, the current construction of the 24 schedules is -- an economic provision resides in 24 25 25 Schedule 80, not in 85. Schedule 85 explicitly refers Page 97 Page 99 CERTIFICATE 1 to Schedule 80 and therefore the provisions in 1 2 Schedule 80 also are incorporated into 85. 2 3 MR. OSHIE: Thank you. 3 STATE OF WASHINGTON 4 COUNTY OF KING 4 No further questions. 5 5 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, 6 Mr. Nightingale. We appreciate your testimony. 6 I, Sherrilyn Smith, a Certified 7 7 And that I believe concludes our witness Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, 8 8 do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is examination. Let's go off the record for a moment and 9 9 true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill 10 10 and ability. discuss deadlines. 11 11 (A brief recess.) JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Let's be back 12 12 13 13 on the record. 14 14 While we were off the record, we had a discussion of some procedural issues. First the 15 15 16 responses to the bench requests will be due on 16 17 June 8th. With respect to the Bench Request No. 1, it 17 18 is directed to all parties, or at least all parties 18 may respond. It was directed originally to Mr. Logen 19 19 for Puget Sound Energy, but all parties may respond by 20 20 June 8th. 21 21 22 22 Simultaneous posthearing briefs will be due on 23 23 June 30th. We will not schedule a reply at this time, 24 but parties may move for permission to file a reply if 24 25 25 they feel strongly. We will deal with that issue if

<u> </u>	1			, ago 100
A	adds 64:4	48:20 49:4,8,9	51:1 73:14,16	assured 35:4
\$1 68:8	adjourned 98:19	allowed 39:20 77:3	76:14 80:7,11	AT&T 14:2 22:22
<b>\$1.8</b> 39:14,15,24	administrative	85:18	82:9,25 83:6,7,10	attached 35:9
40:17,22 41:8	12:12 13:2 22:12	allows 31:3 33:13	84:7	66:16
42:2 44:12	27:19	33:21	apply 29:8 45:6	attendance 57:15
<b>\$104</b> 42:7,9	admission 24:7	alternative 79:19	49:6,6 50:23,25	<b>Attorney</b> 13:9 14:4
<b>\$5.3</b> 48:11 52:10	admitted 24:9,14	84:9	72:15,20,24 73:3	Aug 18:9 21:8
<b>\$8</b> 16:16 18:17 39:2	25:19 52:6	amend 94:25	73:8 75:16,16	August 54:25
<b>\$8.1</b> 38:17 43:24	advice 19:5 83:18	amount 26:23	76:16 77:15 81:11	authority 36:20
48:2 52:9	84:21 85:1 89:25	47:23 48:13,20,23	81:14 83:1 85:25	37:15 45:1
a.m 12:14 22:2	90:12,19	50:3 64:1 68:25	86:8 87:16 89:10	authorizes 37:1
98:20	age 88:10	amounts 64:18	89:19 90:22	available 38:1
ability 99:10	ago 33:6	analyses 55:8	appreciate 51:6	79:12
able 55:18	agree 38:13 40:14	analysis 20:18	58:24 97:6	Avenue 12:21
absent 45:24 81:25	41:3 74:4 76:13	37:19,20,24 38:7	approach 33:5 96:5	13:15
82:1,5	79:6 80:9 90:11	38:12 39:1 44:20	appropriate 28:4	average 40:25 54:5
absolute 41:21	agreed 32:24 61:9	50:15,17 54:23	31:22 32:7,19	67:23 68:2,5
accepted 50:16	agreement 17:20	55:3,23 58:10,11	77:9	aware 62:20 63:2,5
accepted/admitted	27:14 28:19 29:2	65:19 66:13 67:22	appropriately	
59:20	29:6,7,18,20	68:10,10 89:9	82:24	B
access 30:24 56:9	30:12,17,21 31:3	analyze 85:15	approximately	<b>B</b> 73:20
accessing 88:6	31:4,6,10 32:24	annual 16:19 66:24	44:16 64:19	B-A-R-N-A-R-D
accommodate	33:2 36:4 45:24	annually 39:5	area 17:4 53:15	59:18
84:15 85:13 86:3	47:2,5 53:14	answer 76:5 86:1	65:5,18 81:18	B-A-R-R-E-T-T
account 38:4 41:4	61:11 62:16,20	96:19	86:12	23:23
66:7 68:9	72:3,9,13,19,25	answered 63:4	arises 98:1	<b>back</b> 36:10 37:6
Accounts 16:15	73:4,5,14,15,20	Answering 18:13	article 16:7	54:17 67:11,19,23
accurate 54:14	73:21,22 74:13	19:8 20:21 21:9	asked 43:12 44:1	69:25 70:5 72:22
99:9	76:25 77:24 78:23	ANTHONY 16:3	85:11	77:23 79:18 80:13
accurately 54:3	79:14 81:16,25	anticipate 57:6	asking 48:10 86:21	85:10 97:12
acknowledged	82:1,5 83:15	anticipated 88:8	87:16 89:1,21	<b>Baker</b> 16:3 71:11
57:21 62:21	agreements 17:23	anticipates 35:19	90:22,25 92:12	71:12,14
Act 16:15	27:12,15,18 28:6	anybody 78:20	96:16	<b>Ball</b> 20:15,17,21
action 46:9	28:10,12,20 29:11	appear 67:23 68:3	assertion 63:21	Barnard 15:10
actions 78:5	29:15,24 30:3	69:12 76:9	assessment 38:7	19:7,9 41:7 59:2,6
activities 31:17	45:5 49:6 61:20	appearance 23:6	assets 39:12 55:21	59:15,18 60:5,10
actual 48:12 49:25	61:24 72:1,4,7,17	appearances 22:14	66:3	60:15 69:22
<b>AD</b> 16:2 17:2 18:2	77:19 79:2 94:21	23:19	associated 29:12	<b>Barnett</b> 13:20 15:3
19:2 20:2 21:2	allocate 91:14 92:8	appears 54:10	Association 35:22	15:5,7,8,11 22:25
add 79:11 86:25	92:14	67:16,25 69:10	36:2,5	22:25 24:21,22,23
added 90:12	<b>allocated</b> 65:1,3,8	applicability 96:18	assume 27:14 38:25	24:24 25:9,10,13
addition 29:5,7	65:14,21 66:8	application 72:23	40:20 72:3 73:12	27:2 50:7,8,11
64:24 80:5	93:1	74:23	73:15 87:2 98:13	51:3,21,23 52:14
address 31:8	<b>allow</b> 30:23 77:10	applied 75:8	assuming 40:21	58:2,4,5,8,21
addressed 30:3	<b>allowance</b> 48:18,19	<b>applies</b> 29:9 46:25	44:7 81:16	59:14 60:4,5,9
				69:18,20,21 95:10

95:12 98:2,4,12 Barrett 23:9 24:20	69:6 <b>bounce</b> 67:19	calculations 53:24 54:1	14:6 <b>Cingular</b> 12:7 22:9	Complies 28:15 30:22 42:15 45:16
base 55:1 62:8,13	Box 13:5,9 14:4	Calendar 16:19	circuits 46:24	47:16
63:13 67:17	Boyer 19:13,14	call 91:10	circumstances	component 37:25
based 26:16,17	<b>Boyer's</b> 98:5	capacity 86:25	29:12 72:24	42:25 43:11 69:9
28:5 39:19 40:10	branch 27:22	capital 39:2 46:18	cite 37:1,4,7 44:24	compute 43:12
43:23 44:1 48:21	break 69:25 70:6	82:22	45:1,4	conceptual 53:11
49:10,12,15 55:20	<b>brief</b> 70:4 97:11	captioned 22:6	Cities 16:7	53:16
60:18 61:24,25	<b>briefs</b> 97:22	care 52:22	citing 77:9	conceptualize
62:2 63:21 64:3	brings 70:8	case 34:1 40:20	clarification 98:2	72:22
65:6 67:17 69:8	<b>BRITZ</b> 16:3	45:25 46:2 49:2	98:14	concern 57:20
<b>basic</b> 62:10,10 66:1	broader 81:7	50:16 74:22 79:19	clarifications 71:7	<b>concerns</b> 56:6,7,12
<b>basis</b> 62:4,15 65:2	<b>Brooks</b> 13:13 15:8	82:2 83:15 85:9	clarify 66:6	56:20 88:6
78:16	15:11 22:20 51:9	85:16,25 93:1	class 66:8,9 81:21	conclude 63:9
Beekman 16:9	52:16,19 57:24	95:24,25	classification 63:25	concluded 98:20
beginning 48:17	59:2 60:11,14	cases 41:19 53:13	<b>clear</b> 60:9 78:1	concludes 70:7
78:7	69:15	63:15	clearly 23:20	97:7
begins 39:1	Brown-Barrett	caveat 78:21	close 23:20	conclusion 62:15
believe 24:19 30:18	23:9,13,14,22,23	CCR 12:20	<b>Code</b> 36:20	63:10,14,19
32:21 33:1 35:9	<b>Buell</b> 12:21	cents 49:12	Coie 13:20 23:1	condition 95:1
35:12 37:10 42:11	<b>build</b> 39:7 77:11	certain 27:12 29:9	<b>column</b> 40:15	conditions 88:10
43:5 51:9 57:5,16	building 84:15	72:1	42:21 43:8 64:13	conduct 54:22
61:7 62:23 66:19	85:13 86:4	Certified 99:6	67:3,15,16,20	Confidential 20:18
67:10 69:2,14	built 39:7 62:23	certify 99:8	68:4,14,24 69:4	conflict 29:17,19
70:9 71:3 72:7	77:12	Chad 13:14 22:17	69:13	73:16
78:1 79:3 83:6,11	C	change 16:19 26:23	<b>Combined</b> 64:23	connected 48:23
87:9 89:25 97:7	C 13:1 14:1 16:14	41:20 44:25 53:6	come 41:25 93:14	connection 30:10
98:2	25:12 27:7 50:10	84:1,3,13 85:11	comes 69:4 83:15	consider 58:10,12
believes 32:2	51:22 52:18 58:7	86:2,11,16,19,22	commercial 91:15	66:10 79:23,25
Bellevue 13:22	59:13 60:13 70:20	91:4,6,8,9,11	92:9	consideration
bench 48:10 50:2	71:21 96:14 99:1	93:18 98:5,9	Commission 12:2	55:24
97:16,17	99:1	changed 25:22,24	12:16 13:4,7	considerations 34:19 58:14
<b>best</b> 32:3,22 45:12 99:9	cable 13:14 22:17	26:11,12,14 55:7 90:21 91:1	20:15,22 23:4 34:3 45:5 49:5	considering 26:21
better 31:21 32:5	88:10	changes 25:20	94:19,24	considers 63:3
.1	cables 55:19 56:24	26:19,21 41:18	Communications	constant 40:22
32:10,18 47:23 63:4	88:12	52:6 71:6	12:6 22:8,19	constructed 45:18
beyond 62:8,11,12	calculate 44:1 48:7	changing 92:14	company 22:24	62:17 74:6,8,10
77:4 89:4	50:3	charge 62:10	28:4 79:15,20	74:21,25 75:4,7
big 75:11	calculated 39:3	charges 83:25	85:6 86:18,21	76:8 77:3
<b>billion</b> 64:19,19	41:22 49:9	charging 45:2	90:12 93:20	construction 96:23
BNSF 12:6 13:12	calculating 66:23	check 41:3 44:22	company's 63:14	consumption 55:2
22:7,18 23:9,14	calculation 38:13	chose 33:5	63:21 96:5	contain 65:19
23:24	39:18 41:5 44:17	Cindy 14:3 22:21	compared 65:9	contained 88:3
<b>bottom</b> 35:25 68:21	47:24 49:14,18	cindy.manheim	compared 05.5	96:21

	_	<del></del>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>
context 30:14 73:9	correction 26:19	24:16,18 27:3	dangerous 79:7	16:2 17:2 18:2
continue 33:11	52:8,22 53:9	52:15 60:6 70:7	Daniel 16:8	19:2 20:2 21:2
34:11,12,13 57:7	60:24 71:10	71:16	data 17:11,13,15	designated 24:8
79:22 88:9	corrections 25:19	cstokes@cablehu	18:12,16,20,22	detail 61:21
continued 14:1	26:8 50:17 52:6	13:17	19:3,19,21,24	determine 32:6,18
17:1 18:1 19:1	59:19,21	current 72:8,10	20:3,6,8,11,13	37:21 39:13,25
20:1 21:1 56:5	cost 34:14 40:9	73:21,22 81:14,17	26:20 35:15	47:19
87:5	45:2 48:24 49:18	83:4 96:23	date 88:15	determined 93:21
continuing 78:12	49:24,25 53:3,6	currently 71:11	dated 17:22	dictated 46:9
contract 73:9,10,18	54:4 61:15 65:4	<b>customer</b> 33:2 35:5	dates 28:25	diesel 79:17
76:3,23 77:1,6,10	65:17 67:8 69:14	36:9 38:6 45:10	<b>David</b> 15:13 20:22	difference 65:20
78:2,3,10,12	77:20 84:3 86:19	48:22 57:2,14	20:23 21:10 70:12	<b>different</b> 48:5 56:4
91:19,20,23,25	91:14 92:8,14	66:8,9 83:12,13	70:25	63:6 68:2 95:25
92:12 93:22 94:25	93:25	84:4,13 85:11	days 85:24	96:7
96:1	cost-driven 34:16	86:2,25 89:10	dbarnett@perki	differently 79:9
contracts 78:19	costs 29:24 30:6,7,8	93:17,18 94:4,6,7	13:23	difficult 88:14
conversations	30:9 32:2 54:5,11	customer's 32:12	deadlines 97:10	direct 15:3,7,11,14
53:10	59:23 65:1,3,9,10	93:24	deal 97:25 98:18	16:23 17:18 19:14
<b>copy</b> 66:18 72:7	65:15,16,20 66:4	customers 17:8	<b>Dec</b> 18:10	59:21
correct 24:20,21	66:7 78:16 81:21	27:13,20 28:21	December 16:9	directed 97:18,19
29:5,25 30:1 33:8	82:13 85:7 93:13	29:5 31:16,21	decided 46:22	direction 40:6
33:9,15,22,23	95:1	32:1,4,9,17,21,24	decides 45:5	discrepancy 68:9
34:16,18,20,22	County 12:5 13:12	33:4,5 34:2,10,24	<b>decision</b> 32:3 33:25	<b>discuss</b> 34:3 97:10
35:7,14,23 36:10	16:7 22:7,18	35:3,6,20 36:13	Declaratory 12:9	discussed 24:6
36:14,15,22,23	35:16 99:4	38:2,14,18 40:1	22:10	28:12 54:11 62:25
37:20 38:14,15,18	couple 47:11 50:8	41:13 42:1,12	declined 39:11	64:11
38:19,21,25 39:1	52:22 79:7	44:3 45:2,7 46:4	deemed 93:11	discussing 34:8,10
40:7 41:1,9,10,13	course 46:17	46:13 48:23,24	defer 41:6	48:18
42:2,4,5,8,21	court 25:15 52:2	53:9,19 56:1,20	deferred 66:12	discussion 97:15
43:16,24 44:22	59:16	58:15,19 61:16,23	degrade 88:11	disparity 41:4
45:3,19,20 47:21	cover 29:4,12 39:13	62:6,21,24 65:2,3	Degraded 17:8	distinction 95:19
48:1,6 49:17	89:24 90:11	65:8,8,12,21 66:9	deliver 61:9	distributed 88:16
52:10 53:4,5	covered 46:15 87:8	72:2,16,21 77:20	delta 49:23	distribution 16:19
54:12,13,20,21	covering 62:11	77:24 79:23,25	depend 32:12	43:9 45:22 46:3
61:3 63:11,12,13	covers 96:1	80:1,3 81:11,14	depreciable 55:10	46:14,24 48:25
63:24 64:6,9,21	Cross 16:9 17:12	81:18,24,25 82:9	55:21	61:2 62:10,10
64:25 66:10 69:2	17:14,16 18:13,23	82:13,14 83:1,2,4	depreciate 39:12	63:16,22,23,25
69:11 71:4,5	19:4,6,8,20,22,25	83:7,8,10 84:1	derived 68:22	64:4,18 65:10,24
72:14,17 74:2,11	20:4,7,9,12,14,21	87:16 88:22 90:22	describe 57:12	66:2 69:4,13
75:14 76:18,22	21:9	91:16 92:10 93:2	68:13 74:7	76:17 82:5,19
77:15,21 81:9	cross-answering	93:7 95:3,20	described 56:21	91:4 94:5 95:3,20
84:12 87:18 88:19	16:21 38:11 60:18	D	87:13	95:22,23 96:4,6,8
89:18 90:8 94:21	75:18	<b>D</b> 25:12 50:10	describing 30:15	distribution-only
96:9	cross-examination	51:22 58:7 59:13	66:22	68:17,25
corrected 40:16	15:4,8,11,15 24:9	70:20 84:25 96:14	DESCRIPTION	distributions 65:3
j		70.20 07.23 30.14	}	

65:16	58:17 62:2 63:15	ensure 87:5	excuse 43:8 75:20	expressly 31:3
divide 42:6 43:13	66:11 94:3	entered 29:10	79:24 80:18	extension 17:21,24
44:13	economic 20:18	entering 29:14	excused 24:17 51:6	45:19,23 46:5,15
divided 68:16,25	37:19 49:19,24	76:24	58:24 69:23	46:20,25 48:21
divided 68:10,23	50:15 54:19 55:4	entire 68:6	executed 27:12	49:7,15 50:24
division 27:21	55:23 58:9,11	entirety 66:3	72:1	62:7,17 72:25
<b>DN-1T</b> 20:23 24:13	67:22 74:1,15,19	entities 89:3	exhibit 16:2 17:2	73:1,3,9 75:9,11
71:4,10 77:18	76:10 77:4 80:24	entitled 49:3	18:2 19:2 20:2	80:3 95:20,23
80:14 83:23 84:21	81:13 82:15 83:6	entity 84:3 85:4,6	21:2 24:10 25:21	extensions 18:5,10
86:13 89:7	96:20,24	86:5,18,18 93:12	25:22,23,23 26:10	21:4 61:18 75:12
<b>DN-2</b> 21:3	economically 33:15	environmental	26:12,13,15,17	75:15 95:21
DN-3 21:6	33:22 36:21 37:21	88:10	28:13 29:23 31:19	extent 46:6,7 59:23
<b>DN-4</b> 21:9 71:4	50:19 74:21 80:17	errors 53:21,21	35:12 36:16 38:10	73:14
<b>DN-4T</b> 24:13 75:19	80:24 81:6 83:5	54:6	38:23 40:2 42:14	
Docket 12:6 22:6	95:5	especially 73:3 88:6	43:18,19 47:15	F
document 57:12,20	economically-dri	Essentially 77:8	48:3 54:8 56:14	<b>F</b> 15:2 17:17,18
documents 28:8	36:11	establish 52:23	56:16 57:9 60:19	18:14 25:5,16,16
doing 33:14 82:23	effect 33:17 36:23	established 82:4	63:24 64:7 66:15	99:1
<b>Donna</b> 13:20 22:25	37:3 48:25	Estate 23:16 24:3	66:16 69:3 72:6	<b>facilities</b> 32:17 36:3
double 85:3	effective 17:25 18:4	estimate 52:9 53:20	80:15 83:17,18	36:6 45:1,8 61:5
double-pay 48:25	18:6,8,10 21:5,8	53:23,24	87:19 89:25 98:5	61:10,13 75:25
drafted 27:25	effectively 57:8	estimated 48:21	exhibits 16:1 17:1	76:1,4 84:2,14
drafting 27:23 53:2	73:1	49:12 53:3,6 67:8	18:1 19:1 20:1	85:5,12 87:7
dramatically 34:14	eight 62:7,12	estimates 53:11,16	21:1 24:6,8,9,14	90:20,23 91:1,9
<b>Drive</b> 12:17 13:4	either 34:17 82:25	54:4,11	25:18,20 26:22,25	91:12,15,17 92:8
drop 86:11	electric 17:24 18:3	estimating 53:18	52:5 59:20 71:4	92:10 96:6,7
dropped 64:1	18:7 19:6 21:3,6	evaluate 82:19	exist 91:24,25,25	facility 85:5 86:17
drops 86:10	32:15,16 45:1	evaluates 46:24	92:2	fact 62:21 63:14
due 26:19 86:19	61:10 74:16 75:25	event 29:17 30:4	existing 51:2 55:16	87:14 91:19
97:16,22	84:2 86:16 91:14	Evergreen 12:17	83:8 85:5 86:16	factors 53:8
duly 25:6 51:16	92:8	13:4	89:4	fail 56:25 57:3,8
59:7 70:13	electrical 17:5,21	evidence 78:19	expect 65:7,12,14	88:12,18,23 89:11
duration 46:23	91:7	evidentiary 12:10	expectancy 57:5	<b>failing</b> 91:14 92:8
88:9	Electronic 36:5	22:11 98:20	expected 26:23	fails 81:24
	eligible 49:8	exactly 84:12	55:16	failure 57:22
<u>E</u>	emergency 16:8	examination 15:1,3	<b>expense</b> 33:4 68:15	fair 62:14 86:21
E 13:1,1 14:1,1	37:25	15:4,5,7,8,11,14	experience 32:11	89:9
25:12,12 27:7	energy 13:19 23:1	15:15,16 97:8	expert 55:18	fall 32:4 84:16
47:13 50:10,10,10	24:15,19 79:20	examined 25:7	expertise 65:5,18	85:14 86:12,23
51:22,22 52:18	97:20	51:17 59:8 70:14	experts 39:8	87:2
58:7,7,7 59:13,13	Energy's 70:8	exceeded 79:4	expired 35:18	falls 86:5
60:13 70:20,20	engineering 46:22	exception 28:23	<b>explain</b> 48:19 90:19	familiar 61:17,20
71:21 95:16 96:14	53:13	74:22 77:9	explains 56:20	far 27:23 55:4
96:14,14 99:1,1	<b>enhance</b> 87:17 89:3	excerpts 16:14 18:4	explicitly 96:25	faults 19:17 57:4
e-mail 56:19	89:21	18:8	exploration 79:19	favor 29:21
earlier 34:11 53:9				feasibility 20:18
	•	•	•	•

25 10 51 10 25		70 17 01 02 00 02	1	1 46.10
37:19 54:19,25	Form 19:11	78:15 81:23 88:23	higher 44:4 94:2	46:18
55:23 58:14,20	Fort 23:24	89:11 93:10	highest 41:9,21	incentive 82:6
74:1,15 76:11	<b>found</b> 49:5	Good 22:16 26:6	historically 96:1	include 29:24 30:8
80:24 81:13 83:6	four 28:20,21	27:9,10 51:24,25	history 88:4	37:24 38:7 55:24
96:20	fourth 12:21 13:21	52:20,21 59:15	home 75:15	included 66:4 81:7
feasible 33:15,22	21:4,7 42:21	60:15,16 71:23,24	Honor 22:16 24:24	includes 31:7 65:24
37:22 50:19 74:21	frame 95:14	98:16	27:2 47:7,10 51:4	65:25 66:1
80:17 81:6 83:5	frequency 46:23	Gorman 16:10,12	52:14 58:2,5,22	including 66:3 76:1
fed 48:5	88:8	16:13,21 38:16	60:4 69:18,21	76:16
Federal 16:15	front 37:9 54:8	40:7,25 43:16	70:2,18 71:17	inconsistent 76:3
feeding 47:22	60:19	63:24	95:9 96:12 98:15	incorporate 73:5
feel 97:25	Frontier 12:6 13:12	Gorman's 38:12	hook 93:20	76:10 95:1
FERC 19:11	22:8,19 35:17,18	44:5,20 50:15,17	hopefully 70:1	incorporated 31:6
Fifth 13:15	full 69:10	63:8 68:10 75:24	horizon 55:3	97:2
figure 31:22 43:24	<b>fully</b> 61:15 62:24	governed 45:23	hospitals 38:6	increase 34:14 87:1
48:11	function 69:14	46:4 47:4,5	58:18	88:9,21,23 93:19
file 97:24	<b>further</b> 47:6 51:3	governing 61:18	hour 49:12	increased 64:23
filed 40:20 90:18	58:21 69:15 95:8	76:4	hours 48:22 49:13	increasing 88:7
filing 19:6 83:18	97:4	grabbed 66:18	hurdle 91:18	increasingly 88:14
84:22 90:1,12,19	future 34:13	graciously 66:12	<b>Huston</b> 13:14 22:17	incurred 30:8
final 78:18	G	grade-out 40:15	hypothetical 86:8,9	incurring 81:21
<b>find</b> 40:6 53:19		gray 67:2,20 68:14	91:23 92:1,3,6	independently
findings 26:24	G 18:3,7 21:3,6	<b>Gregory</b> 12:12 13:3		40:10
finish 70:1	66:4 74:16	16:3 22:11		<b>INDEX</b> 15:1 16:1
FIRESTONE 16:4	general 14:4 18:3,7	Gross 19:11	identical 65:2	17:1 18:1 19:1
firm 22:18,20	21:6 33:20 38:2	group 40:9,10	identified 36:19	20:1 21:1
first 17:15 24:19	45:21 46:2,19	46:12,22 88:16	63:15 78:7 79:14	indicate 29:23
25:6 34:7 42:3	56:2 66:2 79:14	GTE 17:21 27:14	identifying 39:1	77:18
51:16 59:7 62:24	84:5 92:23 93:5	guys 37:19	Ignore 91:20 92:25	indicated 53:2
67:7,25 70:13	95:19,21	H	ignoring 45:21 46:2	54:18 66:23
75:23 79:14 86:15	General's 13:9		II 12:10	indicates 45:17
88:3 91:18 97:15	generation 32:13	half 62:8,12	illegally 36:13	80:6
five-eighths 44:10	66:3	hand 25:2 51:13	illustrate 64:10	industrial 91:16
Flipping 77:23	generator 79:17	70:10	impact 16:16 18:17	92:9
focusing 85:24	<b>GEORGE</b> 16:3	handled 27:19 28:3	26:24 38:13,18,20	inferred 30:6
folks 53:17	germane 84:24	happen 30:3	39:25 41:12 42:1	information 69:13
<b>follow</b> 64:13	getting 79:7 83:20	heard 25:18 52:5	43:10,12 44:2	infrastructure
follow-up 96:18	give 23:19 37:15	68:13 81:4	59:25 68:1	46:17
<b>follows</b> 25:7 51:17	glad 60:7	hearing 12:10	impacts 38:8 40:7	initiative 93:16
59:9 70:14	go 41:12 44:21	22:11 23:7,18	55:4	input 48:2,8 67:17
<b>footer</b> 25:22	53:12 67:11 75:19	24:17 26:3 98:19	importance 55:24	inputs 39:19,19
foregoing 99:8	81:24 85:10 87:20	98:20	58:10	install 78:8
foreseeable 34:13	91:18 97:9	Hey 93:10	imposed 84:3	installation 78:10
Forest 34:24 71:12	goes 27:23 41:9	Hi 22:21	imposing 82:13	78:17 96:2
71:13	85:7 87:6 89:14	high 53:23 54:4	83:25	installed 46:11
	going 46:14 78:14	61:25	improvement	

75:25 76:6,11,17	Jennifer 16:4 19:13	Katherine 15:10	labeled 42:10 56:13	<b>LFL-15</b> 19:5 24:12
76:19,21	19:14 98:5	19:7,9 59:6,17	64:22 67:15	83:18 90:8,9
installing 78:4	Jenny 88:5	kilowatt 48:22	lack 34:21 47:23	LFL-1T 17:18
instance 94:2	JLB-1T 20:16	49:12,13	language 76:15	24:11 29:23 31:20
intent 78:2	24:13	kind 45:24 84:15	78:11 80:15 81:5	37:6 48:16
interest 37:25	JLB-2C 20:18	85:13	81:7,10 82:9,25	LFL-2 17:19
interested 49:23	<b>JLB-3</b> 20:19	kinds 56:10	83:24 84:4 86:5	LFL-3 17:20
interpret 28:9	<b>JLB-4</b> 20:21 24:13	King 12:5 13:12	86:13	LFL-4 17:23 28:14
77:18	JMS-1T 16:23	16:7 22:7,18	LaRhonda 23:13	72:6 77:23
interprets 29:23	24:11 52:8	35:16 99:4	23:22	LFL-5 17:24
invest 82:21	<b>JMS-2</b> 17:3	<b>KJB-1T</b> 19:8 24:12	late 59:4	LFL-6 18:3
investment 16:17	JMS-3 17:4	60:19	law 12:12 13:2	LFL-7 18:7
18:17 39:3,4,13	JMS-4 17:5	<b>KJB-2</b> 19:10	22:12,18,20	LFL-8 18:12 35:12
40:11 41:16 47:20	JMS-5 17:7	<b>KJB-3</b> 19:11 24:12	lease 36:2	LFL-8T 25:23
47:23 48:12 63:11	<b>JMS-6</b> 17:10	64:7	leasing 36:6	LFL-9T 18:13
63:15,20,22,22	JMS-7 17:11 56:14	know 28:16 32:8	legally 36:9	25:21,23,23 26:10
64:4 65:23	57:9 87:20	34:15 36:17 37:12	let's 22:5,14 33:12	26:12 38:10
involved 27:17,24	JMS-8 17:13	43:17 55:12 66:15	37:11 38:10,22	life 30:17,18 40:23
53:18	<b>JMS-9</b> 17:15 24:11	73:8 82:4,7,8 83:8	41:24,24 42:13	41:1 55:10,21
issue 24:25 34:16	54:8	86:1,4,8,10 90:15	69:24 75:18 83:17	57:5 79:4
34:18,21 62:9	job 48:24 82:24	96:19	83:17 84:14,25	lifecycle 78:6
82:23 87:12 97:25	Joint 16:6	knowledge 30:14	85:10,12 86:13	line 16:17 17:9,24
issues 97:15	<b>JOT-1T</b> 16:6 24:10	35:8 45:12 61:9	87:19 89:25 97:9	18:5,9,18 19:17
	<b>JOT-2</b> 16:7 24:10	99:9	97:12	20:20 21:3 25:24
J	<b>JR</b> 16:4	Kopta 12:12 13:3	letter 17:7 89:24	26:10,12,14 29:13
<b>J</b> 12:12 13:3,8	judge 12:12 13:2	15:4,15 22:5,12	90:11,18	30:4,17,24 31:11
15:10 19:7,9 59:6	15:4,15 22:5,12	22:23 23:2,5,11	level 61:25 89:4	31:14,17 32:19
J-A-S-O-N 52:3	22:23 23:2,5,11	23:17,25 24:4,23	94:2	33:4,8,11 34:6,8
<b>JAB-10</b> 20:10	23:17,25 24:4,23	25:1,9 26:4,6,9	levy 16:8	34:12,17 35:2
<b>JAB-11</b> 20:13	25:1,9 26:4,6,9	27:4 47:8,11,14	<b>LFL</b> 37:11 90:1	37:12,21 40:23
24:13	27:4 47:8,11,14	50:5 51:5,11,19	LFL-10 18:15	41:1 42:6,16 45:3
<b>JAB-1T</b> 19:14	50:5 51:5,11,19	52:16 58:1,3,23	26:15,22 38:22	45:11,18,18,22,23
24:12	52:16 58:1,3,23	59:3,11 60:7,11	47:15 66:20 67:11	46:3,4,5,15,19,25
<b>JAB-2</b> 19:15 98:5	59:3,11 60:7,11	69:17,19,22 70:3	67:24 68:4	47:4 48:17,21
<b>JAB-3</b> 19:17	69:17,19,22 70:3	70:5,16 71:18	LFL-11 18:17	49:3,7,15 50:19
<b>JAB-4</b> 19:18	70:5,16 71:18	90:7 95:10,13,17	26:17,22 40:4,14	50:23,24,24,25
<b>JAB-5</b> 19:21	90:7 95:10,13,17	96:10 97:5,12	41:24 42:17 66:19	51:2 52:9 53:1
<b>JAB-6</b> 19:23	96:10 97:5,12	98:10,13,16	66:21,21 67:2,20	55:1,12,16 56:5
<b>JAB-7</b> 20:3	98:10,13,16		67:25 68:12 69:3	56:24 57:21 61:1
<b>JAB-8</b> 20:5	June 18:6 21:5	L	69:11	61:2,6,16,18 62:4
<b>JAB-9</b> 20:8	97:17,21,23	L 13:20 16:3 20:15	LFL-12 18:20	62:5,6,12,17,22
January 36:24	justifies 83:25	20:16,21	36:17	62:23 63:9 67:4,5
<b>Jason</b> 15:6 16:22		L-A-R-H-O-N-D	LFL-13 18:22	67:9 68:23,24
16:23 17:7 20:15	K	23:23	45:15	71:11 72:24 73:1
20:16,21 51:15	K-A-T-H-E-R-I	L-O-G-E-N 25:17	LFL-14 19:3	73:3,9 74:5,7,20
52:3	59:17	L-Y-N-N 25:16		
	I ·	1	<u> </u>	1

	1		I	
74:24 75:8,8,11	87:15 93:15	32:1 35:22 36:1,3	26:16,17,18 38:17	N
75:12,15 76:8,17	looked 41:21 43:10	36:4 45:2,17 47:3	39:2,4,9,14,15,17	N 13:1 14:1 25:12
76:19 77:11 78:9	63:25 79:19	50:19 55:12 56:5	39:17,18,20,24	25:12 27:7,7
78:14,15,21 79:3	looking 28:18	56:19 57:21 61:2	40:11,17,22 41:8	47:13,13 50:10,10
79:8,12 80:2,7	35:13 40:12 64:17	61:6 62:7 72:2,15	42:2,4,7,9,20	51:22,22 52:18,18
87:1 88:18,23	65:22 67:25 80:13	76:5,19 77:19	43:13,14,24 44:12	58:7,7 59:13,13
89:11,14 90:15	81:10 92:12	79:3,11 84:1 88:3	44:14 48:2,11	60:13,13 70:20,20
91:11,11,25 92:2	lot 66:18 77:14	92:14,19 95:2,4	52:9,10 53:4	71:21,21 95:16,16
92:4,15,18,20	loud 94:23	manager 23:16	59:24 67:8,17	96:14,14
93:9,9 94:18 95:3	loudly 23:20	24:3 27:21,22	68:8 69:4	N-I-G-H-T-I-N
95:4,4,20,21 96:3	low 54:4 65:7,13	Manheim 14:3	minor 16:3 98:4	71:1
lines 31:24 46:11	lower 65:9,14 68:6	22:21,21	minutes 57:13	name 25:14,16 52:1
46:14 59:22 63:2	68:7	manufacturer 87:4	69:24,25	52:2 59:16,17
77:3 80:22 81:1	lump 64:5	94:3	missing 78:11	70:23,23,24
82:19 86:3 91:4	<b>Lynn</b> 15:2 17:17,18	map 88:15	misunderstood	names 28:24
94:23	18:14 25:5,16	margin 48:18,19,20	46:1	National 12:24
list 24:10	3.5	49:4,8,9	<b>mobile</b> 75:15	71:12,13
little 23:18 85:2	<u>M</u>	<b>Mary</b> 88:5	model 18:15 39:6,6	necessary 31:23
LLC 12:8,21 22:9	M 13:14 15:6 16:22	materials 55:15,17	39:19 47:17,18,22	32:6 76:2 82:8
LLP 13:14,20	16:23 17:7 25:12	Mathisen 16:4	48:11 66:21	need 46:14 47:20
load 45:10 65:7	27:7 47:13 50:10	23:15,15,25 24:1	<b>modeling</b> 39:8,16	72:22 78:7 98:18
81:19	51:15,22 52:3,3	24:1 26:1	modifications 51:1	needed 39:13 77:12
loads 65:13	52:18 58:7 59:13	matter 12:4 22:6	71:7 94:20	needing 57:22
located 90:21	60:13 70:20 71:21	46:16,17	<b>modify</b> 29:11	needs 30:4 79:8
<b>location</b> 45:7 80:18	95:16 96:14	mean 46:7 58:12	moment 97:9	81:19 82:8,20
84:14 85:12 86:2	M-A-T-H-I-S-E-N	66:2 74:16,17	morning 22:16	negotiate 27:20
86:11,22	24:2	82:1,4,18 86:7	24:6 27:9,10	negotiations 27:17
<b>Logen</b> 15:2 17:17	maintain 31:14	91:6 93:15	48:12 51:24,25	net 16:19 63:11,20
17:18 18:14 24:19	33:7 34:12 46:10	meaning 27:12	52:20,21 58:25	64:14
25:5,14,16,17	78:9 79:8 82:7	28:9,12 36:10	59:15 60:15,16	never 78:18 87:6
27:3,9 47:15	maintained 82:18	72:1	69:23 70:6 71:23	new 12:7 22:9
50:12 51:6 62:1	maintaining 30:10	meeting 17:6 53:19	71:24 98:18	34:24 50:24 78:7
62:25 66:11,22	33:11 78:4	57:13,14,15	mountainous 56:9	78:9 83:7,10,13
68:13 97:19	maintains 94:5	mentioned 72:16	move 24:18 41:24	84:15 85:13 86:3
Logen's 58:17	maintenance 20:19	methods 93:21	63:6 97:24	Nightingale 15:13
59:23 61:7 66:16	30:8 31:16,22	Michael 16:4,10,11	moving 36:8 45:7	20:22,24 21:10
long 55:12,19 56:16	32:3,6,18,21	16:13,21	MPG-1T 16:11	70:9,12,22,25,25
76:2 78:21 95:4	34:14 56:5 61:12	microphone 26:2	24:11	71:2,15,23 96:16
longer 55:16 81:25	61:14,15 77:5	microwave 79:15	MPG-2 16:13	97:6
82:15 89:11	78:11,17 96:2	mike 23:15,20 24:1	MPG-3 16:14	nonresidential
look 35:25 37:13	majority 54:6	mile 62:12	MPG-416:16	75:13
40:15 42:16 55:4	making 52:24	miles 62:8	MPG-516:19	normal 72:23 74:22
58:15 62:9 67:2,5	Maloney 16:17	million 16:16 18:17	MPG-6T 16:21	78:6 80:3 96:3
67:14 84:23 85:15	17:4,5,8 18:17	25:24,25 26:11,11	24:11	normally 82:3
85:17 86:9,13	19:17 20:20 27:13	26:13,13,15,15,16	Mt 71:12	Northeast 13:21
	28:21 29:4 30:4			
L.		•		

NI 41 410 6	.1	70.10	(7.11.12.20.69.4	1-20.4.92.7
Northwest 12:6	okay 23:11,17,25	option 79:12	67:11,13,20 68:4	people 28:4 82:7
22:8 23:16 24:2	26:6 28:2,5,8,13	options 20:19 45:4	69:3,11 71:11	percent 38:17,20
notes 17:6 74:1	29:1,10,16,22	79:20	75:19,20 80:14,15	40:8 43:21 44:16
Nov 17:25	30:16 31:8 33:10	order 12:9 22:10	80:20,21,25 83:23	44:21,21 53:7,25
number 37:10	33:12,24 34:4	41:25 68:21 94:20	87:15,25 89:7	54:1,2,2 66:23
38:17 39:7,14,15	36:8,16,19,25	94:25	94:9,13,15,16	68:18,22 69:1,8
39:15,24 40:17,18	37:11,18,24 38:5	Oregon 13:16	98:6	percentage 53:25
41:8,11,22 42:1,2	38:16,22,25 39:10	original 27:13	pages 12:11 25:22	65:9
42:23 44:2,11,13	39:14 40:12 41:3	53:20,22,24 72:2	paid 95:3	perform 31:16
53:15,22 55:7	41:8,15,24 42:13	78:2	paragraph 29:2,16	performed 37:19
57:4 58:19 66:24	42:17,20 43:23	originally 45:18	30:6,20,23 31:10	37:20 39:18 54:19
67:16,21 68:2,6	44:6,9,20,24	74:5,10 97:19	31:13 72:13 73:13	58:10
68:16,17,21,22	45:10,13,15 47:3	<b>Oshie</b> 13:8 15:14	73:20 75:6 87:10	period 54:22 64:20
69:4 88:7 96:17	48:10,15 56:15,18	15:16 23:3,3 47:9	88:3 91:13 92:7	68:6
numbers 54:14	57:11 67:4,6 72:6	47:10 58:1 69:17	94:12	Perkins 13:20
55:10 67:23	72:8,11,20 73:19	70:17,18,21 71:15	Paragraphs 31:9	22:25 28:1
	73:23 74:12,17	96:12,15 97:3	parentheses 69:5	permission 97:24
0	75:4,7,18 77:17	outage 88:4	<b>Park</b> 12:17 13:4	permit 34:24 35:17
O 25:12 27:7,7	79:1,10,23 80:5	outages 32:12,13	parks 75:15	35:18,19,21 36:7
47:13 50:10 51:22	81:3,13 84:13	32:14 46:23,23	part 16:15 41:4	permits 34:25 35:1
52:18,18 58:7	85:8,10,23 86:1	57:7 88:7,14,15	52:25 61:2 62:5	<b>Petition</b> 12:4 22:7
59:13 60:13,13	86:25 87:4,19,24	output 47:18,24	62:15,22 63:3,6	Petitioner 18:12,15
70:20 71:21,21	88:1 89:14,24	<b>outside</b> 76:11 83:14	73:1,11 75:2	petitioners 16:3,10
95:16 96:14	90:15,18,25 91:3	96:3,7	76:14 78:11 84:17	17:12,14,16 18:20
O&M 42:3 44:12	91:21 92:21,24	overall 64:3	86:20 93:6,21,22	18:23 19:4,6,19
68:15	94:9,17 96:10	overhead 53:25	93:25 94:20	19:19,22,24 20:4
o0o 14:23 15:23	98:10	54:1	participating 24:17	20:6,9,11,14
21:23 22:3	<b>Olympia</b> 12:17,23	overheads 54:3	particular 47:20	22:15,17 24:16
oath 24:25 25:6	13:5,10 22:1	ownership 62:3	49:15 62:9 85:9	35:16 38:1 49:2
51:16 59:7 70:13	once 82:4		85:16	50:13,23 55:25
objection 98:14	ones 32:11	<u> </u>	parties 24:6 30:3	63:9 78:6,20
obligation 46:19	ongoing 96:2	P 13:1,1 14:1,1	50:16 77:11 88:18	79:13 89:2
94:6	open 53:1	16:10,12,13,21	94:25 97:18,18,20	phase 78:13,18
obligations 61:23	opening 16:6,11	<b>P.O</b> 13:5	97:24	phone 23:18 26:3
occasions 53:22	48:16 76:9 77:17	<b>Pacific</b> 23:15 24:2	parts 75:10,16	93:8,10
occur 29:17	80:14 94:9,12	98:8	85:25	Photographs 17:4
<b>October</b> 57:14 90:4	<b>operating</b> 30:6,7,10	page 15:2,6,10,13	party 44:25	physical 91:9
<b>OFD</b> 16:2 17:2	79:15 90:20	19:12 25:23 26:10	passed 28:3	pick 93:8,10
18:2 19:2 20:2	operation 32:2	26:12,14 31:24	Patrick 13:8 23:3	piece 58:19 80:2,3
21:2	61:14 62:3 77:5	37:7,11 38:11,11	Pause 35:11 83:21	place 32:13 62:24
off-the-record 23:8	78:12 96:3	38:23 40:15 41:25	87:23	81:17 91:19 96:1
offers 27:2 52:15	opined 27:11 71:25	42:13,13,14,17	pay 81:19 85:6	<b>plan</b> 46:18
60:5	opportunities	48:16 52:8 53:1	86:18 93:7,20	<b>plant</b> 16:19 19:11
office 13:9 27:22	53:12	54:18 56:17 57:10	94:7	55:10 63:11,16,17
<b>Oh</b> 23:11 44:6 67:2	opposed 67:22	59:22 60:22,23	<b>PCS</b> 12:7 22:9	63:20,22 64:14,24
92:5		61:22 63:7 67:3,3		
	I .	I	l .	I

			<del></del>	1 age 100
65:23 87:6,7	previously 81:4	20:5,8,10,13 21:3	65:17 66:12 68:12	Realtime 12:21
play 58:20 83:15	primary 29:4	21:6 27:2 28:21	68:20 72:12 73:19	reason 29:14
please 23:12 25:3	probably 52:22	32:2 33:3 50:12	75:23,23 78:14	reasonable 87:1
25:14,15 52:1,2	57:6 71:12 79:17	50:16 52:14 58:10	83:3 85:10 92:6	reasonably 92:14
59:2,15 70:22	86:22 93:23	60:4 72:3 79:22	92:11,19 95:13	reasoning 90:19
87:20	procedural 97:15	80:16 82:18 88:5	96:18	recall 27:19 41:2
<b>PO</b> 13:9 14:4	proceed 23:7	88:17	questions 47:9	66:14
point 30:2,16 31:2	proceeding 22:11	PSE's 61:2	48:15 50:6,21	receiving 32:10
31:25 34:15 41:9	45:21 65:7 84:24	public 37:24 38:2	51:3 52:23 57:25	recess 70:4 97:11
41:22 57:8 58:17	94:20	56:1	58:2,22 60:17	recital 73:20
60:22 77:23 79:5	proceedings 35:11	Puget 13:19 23:1	62:3 69:16,18	recitals 73:25 76:9
93:17	83:21 87:23	24:15,18 29:10,23	70:9 96:17 97:4	79:13
pointing 77:8	process 28:11 33:6	30:9,23 31:3,11	quite 66:14 95:14	reclassification
points 64:10	35:17 82:18	31:13,21 32:5,15	quote 80:15 83:23	64:2
policies 45:23	procured 36:9,13	33:7,11,14,21,24	84:20	reclassified 63:16
policy 46:5,15,20	production 65:25	34:5,7 35:1 36:12	quoted 86:6,14	63:23
46:25 48:21 62:18	professional 17:3	37:1,20 38:2	<b></b>	recognizing 65:23
75:9,11,12	17:19 19:10,15	54:18 55:8 56:6,8	R	recollection 27:25
portion 65:15	98:6	61:5,9,12 63:2	<b>R</b> 13:1 14:1 25:12	recommend 94:24
Portland 13:16	program 33:3	67:21 70:7 81:17	27:7 50:10,10	recommended
pose 56:5	project 49:19,24	81:22 82:12 83:4	51:22 52:18 58:7	94:19
poshie@utc.wa.g	78:13 85:4	88:22 90:18 91:13	58:7 59:13 60:13	reconstruct 49:3
13:11	<b>provide</b> 34:2 61:14	92:7,13 93:9,13	70:20 71:21 96:14	record 22:5 24:5,14
<b>position</b> 31:21 32:5	80:16	94:5 97:20	96:14 99:1	70:6 90:7 97:9,13
32:10,18,22 36:12	provided 38:1	Puget's 17:8 29:20	radio 16:8	97:14
56:23 57:1	55:25 56:25 65:7	45:22 54:10 56:1	Railway 12:6 22:7	recover 47:20
posthearing 97:22	78:19 88:13 89:12	56:23 61:17 62:5	22:18 23:10,14,24	redirect 15:5,8,16
Potelco 56:8	91:7	62:22 63:11,20	raise 25:2 51:12	50:7 58:4 96:11
Potelco's 88:5	<b>provider</b> 32:16,16	68:10 84:14 85:12	70:10	Redmond 14:5
power 16:15 55:2	56:8	86:3 90:12 92:22	range 44:18	reduced 53:6 54:2
58:12	<b>provision</b> 31:2 34:4	95:18	ranking 82:21	59:24
powering 79:16	44:24 74:4 76:24	purely 55:20	rate 38:17,20 39:20	reduction 63:10,20
practice 82:3	77:2 84:22 85:14	purport 28:9	40:20 41:12,19,25	64:18
precedence 73:10	86:23 87:2,8,15	pursuant 30:9	42:16 43:11 44:2	redundant 87:7
predecessor 29:10	88:17 89:10 96:24	74:15 75:1,2	63:15 67:17	refer 37:8
<b>prefiled</b> 24:7 27:11	provisions 18:4,8	76:23	ratepayers 38:8	reference 52:9
60:18 71:3,9,25	21:7 29:21 31:5,7	push 16:7	81:21	59:22 73:24 74:20
prepared 32:14	74:16 77:14,15		rates 40:21 41:16	77:1 83:22 98:7
40:6,8,10	80:24 92:13 96:20	Q	41:20 43:11,13	referenced 72:18
present 33:17,19	96:20,21 97:1	qualifications	69:9	84:22
presiding 22:13	<b>PSE</b> 16:9,22 17:11	16:13 17:3,19	read 26:21 86:15	references 30:17
<b>pretty</b> 56:16	17:13,15,17,21,24	19:10,16 98:6	88:2,17 94:23	referencing 59:23
preventive 31:22	18:3,7,12,15,20	quality 94:2	reading 74:4 84:4	referred 30:19
32:3,20	18:22 19:3,7,13	question 29:1 31:9	real 23:16,19 24:2	referring 31:19
previous 68:24	19:18,21,23 20:3	36:10 41:6 54:24	really 55:18 61:19	33:16,20 37:13
·		63:4,18 65:4,11	65:4 86:8 93:11	
•		I	I	

	<u> </u>			1,10,10,25,25
repeat 23:12 26:7	85:4,6 86:5,17,18	18:18 39:2,3,13	rounding 53:21	74:18,18,23,25
repaired 89:15	requesting 84:2	revenue 16:17	rounded 53:21	73:16 74:12,13,16
repair 30:8	90:21	return 39:20	room 66:11,14	72:15 73:5,6,7,11
renewing 35:17	requested 84:2	retirement 43:4	risk 58:19	65:24 68:23 69:9
78:10	97:17	resume 98:11	35:23	62:11 65:2,8,13
renewed 30:25	85:13 93:6 94:1,4	Results 17:10	rights 30:11 35:6	49:11 50:22,23,25 51:1 61:17 62:6
renewal 35:19	48:10 50:2 84:16	resulting 81:20	right-of-way 34:22	47:4 49:6,10,10
remove 78:14	20:13 26:20 35:15	resulted 53:8	98:17	44:3,25 46:10,11
removal 91:11,11	19:24 20:3,6,8,11	61:12 77:20 78:20	87:11 97:5,12	42:24,25 43:7,11
remember 27:22	18:22 19:3,19,21	responsible 32:1	79:5 82:10 84:5	41:12 42:1,10,12
remains 78:21 95:5	17:15 18:12,16,20	77:25 78:4,5	71:18 75:11 77:13	38:14,18 40:1
remaining 81:21	request 17:11,13	31:14 32:25 33:7	67:19 70:5,10	33:13,16,21 34:4
rely 76:10 79:21	23:1,3	responsibility	54:24 62:14 64:14	29:8,9 31:6 33:12
relocated 90:23	representing 22:18	responses 97:16	50:4 51:5,11,13	18:3,5,7,9 21:3,6
93:19	42:23	45:17 62:2 63:7	44:9,14,17 48:14	schedule 17:24,24
89:4,4,17,22	representative	35:20,24,25 37:5	40:16 41:14,19	80:16 84:5 90:20
87:17 88:11,22,24	represent 42:9	20:13 26:20 35:16	34:3 37:10 39:22	76:13,23 79:6
reliability 87:10,12	Reporting 12:21	19:23 20:3,5,8,10	27:4 30:24 33:19	73:8,13,18 74:25
relatively 65:13	59:16 99:7	18:22 19:3,18,21	right 24:4,5 25:2	46:10 49:11 71:11
Relating 17:20	reporter 25:15 52:2	17:15 18:12,15,20	95:2,4	says 30:7 36:1
related 56:9	REPORTED 12:20	response 17:11,13	84:1 88:4 92:19	saying 57:3 76:20
reimbursing 62:24	reply 97:23,24	88:14 97:19,20	77:19 79:3,12	62:1,25
reimbursed 61:15	96:7	respond 32:9 75:24	72:15 76:6,19	52:20 58:9,23
68:3	46:16 79:11 96:6	respect 97:17	61:2,6 62:7 72:2	51:15,24 52:3,15
regulated 39:9,11	replacing 34:10	resolved 29:21	56:5,20 57:21	16:24 17:7 51:10
94:4	replaces 85:5 93:13	resides 96:24	47:3 50:19 55:12	<b>Sanders</b> 15:6 16:22
regular 93:5,22	82:22	91:15 92:9	36:2,3,5 45:2,18	sake 91:22
81:5	replacements 46:21	75:12 82:13,14	30:4 32:1 35:22	56:6,7,7,12 88:6
57:21 66:12 77:5	95:2	residential 46:12	27:13 28:21 29:5	safety 34:18,19
34:21 50:15,21	88:11 91:4,10	rerun 48:11	17:9 18:18 19:17	73:12,15
regarding 32:3	76:16 77:20 81:20	42:11 78:8	<b>Ridge</b> 16:17 17:4,5	safe 27:14 72:3
36:21	53:3 56:24 76:1,2	requirements 40:9	54:1,3,10	52:4
refusing 34:7 36:8	47:3 50:18,18,25	74:1	21:7 26:23 44:2	S-A-N-D-E-R-S
refused 50:12	45:11,22 46:4	68:1,23 69:9,10	revised 17:15 21:4	71:21,21
81:17 83:4	33:4 37:4,21	47:19,25 66:5	28:11 61:21 72:4	52:18,18 60:13,13
34:5 37:1,15	replacement 29:24	42:24 43:1,6,9	reviewed 27:15	S 13:1 14:1 27:7,7
refuse 33:14,21	79:4 81:19 93:11	40:16 42:3,12,17	review 28:8 85:19	S
refusal 84:11	46:14,22 57:22	18:19 39:2,4	revert 79:18	
reflects 54:5	replaced 30:5 46:8	requirement 16:18	68:3	rural 81:18
reflect 54:2 57:20	78:15,23 81:22,23	86:17,17 95:23	revenues 39:9,11	34:2 37:9
refineries 58:18	46:2 55:15 67:8	required 80:16	69:8,10	rules 18:4,8,10 21:7
96:25	34:5,8,17 35:1	require 77:19	55:2 66:5 68:1,23	rule-based 36:20
refers 74:10,18	replace 16:8 30:12	93:18 97:16	43:4,6,9 47:19,24	37:7,13
96:22	rephrase 88:25	requests 44:25 85:4	40:9,16 42:3,10	rule 36:23,25 37:4
40:2 76:6 84:17	63:18 65:11	89:3,3 93:12 94:8	40:9,16 42:3,10	row 64:22

				1 ago 110
75:3,4,8 76:1,3,6	31:10 32:11,16,23	situations 29:9	stand 25:2 70:10	substitutes 73:1
76:7,8,12,14,17	33:2,3,14,21	74:20	stand 23.2 70.10 standing 51:12	subtract 42:3 44:12
76:20,21,24 77:2	34:12,24 36:9,10	skill 99:9	standing 31.12	48:23
77:9,13,13 80:1,5	36:14,21 37:1,16	small 71:10 81:19	start 60:17 75:23	subtracting 68:14
80:7,11,25 81:8	38:4 40:9 45:5	Smith 12:20 99:6	started 33:5	successor 94:25
81:10 83:24 84:16	46:3 49:5 50:12	99:17	starting 22:14 33:3	Suite 12:22 13:15
84:17 91:14 92:7	53:13 55:13 56:8	Snoqualmie 71:11	39:15 68:14	13:21
92:13 93:5,6,18	56:25 58:11 61:10	71:13	state 25:14 29:16	sum 64:5
93:24 94:5 96:17	61:11,20,23 62:16	snow 88:13	31:20 33:21 35:24	summarize 31:20
96:21,22,25,25	65:4,17 66:1	Sobieski 28:22 88:4	52:1 59:16 68:20	summary 17:10
97:1,2,23	69:14 72:1,7,16	somewhat 44:4,6,8	70:23,23 76:5,9	19:17 88:2
scheduled 42:17	73:14,15 74:2	sorry 23:11 24:23	76:12 80:19,23,23	supersede 96:21
schedules 29:3,8,20	77:19,24 80:17	26:1,4 43:3 44:11	87:14 89:5 99:3,7	supersedes 73:4
96:24	81:16,17,25 82:1	46:1 56:7 67:2,3	stated 31:25 33:1	supported 26:24
se 50:24	83:4 84:11 86:10	67:19 72:10 73:15	34:11 53:9 55:1	63:1
seated 51:20	86:11 87:5 88:13	80:15 83:20 92:5	statement 61:1	sure 23:22 57:3
<b>Seattle</b> 12:22,23	89:11 91:5,7,16	94:14	63:1	65:12 68:21 71:13
16:7 98:8,8	93:19 94:21	sound 13:19 23:1	states 29:19 75:24	83:8 87:5 95:14
second 33:12 67:15	services 38:1 49:1	24:15,19 44:17	77:24 84:1	surprised 82:3
85:3	55:25	70:8 97:20	stating 95:1	SW 13:4
section 30:9 36:20	serving 81:18	source 58:12	status 35:21	sworn 25:6 51:16
74:18 76:16 84:18	set 41:16 48:15	South 12:17 13:4	stay 51:12 93:12	59:7 70:13
84:21 90:13 93:17	shared 88:5	Southwest 12:17	stays 40:22	system 16:8 45:22
sections 95:2	<b>sheet</b> 21:4,7 85:1,2	13:15	Steps 17:6	46:24 47:1 57:3,4
securing 30:10	Sherrilyn 12:20	<b>space</b> 36:6	stipulated 24:7	58:16 61:3 62:5,8
see 40:7 42:20 44:6	99:6,17	<b>speak</b> 23:20	<b>Stokes</b> 13:14 15:4	62:11,13,16,22
57:18 84:25 85:17	ship 87:4 94:3	speaking 32:20	15:15 22:16,17	63:3 66:2 82:5,7
87:20 89:25 92:11	Shorthand 99:7	speaks 61:22 87:10	27:4,5,8 47:6,8	82:21 88:11,12,15
sense 80:4 86:9	show 39:8	special 47:2,5 82:5	50:21 70:2 71:19	89:22 92:22 93:22
92:1	showing 88:15	83:15 93:22 94:1	71:22 90:9,10	93:25 94:6 95:19
sentence 30:7 85:3	shows 39:17 40:18	specific 31:5 49:14	95:8 96:16,22	95:20,22 96:4,6,8
86:15	64:14,18	75:6 78:8 93:2	98:15	systems 82:17
separate 80:2,2	signed 28:25	specifically 48:17	Street 13:21	T
Sept 17:22	significant 26:24	49:7 63:7 73:8,25	strongly 97:25	
serve 36:12 82:15	significantly 64:1	77:2	studies 53:15 58:14	T 25:12,12 27:7
82:15 87:7	silent 35:20 93:13	spell 25:14 52:1	study 54:19,25 55:6	47:13 50:10,10
served 46:13 83:12	similar 78:5	59:16 70:22,23	55:22 58:20 69:14	51:22,22 52:18
86:3 92:10 95:4	simply 46:10	splices 57:7 88:10	Subchapter 16:14	58:7,7 59:13,13
serves 28:21 46:4	Simultaneous	sponsor 55:5	subject 41:3 44:22	60:13 70:20,20 71:21 95:16 96:14
63:3	97:22	spreadsheet 39:25	subsection 84:19	96:14 99:1,1
service 17:6,8,21	sit 59:3	Staff 13:7 17:11,13	84:25	table 49:11 64:9
17:23 18:10 27:12	site 53:15 77:2	17:15 18:22 19:3	subsequent 41:19	67:14 68:19
28:9,19,20 29:2,6	79:16 88:6	19:21,24 20:3,6,8	78:3	take 32:24 43:23
29:7,18,24 30:2	situation 29:15	20:11,13,15,22	<b>substation</b> 81:18,22	66:7 69:24 85:16
30:21,24 31:4,7	72:25 83:16	23:2,4 26:20 70:8	81:23	91:16
				71.10
			-	

taken 38:3 46:9	36:25 37:6,11	41:18 54:22 57:4	UE-141335 12:6	values 53:23
81:6	38:11 48:16 51:7	64:20 68:6 75:7	22:6	variance 78:18
takes 73:10	52:5,25 53:2	85:16 97:23	Uh-huh 50:1 80:12	verbatim 84:4
talk 37:18 38:12	54:17 58:24 59:20	times 16:7 47:1	95:7	Verizon 12:7 13:12
59:1	60:18,23 61:7,22	56:11	ultimate 57:22	22:8,19 23:16
talked 57:1 80:6	62:1,4 63:1,7,8	timing 46:8,20	ultimately 56:25	24:3 36:1,4
talking 90:13 91:8	64:3,22 65:6,19	today 22:10 37:2,3	88:12	version 33:16,18,19
91:9 92:16,18,22	65:22 66:6,17	37:16	undergraduate	versus 49:25
talks 74:5,19 75:12	69:23 71:3,8,9,25	told 89:10 93:9	98:7	view 34:5 83:25
tampering 98:11	72:14 73:24 74:24	toleration 32:12	underlined 86:14	88:21 90:25 91:3
tampering 98.11	75:19,24 76:9,12	Tommy 13:13	86:20	91:3,13
tariff 17:24 18:3,7	76:13 77:17,18	22:20	understand 24:15	voltage 45:13 87:1
19:6 21:3,6 28:11	79:6 80:6,13,14	tool 39:12	29:3 47:17 54:24	volts 90:16,16,20
29:21 46:10 49:16	83:23 84:21 86:6	top 67:16	70:6 72:14 92:11	<b>VOLUME</b> 12:10
74:16 85:1,2,19	86:14 87:14,21	topic 56:4	understanding	VOLUME 12.10
90:22 93:12	94:10,12 97:6	total 16:17 18:18	36:3 50:22 55:5,6	W
	74:10,12 97:0 Texas 23:24		55:9 58:13 61:25	WAC 34:2
tariffs 29:4,11,18 taxes 39:21	text 28:6 48:17	43:4,6,11,12 65:23	66:25 67:7,9	wait 81:24
	text 28:6 48:17 thank 22:23 24:4	tower 36:6	68:18 77:1 83:3	walk 53:15
tbrooks@cableh			88:25 95:18	want 35:1 56:4
	25:10 27:1,5 47:8 51:5 52:11,24	tracks 46:23 transcript 99:8	uneconomic 73:2	63:6 87:4,5 98:10
Telephone 79:15 tell 32:23	54:7,16 57:24	transcript 99:8 transmission 63:16	78:22	wanted 98:3
	58:21,23 59:11		unfeasibility 74:19	wants 84:13 85:11
telling 73:25 88:18 88:22	·	63:23 64:5,24	unfeasible 36:21	86:2,25
88:22 tendered 71:16	69:15,23 70:2,3 70:16,18 71:15,18	65:9,15 <b>transmissions</b> 65:1	95:5	Washington 12:1,5
tendered /1:16	90:9 95:6 96:10	transmissions 65:1	unilaterally 33:25	12:16,17,22 13:3
tense /4:9 term 47:23	97:3,5 98:4,19	12:2,16 13:4	unique 29:12,15	13:5,9,10,22 14:5
term 47:23 terminate 30:23	77:3,3 98:4,19 Thanks 51:19 60:1	65:25	University 98:8,9	22:1,7 36:19 38:2
31:3	theoretically 82:12	trouble 23:18 26:2	updated 82:20	56:1 99:3,7
terminates 30:24	thing 34:9 75:16	true 99:9	upgrades 82:22	wasn't 74:13 76:20
terminates 30.24	things 39:23 56:10	turn 28:13 30:20	upgrades 82.22 use 30:12 41:11	way 29:2,11 57:2
terms 28:24 96:5	73:8 78:17	33:12 36:16 37:11	43:20 47:22 48:2	62:8 72:13 82:17
terms 28:24 90:3	think 26:9 32:8	38:10,22 41:24	48:7 54:22 55:11	93:15
test 76:11 81:13	35:1 49:22 57:2,8	42:13 45:15 47:15	58:12,15 67:21	we're 81:22
testified 25:7 51:17	58:16 73:12,24	56:4,13,17 57:10	68:2,4 78:23	Weather 88:9,13
59:8 70:14 71:3	80:6 81:4 83:7,25	64:7 66:21 72:6	91:13 92:7	went 53:3 55:6
89:2	84:7	75:18 83:17,17	useful 30:17,18	weren't 27:23
testimony 16:6,11	thinking 93:4	87:19 89:24 94:9	79:4	wintertime 56:10
16:21,23 17:18	third 64:14 67:15	turning 37:6 54:17	Users 35:22 36:2,5	Wireless 12:7,7
18:13 19:8,14	85:2	two 35:20 53:18	Utilities 12:2,16	22:9,9,19 23:16
20:16,21,23 21:9	75.2 THOMPSON 16:4	70:1 85:1	13:3	24:3
24:7 25:18 26:21	thoroughly 72:4	type 34:9	Utility 16:17 18:18	wish 23:5
27:11 28:5 29:3	85:21	typically 55:11	utilizing 69:12	witness 25:5 26:5,7
29:22 31:19 33:13	time 23:19 27:3,21	82:6	utilizing 07.12	51:15 59:6 63:8
33:20,24 35:10	34:1 39:11 41:17	02.0	V	70:12 71:16 97:7
33.40,47 33.10	ут. 1 <i>37.</i> 11 <b>7</b> 1.1/	U	value 52:10	witness's 26:2

				1 age 112
witnesses 24:16,19	zero 89:17	<b>1325</b> 12:21	<b>2097</b> 12:20	<b>360.664.1188</b> 13:10
63:5 70:1,8		<b>14</b> 16:9 26:14	<b>21</b> 28:13 72:6	<b>38</b> 56:17
word 30:12 78:23	0	<b>15</b> 48:17 87:15 89:7	<b>23</b> 18:10 44:21	<b>39</b> 26:20
words 34:17 40:13	<b>001</b> 18:12	94:23	<b>23,1971</b> 17:22	<b>3rd</b> 36:24
43:1	<b>005</b> 17:11	<b>16</b> 54:2 89:7	<b>24</b> 16:6,7,11,13,14	
work 34:23 82:17	006 18:21	<b>17</b> 31:24	16:16,19,21,23	4
98:7	<b>007</b> 18:23	<b>18</b> 29:23 31:19	17:3,4,5,7,10,11	4 30:6 38:17,23
worked 68:19	<b>008</b> 19:4,19	37:12 80:25 81:1	17:13,15,18,19,20	40:8 42:13,14,17
working 58:17	<b>018</b> 17:13	94:9,12,14,15,16	17:23,24 18:3,7	43:8,21 44:21
66:20	<b>019</b> 19:22	1840 12:22	18:12,13,15,17,20	52:8,9 53:1,1
works 66:25 68:14	<b>021</b> 19:24	<b>19</b> 55:1 80:25 81:1	18:22 19:3,5,8,10	54:18 67:11,13
Worth 23:24	<b>023</b> 20:4	94:11	19:11,14,15,17,18	68:4,23 69:3,5,11
wouldn't 35:1,4	<b>024</b> 20:6	<b>1965</b> 17:25	19:21,23 20:3,5,8	<b>40</b> 83:12
92:2	<b>035</b> 20:9	<b>1971</b> 55:14,17 78:8	20:10,13,16,18,19	<b>40128</b> 13:9
writing 66:19	<b>036</b> 20:11	79:14	20:21,23 21:3,6,9	<b>425.580.8112</b> 14:5
written 74:9	<b>037</b> 20:14	<b>1985</b> 18:5	38:14,18 40:1	<b>425.635.1419</b> 13:22
wrong 72:15	<b>039</b> 17:16	<b>1991</b> 18:6 21:5	41:12 42:1,10,12	<b>47</b> 15:4
<b>WUTC</b> 17:11,13,15		<b>1994</b> 78:9	42:24,25 43:7,11	<b>47250</b> 13:5
18:22 19:3,21,23	1		43:12 44:3 49:10	<b>480-100-056</b> 36:20
20:3,5,8,10,13	1 18:9,16 19:11	2	49:11 62:6,11	37:3
www.buellrealti	21:8 67:5 71:11	<b>2</b> 18:5 31:9,10	65:2,8,13,24	<b>480-100-123</b> 37:7
12:25	97:17 98:6	40:15 41:25 43:18	68:23 80:1 91:7	
	<b>1.2</b> 38:20 44:8,10	43:19 50:2 59:22	<b>24's</b> 69:9	5
X	66:23 68:16,16,18	60:22 67:3,20	<b>245</b> 43:5,14,15,20	<b>5</b> 68:24 69:25
<b>X</b> 25:12 27:7 47:13	68:22,25 69:1,8	75:19,21,22	44:14	<b>5.1</b> 44:2
50:10 51:22 52:18	<b>1.25</b> 42:4	<b>2.05</b> 64:19	<b>245,829,144</b> 43:6	<b>5.3</b> 25:24 26:11,13
58:7 59:13 60:13	<b>1.252</b> 44:13	<b>2.2</b> 64:19	24th 90:4	26:15,16,17 48:3
70:20 71:21 95:16	<b>1.5</b> 39:17	<b>20</b> 31:24 53:25 54:2	<b>25</b> 15:3 46:13	48:5,7 53:4 59:24
96:14	<b>1.6</b> 39:16	69:24	<b>27</b> 12:15 15:4 22:1	<b>50</b> 15:5
	<b>1.8</b> 39:4,9,18,20	<b>2000</b> 13:15	<b>28</b> 55:6,20,22	<b>50,000</b> 90:16,16,20
	66:24 67:7,15,21	<b>2002</b> 36:24	<b>29</b> 36:16	<b>503.224.3092</b> 13:16
Yeah 57:19 73:18	68:5,14	<b>2006</b> 18:9,11 21:8		<b>51</b> 15:7 80:15
94:14	<b>10</b> 26:12 29:2,16	<b>2010</b> 64:15	3	<b>52</b> 15:8
year 40:21 49:13	37:7,12 38:12	<b>2010-2013</b> 16:20	<b>3</b> 25:24 26:10 30:9	<b>547,000</b> 68:15
57:18 67:8,21	72:13 73:13 94:18	<b>2011</b> 55:2	31:10,13 63:7	<b>58</b> 15:8
68:5 82:21	<b>1001</b> 13:15	<b>2012</b> 90:4	75:19,21,22	<b>59</b> 15:11
year's 68:1	101 16:15	<b>2012-029</b> 19:5	<b>30</b> 17:10	
years 16:20 17:10	<b>104</b> 42:20 43:5,13	83:18	<b>30th</b> 57:14 97:23	6
33:6 39:7 46:13	68:17,25 69:1,4	<b>2013</b> 39:8 40:18	<b>32</b> 89:25	<b>6</b> 18:6 21:5 31:24
53:18 55:6,20,22	<b>10885</b> 13:21	54:25 57:17 64:15	<b>33</b> 42:16	71:11
64:15 79:7 83:13	11 40:3 48:16 59:22	67:15	<b>34</b> 84:18,18,21,25	60 15:11
88:8	11:00 69:24,25	<b>2014</b> 16:9 35:19	90:13 91:13 92:7	<b>64</b> 57:10 87:25
yielded 68:17 69:1	11:41 98:20	<b>2015</b> 12:15 22:1	92:13 93:6	<b>67</b> 17:24
yields 68:16	<b>12</b> 12:11 94:23	<b>2031</b> 35:7,23	<b>35</b> 53:7	7
Z	<b>13</b> 59:22 83:23	<b>206.287.9066</b> 12:23	<b>360.534.9066</b> 12:23	7 25:23 26:10,12
	<b>1300</b> 12:17 13:4	<b>207</b> 19:12	<b>360.664.1136</b> 13:6	1 43.43 40.10,14

Tage 113				<del></del> 1
63:9	80:22			
<b>70</b> 15:14	<b>9:29</b> 12:14 22:2			
<b>700</b> 13:21	911 37:25			
<b>71</b> 15:15 78:2	<b>94</b> 33:17 78:3			
<b>73</b> 56:17 57:10	<b>95</b> 15:15 33:17			
<b>75</b> 44:16	96 15:16			
8	97061 14:4			
<b>8</b> 17:25 30:20 42:14	<b>97204-1136</b> 13:16 <b>98004-5579</b> 13:22			
42:18 61:1 67:3	98073 14:5			
<b>8.1</b> 25:24 26:11,14				
26:16,18 40:11	98101 12:22			
48:4 53:3 59:24	98504 13:5,10			
67:8,17	98504-7250 12:17			
<b>8.12</b> 26:13	99 12:11			
<b>80</b> 18:3,7 21:6 29:3				
29:8,8,20 31:6				
33:12,13,17,21				
34:4 44:25 72:15				
72:24 73:16 77:13		•		
80:7,11 81:8,10				
83:24 84:17 91:14				
92:7,13 93:18				
96:17,22,25 97:1				
97:2				
80-d 21:8				·
800.846.6989 12:24				
80NN 85:2				
<b>85</b> 18:5,9 21:3 29:4				
29:8,9,20 46:10				
46:11 47:4 49:6				
49:11 50:22,23,25				
51:1 61:17 72:15				
72:24 73:5,6,7,11				
73:17 74:12,13,16				
74:18,23,25 75:3				
75:5,8 76:7,8,12				
76:14,21,24 77:2				
77:14 80:5,25				·
81:4,5 96:21,25				
96:25 97:2				
<b>85-f</b> 21:4				
8th 97:17,21				
9				
9 38:11 80:14,15,21				
			<u> </u>	