Docket No. UE-220701 - Vol. II

Argunov, et al. v. Puget Sound Energy

March 14, 2023



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

COURT REPORTING AND LEGAL VIDEO

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 www.buellrealtime.com email: info@buellrealtime.com



| | Page 18 | | Page 20 |
|--|--|--|---|
| BEFORE THE | | | Lage 20 |
| WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATIO | DN COMMISSION | E X A M I N A T I O N EXAMINATION | PAGE |
| ALEXANDER AND ELENA ARGUNOV,) | 3 | lan Hagan | TAGE |
| THOMAS AND HEIDI JOHNSON, CHAD | 4 | Cross by Ms. Argunov | 56 |
| AND VICTORIA GROESBECK,) | 5 | Redirect by Mr. Starkey | 65 |
|) Complainants,) Docket No. UE-220701 | 6 | Allison Sains | |
|) | 7 | Cross by Ms. Argunov | 67 |
| v.) | 8 | Redirect by Mr. Starkey Kristina McClenahan | 86 |
| PUGET SOUND ENERGY,) | 10 | Cross by Ms. Argunov | 89 |
|) Respondent.) | 11 | Redirect by Mr. Starkey | 97 |
| | 12 | Stacey Halsen | |
| VIDEOCONFERENCE EVIDENTIARY HEARING Pages 18-158 | 13 | Cross by Ms. Argunov | 98 |
| ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE THOMAS JOH | INSON 14 | Cross by Ms. Gafken | 112 |
| March 14, 2023 | 15 | Redirect by Mr. Starkey | 119 |
| 9:30 a.m. | 16 17 | Aaron Tam Cross by Mr. Starkey | 120 |
| | 18 | Redirect by Ms. Gafney | 124 |
| | 19 | Shari Hoyt | |
| | 20 | Cross by Ms. Argunov | 126 |
| | 21 | | |
| | 22 | | |
| | 23 | | |
| DATE TAKEN: MARCH 14, 2023 REPORTED BY: CARISA KITSELMAN, RPR, CCR 2 | 25 | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Page 19 | | Page 21 |
| | Page 19 1 | EXHIBITS | Page 21 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON | 1 2 | PAGE | |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) | 1 2 3 | | |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP | 1 2 3 4 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted | |
| ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) THOMAS JOHNSON FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) BRIAN STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 | 1 2 3 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S | 33 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street 8 Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com | 1 2 3 4 5 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted | |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street 8 Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com | 1 2 3 4 5 6 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck | 33 33 41 43 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Mr. Starkey Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken | 33 33 41 43 44 52 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Mr. Starkey Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street 8 Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 0lympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 360.915.4521 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 12 12 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Mr. Starkey Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street 8 Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 11 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 12 12 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken 4 Assistant Attorney General | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 6 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 11 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 12 12 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 9 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 12 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken Assistant Attorney General 15 800 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000 16 Seattle, Washington 98104 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street 8 Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 0lympia, Washington 98504 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 12 12 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken 15 800 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000 16 16 Seattle, Washington 98104 206.464.6595 17 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 12 12 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken Assistant Attorney General 15 800 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000 16 Seattle, Washington 98104 206.464.6595 17 17 Lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 ALSO PRESENT: (via Zoom) 19 ELENA ARGUNOV | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street 8 Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 0lympia, Washington 98504 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken Assistant Attorney General Suite 2000 16 Seattle, Washington 98104 206.464.6595 206.464.6595 17 Lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 ALSO PRESENT: (via Zoom) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 6 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 11 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 12 12 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken Assistant Attorney General 15 800 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000 16 Seattle, Washington 98104 206.464.6595 17 Lisa.gafken @atg.wa.gov 18 ALSO PRESENT: (via Zoom) 19 ELENA ARGUNOV THOMAS JOHNSON VICTORIA AND CHAD GROESBECK | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) THOMAS JOHNSON 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken Assistant Attorney General Suite 2000 15 800 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000 16 Seattle, Washington 98104 206.464.6595 17 Lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 ALSO PRESENT: (via Zoom) 19 ELENA ARGUNOV THOMAS JOHNSON 20 VICTORIA AND CHAD GROESBECK | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY 9 Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street 8 Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 0lympia, Washington 98504 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 12 12 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken Assistant Attorney General 15 800 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000 16 16 Seattle, Washington 98104 206.464.6595 17 17 Lisa.gafken @atg.wa.gov 18 ALSO PRESENT: (via Zoom) 19 ELENA ARGUNOV 7 THOMAS JOHNSON 20 VICTORIA AND CHAD GROESBECK <td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td> <td>PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey</td> <td>33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145</td> | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |
| 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: (via Zoom) THOMAS JOHNSON 3 THOMAS JOHNSON 4 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (via Zoom) 5 BRIAN STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 6 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 7 425.635.1458 byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (via Zoom) 9 NASH CALLAGHAN 10 Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 47250 11 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.915.4521 12 12 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (via Zoom) 14 Lisa Gafken Assistant Attorney General 15 800 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000 16 Seattle, Washington 98104 206.464.6595 17 Lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 ALSO PRESENT: (via Zoom) 19 ELENA ARGUNOV THOMAS JOHNSON 20 VICTORIA AND CHAD GROESBECK 21 ***** | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | PAGE Prefiled exhibits admitted P R O C E E D I N G S Opening Statement by Ms. Argunov Opening Statement by Mr. Johnson Opening Statement by Ms. Groesbeck Opening Statement by Ms. Gafken Closing Argument by Ms. Argunov Closing Argument by Ms. Groesbeck Closing Argument Mr. Starkey | 33 33 41 43 44 52 139 144 145 |

1 (Pages 18 to 21)

| | Page 22 | | Page 24 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | MARCH 14, 2023 | 1 | parties' objections up front. |
| 2 | 9:30 A.M. | 2 | I will then allow the parties an opportunity to |
| 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the record. | 3 | provide brief opening statements limited to ten minutes |
| 4 | Good morning. It is Tuesday, March 14th, and the time is | 4 | each. And, again, sorry about my voice. I hope it's |
| 5 | 9:30 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an | 5 | understandable. |
| 6 | administrative law judge with the Commission. We're here | 6 | We'll then turn to the cross-examination of |
| 7 | today for an evidentiary hearing in Docket UE-220701. | 7 | witnesses following the order of presentation that I |
| 8 | This case is captioned Alexander and Elena Argunov, | 8 | circulated to the parties earlier. So this means that we |
| 9 | Thomas and Heidi Johnson, and Chad and Victoria Groesbeck | 9 | will swear in Ms. Argunov first, and we'll allow for |
| 10 | versus Puget Sound Energy. | 10 | cross-examination of her. |
| 11 | Let's start by taking appearances beginning | 11 | We'll then proceed through the witnesses and end |
| 12 | with the three homeowners who brought this complaint. | 12 | with Staff witness Sheri Hoyt. And as Mr. Callaghan |
| 13 | Could I turn first to Ms. Argunov? | 13 | noted, Staff is not a party in this case. Ms. Argunov |
| 14 | MS. ARGUNOV: Good morning. My name is | 14 | indicated some cross time for this witness. I may also |
| 15 | Elena Argunov, and I'm the main complainant against Puget | 15 | ask a couple of clarifying questions of Ms. Hoyt. |
| 16 | Sound Energy. We live in Cle Elum address 1550 Old | 16 | |
| 17 | Cedars Road. | 17 | We'll take a brief midmorning break and a lunch break. The parties estimate that there will be |
| 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 18 | approximately two hours and 55 minutes of |
| 19 | Could we have a similar appearance from the | 19 | |
| 20 | Johnsons? | 20 | cross-examination. So when we consider our opening |
| 20 | MR. JOHNSON: Yes. This is Thomas Johnson. | | statements and oral closing statements, I expect that we |
| 21 | Address 1340 Old Cedars Road in Cle Elum, Washington. | 21 22 | would be ending the hearing sometime this afternoon. We can also take a midafternoon break, if necessary. |
| 22 | JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. | 23 | |
| 23 | Could we have an appearance from the Groesbecks? | 23 | I also want to remind the parties, because this is a Zoom hearing, to keep your microphones muted unless |
| 25 | MS. GROESBECK: Victoria Groesbeck and Chad | 25 | they are speaking unless you are speaking, excuse me. |
| | | 2.5 | uney are speaking uniess you are speaking, excuse me. |
| | Page 23 | | Page 25 |
| | | | rage 25 |
| 1 | Groesbeck. Address 971 Old Cedars Road, Cle Elum, | 1 | And also to only use video for those portions of |
| 1 2 | Groesbeck. Address 971 Old Cedars Road, Cle Elum, Washington. | 1 2 | |
| | | 1 | And also to only use video for those portions of |
| 2 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? | 2 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. |
| 2 3 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on | 2 3 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also | 2 3 4 5 6 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please |
| 2 3 4 5 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on | 2 3 4 5 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. In my e-mail to the parties last week, I |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is Lisa Gafken, assistant attorney general, appearing on | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. In my e-mail to the parties last week, I circulated my exhibit list that included prefiled |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is Lisa Gafken, assistant attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. In my e-mail to the parties last week, I circulated my exhibit list that included prefiled testimony exhibits up to and including cross-examination |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is Lisa Gafken, assistant attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. In my e-mail to the parties last week, 1 circulated my exhibit list that included prefiled testimony exhibits up to and including cross-examination exhibits. And there were also I believe there were |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is Lisa Gafken, assistant attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. So I want to start out by giving an overview for | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. In my e-mail to the parties last week, I circulated my exhibit list that included prefiled testimony exhibits up to and including cross-examination exhibits. And there were also I believe there were three exhibits I'm sorry, four exhibits filed by |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is Lisa Gafken, assistant attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. So I want to start out by giving an overview for our plans today. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. In my e-mail to the parties last week, I circulated my exhibit list that included prefiled testimony exhibits up to and including cross-examination exhibits. And there were also I believe there were three exhibits I'm sorry, four exhibits filed by Ms. Argunov on March 10th. And I circulated a revised |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is Lisa Gafken, assistant attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. So I want to start out by giving an overview for our plans today. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. In my e-mail to the parties last week, I circulated my exhibit list that included prefiled testimony exhibits up to and including cross-examination exhibits. And there were also I believe there were three exhibits I'm sorry, four exhibits filed by Ms. Argunov on March 10th. And I circulated a revised exhibit list as well. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is Lisa Gafken, assistant attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. So I want to start out by giving an overview for our plans today. We'll begin in a minute here with admitting evidence and addressing objections. I might reserve | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. In my e-mail to the parties last week, I circulated my exhibit list that included prefiled testimony exhibits up to and including cross-examination exhibits. And there were also I believe there were three exhibits I'm sorry, four exhibits filed by Ms. Argunov on March 10th. And I circulated a revised exhibit list as well. So I wanted to clarify one brief issue with |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Washington. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from PSE? MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Byron Starkey on behalf of Puget Sound Energy and with me here is also Sheri Carson. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Staff. As you know, we're not appearing as a party but are providing Sheri Hoyt as a witness. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Could we have an appearance from Public Counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is Lisa Gafken, assistant attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. So I want to start out by giving an overview for our plans today. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | And also to only use video for those portions of the hearing when you have a speaking role. It shouldn't be too crucial of an issue today, the use of video and toggling on and off, but do keep that in mind. If you are having any technical issues, or you observe that someone has dropped off the call, please mention that in the chat, the Zoom chat. And the chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only because it won't be made part of the official record. Are there any questions about our plans for today or any housekeeping matters before we go on the record I'm sorry, before we continue to the admission of evidence? All right. Hearing none. Let's turn to the admission of prefiled testimony and exhibits. In my e-mail to the parties last week, I circulated my exhibit list that included prefiled testimony exhibits up to and including cross-examination exhibits. And there were also I believe there were three exhibits I'm sorry, four exhibits filed by Ms. Argunov on March 10th. And I circulated a revised exhibit list as well. |

2 (Pages 22 to 25)

| 1 So, Ms. Argunov, right now, as Lunderstand, 2 what you intend to use your Exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 42 through 45 for? Do you see those as exhibits 50 three an couple things. I don't remember the - the exact date. I believe it was either on March 8th or exact date. I submitted tose exhibits and technical issues to put it that exhibit should not be confidentia? If su to try ou say that it and reducted varian and a cover letter? Or would you use wide use offer that with a most of PSE because this is copies or and the iter that exhibit should not be confidentia? If su to the ord or bits. So there is onthing really new about it. 12 confidential because if read through it again. There is no read it. for an end it confidential because this is copies of all of our bits. So there is onthing really new about it. 13 nor cally with a to asse or social security numbers or any other, like, very confidential information. And twill double-check but 1 think I 14 e-mailed about - about to the records center. But to answer your question, I was not planning to use at specifically for cross-examination unless we read it. 15 information of all the prefiled exhibits and testimory. for an or an or of PSE posotis in is that the exhe read it. | | Page 26 | | Page 28 |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 2 your direct testimony, which would be labeled EACCH-17, is not in the record in the Cases application that we have. There is an issue where records center would like you to clarify whether you intend to mark this exhibit confidential because it does have a shaded sentence. 2 Do you see these as exhibits you'll be using to searchise the shaded sentence. 7 Would you be able to refite that with a confidential because it does have a shaded sentence. 1 6 7 Would you like to - or would you - would you as with a that exhibit should not be confidential? 1 1 7 Would you like to - or would you - would you age the admosses, or an those parts would you like to - or would you - would you as with a that exhibit should not be confidential? 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 MS. ARGUNOV: It probably it's up to you. 1 1 1 1 3 no read In with to the docker up on your have. It's sector match a houre addresses or social information. And I will double-check but I think I 1 | 1 | So. Ms. Argunov, right now, as I understand. | 1 | what you intend to use your Exhibits 42 through 45 for? |
| 3 is not in the record in the Cases application that we a constant where source center would like you to clarify whether you intend to mark this obtibit constant whether you intend to mark this obtibit 6 confidential actual to constant with a constant whether you intend to mark this obtibit confidential how a shift whether you intend to mark this obtibit 10 that exhibit should not be confidential? If you | 2 | | 2 | |
| 4 have. There is an issue where records center would like MS. ARGUNOV: So there are a couple things. 5 you to clarify whether you intend to mark this exhibit confidential because it does have a shaded sentence. 7 Would you be able to refite that with a confidential and redacted version and a cover letter? Or 9 would you be able to refite that with a confidential and redacted version and a cover letter? Or 11 that exhibit should not be confidential? that exhibit should not be confidential? 12 confidential because I read through it again. There is a no thally mere is no home addresses or social information. And I will double-check but I think I 16 e-mailed about - about it to the records center. 17 But, yeah, to answer your question, there is no fraiting envin the exhibits from and ask if they would - would it would = wo | 3 | | 3 | |
| 6 confidential because if does have a shaded sontence. 6 believe it was either on Warch Sh or even prior when I 7 Would you be able to refile that with a 6 believe it was either on Warch Sh or even prior when I 7 Would you be able to refile that with a 6 believe it was either on Warch Sh or even prior when I 7 Would you be able to refile that with a 6 believe it was either on Warch Sh or even prior when I 7 Would you be able to refile that with a 6 believe it was either on March Sh or even prior when I 7 Would you like to - or would you = would you say that 1 satually are response to or end my data requests. So 11 that exhibits hould not be confidential again. There is no need to make it confidential. 10 Factorse examination only if there is specific question from any of the sites so we can pull up the copies. But, in general, it's just there for reference just in cases we need it. 12 It was either on March Sont PSE social for or cose-examination outly are working on any of the sites on we con simply any are to to use it specifically for crose-examination unless we really under the weight or - that say to a tot the dock in the gase or a dock of the parties and ask if they would - would 10 10 DIDGE HOWARD: Chay, Chay. 12 And the 42, again, it's not really new. It's just apa | 4 | have. There is an issue where records center would like | 4 | |
| 7 Would you be able to relife that with a 7 submitted those exhibits submitted those exhibits as use to put it into redacted version. And those exhibits 8 confidential and redacted version and a cover letter? Or would you like to - or would you say that that exhibit should not be confidential? It's up to you. 7 submitted those exhibits and those exhibits and those exhibits and testimory. 10 that exhibit should not be confidential it's up to you. 8 So fragona participation of the parties and ask if they would you gate to the admission of all the profiled exhibits and testimory. 8 But - eard I - well, I was working on cross-examination only if there is specific quists is one can pull up the copies. But, in general, it's just there for reference just in case we need it. 10 nor enel of make it confidential. 10 But - eard I - well, I was working on cross-examination unless we reed it. 11 or mead to make it confidential. 10 | 5 | you to clarify whether you intend to mark this exhibit | 5 | I don't remember the the exact date. I |
| confidential and redacted version and a cover letter? Or would you like to - or would you - would you any that sequests. So is the achibit should not be confidential? Its up to you. MS. ARGUNOV: It probably - It's not is no there and the schibit should not be confidential? Its up to you. MS. ARGUNAV: It probably - It's not is no there and the schibit should not be confidential? Its up to you. security numbers or any other, Ike, very confidential is an iter any other, ike, very confidential is an iter any other, ike, very confidential is no transformation only if there is specific question from any other ike, very confidential is an iter any other, ike, very confidential is an iter any other, ike, very confidential is any any other, ike, very confidential is any the schedular about 1 to the records center. general, It's just there for reference just in case we in eed it. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. to each of the parties and ask if they would - would you - when you - when you copies to - let's say to confirm some statements from either my side or PSE's side. The admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. Exper 27 where if they have any objections to the admission of the prefiled exhibits and testimony. So if you see PDF copies, It's about 374 pages. So if you see PDF copies, It's about 374 pages. So i just wanted to use particular specific - specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarity. first. MS. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the schedular previded about the obiescoles? MS. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the schedular. MS. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the schedular. MS. Argunov. Gouid I hear from the dronsebecks? MS. STARKEY. No objections, Your Honor. MS. GROESBECK: No | 6 | confidential because it does have a shaded sentence. | 6 | believe it was either on March 8th or even prior when I |
| would you like to or would you asy that that exhibit should not be confidential MS. ARGUNOV: It probably it's not nor really there is no home addresses or social security numbers or any other, like, very confidential information. And 1 will double-check but 1 think 1 e-mailed about - about it to the records center. But, yeah, to answer your question, there is no nor really address or we can pull up the copies. But, in general, it's just there for reference just in case we address and ask if they would - would to each of the parties and ask if they would - would stipulate or - that's awe can simply say agree to stipulate or - that's awe can simply say agree to the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. So I'm going to turn to each of the parties, or would you address from any of the parties, or would you address from any of the parties, or would you address from any of the copies. It's about 374 pages. So I just wanted to larging to turn to each of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted. MS. ARGUNOV: Wath part, Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hurn next to PSE? add whether or not the objections, Your Honor. MK. STARKEY. No objections, Your Honor. MK | 7 | Would you be able to refile that with a | 7 | submitted those exhibits. But I had technical issues to |
| 10 that exhibit should not be confidential? If sup to you. 10 It's norbing new in terms of PSE because this is copies 11 of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about 10 It's nothing new in terms of PSE because this is copies 11 of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about 11 of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about 11 of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about 11 of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about 12 of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about 11 of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about 13 but yeah, to answer your question, there is specific question from and the sup out the copies. But, in 14 general, it's just there for reference just in case we need it. 15 general, it's just there for reference just in case we need it. 16 general, it's just there for reference just in case we need it. 17 but yeah, to answer your question. I was not planning but to answer your question. I was not planning 17 to each of the parties and ask if they would - would side. 120 18 to each of the parties and ask if they would - would 13 but to answer your question. I was not pla | 8 | confidential and redacted version and a cover letter? Or | 8 | put it into redacted version. And those exhibits |
| 11 MS. ARGUNOV: It probably – it's not 11 of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about 12 confidential because I read through it again. There is 11 of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about 13 no really – there is no home addresses or social 12 it. 14 security numbers or any other, like, very confidential 12 it. 16 e-mailed about – about it to the records center. 16 general, it's just there for reference just in case we 17 meed to make it confidential. 11 10 Teally need to find some copies to - left's asy to 18 useach of the parties and ask if they would – would 11 11 11 11 19 UDDEE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. 12 12 11 But to answer your question, I was not planning 10 to each of the parties and ask if they would – would 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 | 9 | would you like to or would you would you say that | 9 | actually are response to one of my data requests. So |
| 12 confidential because I read through it again. There is 12 it. 13 no really – there is no home addresses or social 13 But + and I - well, I was working on 14 security numbers or any other, like, very confidential 13 But + and I - well, I was working on 15 information. And I will double-check but I think I 14 cross-examination only if there is specific question from 16 e-mailed about - about it to the records center. 16 any of the sides so we can pull up the copies. But, in 17 But, yeah, to answer your question, I was not planning to each of the parties and ask if they would - would 19 JJDCE HOWARD: Chas, Great. Thank you. 10 20 readvise center adds that to the docket in Cases. 20 21 records center adds in that to the docket in Cases. 21 22 So with that issue addressed, I'm going to turn 22 side. 23 the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 23 And the 42, again, it's not really need to find addition because I believe, in 24 first. So I'n going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 So I' gou see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So I' gou see PDF copies, it's about | 10 | | 10 | it's nothing new in terms of PSE because this is copies |
| 13 no really - here is no home addresses or social 13 But - and I - well, I was working on 14 security numbers or any other, like, very confidential 14 cross-examination only if there is specific question from 15 information. And I will double-check but I think I 14 cross-examination only if there is specific question from 16 e-mailed about - about it to the records center. 17 any of the sides so we can pull up the copies. But, in 17 But, yeah, to answer your question, I was not planning to use it specifically for cross-examination unless we 19 yub and to clarify that, and I will ensure that 18 But to answer your question, I was not planning 10 just wanted to clarify that, and I will ensure that 18 but set to answer your question. I was not planning 11 yub that issue addressed, I'm going to turn 18 but on answer your question. I was not planning 12 is or each of the parties and ask if they would - would 18 but on answer your question. I was not planning 12 is or each of the parties and ask if they would - would 23 And the 42, again, it's not really new. It's 13 stope and bit bits on any of hey arties, or would you 19 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. <td>11</td> <td>MS. ARGUNOV: It probably it's not</td> <td>11</td> <td>of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about</td> | 11 | MS. ARGUNOV: It probably it's not | 11 | of all of our bills. So there's nothing really new about |
| 14 security numbers or any other, like, very confidential information. And I will double-check but I think I 14 cross-examination only if there is specific question from any of the sides so we can pull up the copies. But, in general, it's just there for reference just in case we need it. 17 But, yeah, to answer your question, there is no need to make it confidential. 15 18 need to make it confidential. 16 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I 17 20 ipust wanted to clarify that, and I will ensure that 16 21 records center adds that to the docket in Cases. 20 22 So with that issue addressed, I'm going to turn 23 23 to each of the parties and ask if they would - would 23 24 stipulate or - that's a - we can simply say agree to 24 25 the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 25 26 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 27 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 28 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 4 right, what - what if maining. | 12 | | | |
| 15 information. And I will double-check but I think I 15 any of the sides so we can pull up the copies. But, in 16 e-mailed about - about it to the records center. 16 general, it's just there for reference just in case we 17 But, yeah, to answer your question, I was not planning 16 general, it's just there for reference just in case we 18 need to make it confidential. 18 But to answer your question, I was not planning 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. 19 to use it specifically for cross-examination unless we 21 records center adds that to the docket in Cases. 21 confirm some statements from either my side or PSE's 23 to each of the parties and ask if they would would 31 And the 42, again, it's not really new. It's 24 stipulate or - that's a we can simply say agree to 23 And the 42, again, it's not really new. It's 25 where if they have any objections to the admission of the prefield exhibits and testimory. 23 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 26 prefield exhibits and testimory. 50 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? 33 So if you see PDF copies, it's abo | 13 | • | | |
| 16 e-mailed about - about it to the records center. 17 But, yeah, to answer your question, there is no 18 need to make it confidential. 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I 10 just wanted to clarify that, and I will ensure that 11 records center addressed, I'm going to turn 12 records center addressed, I'm going to turn 13 to each of the parties and ask if they would - would 14 stipulate or - that's a - we can simply say agree to 15 the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 16 general, it's just there for reference just in case we 17 need it. 18 But to answer your question, I was not planning 19 to use ht parties and ask if they would 20 ready agree to 21 to each of the parties and ask if they would would 22 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 23 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 24 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any 25 first. 26 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections ro would you 3 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | | | | |
| 17 But, yeah, to answer your question, there is no 17 need it. 18 need to make it confidential. 10 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I 18 But to answer your question, I was not planning 20 just wanted to clarify that, and I will ensure that 10 18 But to answer your question, I was not planning 21 records center adds that to the docket in Cases. 20 confirm some statements from either my side or PSE's 22 So with that issue addressed, I'm going to turn to each of the parties and ask if they would - would 23 24 stipulate or that's a we can simply say agree to 24 just a part of Oracle documentation because I believe, in 25 the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 26 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the horneowners 1 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 4 first. JUDGE HOWARD: Na you bigotions to any 1 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 5 Ms. ArgUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted? Ms. ARGUNOV: But I'm - if you decide that we 6 Ms. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted? Ms. ARGUNOV: But I'm - if you de | 15 | | | |
| 18 need to make it confidential. 18 But to answer your question, I was not planning 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I 19 to use it specifically for cross-examination unless we 10 just wanted to clarify that, and I will ensure that 19 to use it specifically for cross-examination unless we 21 records center adds that to the docket in Cases. 20 centfit specifically for cross-examination unless we 22 So with that issue addressed, I'm going to turn 23 And the 42, again, it's not really new. It's 24 stipulate or that's a we can simply say agree to 24 23 25 the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 25 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 25 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 11 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 11 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 11 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 4 right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Cokay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any objections to any 6 MS. ARG | | | | |
| 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I 19 to use it specifically for cross-examination unless we 20 just wanted to clarify that, and I will ensure that 20 21 records center adds that to the docket in Cases. 20 22 So with that issue addressed, I'm going to turn 20 24 stipulate or that's a we can simply say agree to 21 25 the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 23 26 Page 27 Page 27 27 Page 29 1 where if they have any objections to the admission of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? 2 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 1 4 first. 2 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 5 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? 3 6 Ms. ArgUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. 9 10 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 10 11 Could I har from the Jonesbecks? 10 12 Ms. ArgUNOV. Yeah. They all can be admitted? 10 14 Could I har fr | | | | |
| 20 just wanted to clarify that, and I will ensure that 20 really need to find some copies to let's say to 21 records center adds that to the docket in Cases. 20 confirm some statements from either my side or PSE's 22 So with that issue addressed, I'm going to turn 21 and the 42, again, it's not really new. It's 23 to each of the parties and ask if they would would 23 And the 42, again, it's not really new. It's 24 stipulate or that's a we can simply say agree to 24 just a part of Oracle documentation because I believe, in 25 the admission of all the prefield exhibits and testimony. 26 So I you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 2 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 So I you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 So I you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 4 first. 5 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any 6 7 Ms. ArgUnOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted? 7 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 7 8 Ms. ArgUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted? 7 Ms. ArgUNOV: Yeah. Thank you. 7 10 JUDGE HO | | | | |
| 21 records center adds that to the docket in Cases. 21 confirm some statements from either my side or PSE's side. 22 So with that issue addressed, I'm going to turn to each of the parties and ask if they would would state admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony, 23 And the 42, again, it's not really new. It's general, when you when you open Oracle specifications. 24 sipulate or that's a we can simply say agree to the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 24 just a part of Oracle documentation because I believe, in general, when you when you open Oracle specifications. 25 Page 27 Page 29 1 where if they have any objections to the admission of the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 5 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 2 So I'm going to turn to each of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? 3 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you 5 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 4 mitter Ms. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted? JUDGE HOWARD: Ckay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 10 MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. 0 12 Ms. ARGENDWARD: Thank y | | | | |
| 22 So with that issue addressed, I'm going to turn 22 side. 23 to each of the parties and ask if they would would 23 just a part of Oracle documentation because I believe, in 24 stipulate or that's a we can simply say agree to 24 just a part of Oracle documentation because I believe, in 25 the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 25 general, when you when you open Oracle specifications. 26 where if they have any objections to the admission of the 25 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 2 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 So I' you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the parties, or would you 3 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 4 first. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 4 first. 4 So I' you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. So I' you decide that we 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 So I' you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 4 first. 4 So I' you decide that we 3 5 MS. ArgUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. 8 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | |
| 23 to each of the parties and ask if they would would 23 And the 42, again, it's not really new. It's 24 stipulate or that's a we can simply say agree to 24 just a part of Oracle documentation because I believe, in 25 the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony, 25 general, when you when you open Oracle specifications. Page 27 Page 27 Page 29 1 where if they have any objections to the admission of the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 2 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 5 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 1 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. 5 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits form any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? 7 MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. 8 8 MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. 8 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 10 10 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 10 MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. 11 13 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 10 MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor. | | | | - |
| 24 stipulate or that's a we can simply say agree to the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony, 24 just a part of Oracle documentation because I believe, in general, when you when you open Oracle specifications. 25 Page 27 Page 29 1 where if they have any objections to the admission of the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 1 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. 5 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? 5 So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. 8 MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. 9 No objections, Your Honor. 9 10 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 10 MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. 11 11 Could I hear from the Groesbecks? 12 MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor, JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 13 0 We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections it it used for cross-examination. The were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony, which we can get to that point if needed. 12 MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor. 12 13 | | | | |
| 25 the admission of all the prefiled exhibits and testimony, 25 general, when you when you open Oracle specifications. Page 27 1 where if they have any objections to the admission of the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 2 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 4 first. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 5 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we canot use it, that's going to be fine with me. 8 MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. 8 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. 10 JUDGE HOWARD: No objections, Your Honor. 10 Our position is PSE's position is that these 12 MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. 12 Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. 14 Could I hear from the Groesbecks? 14 submitted well after the deadline for their submission of the objections flat I noted with 42 through 45 17 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 13 14 E | | | | |
| Page 27 Page 29 1 where if they have any objections to the admission of the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 1 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 1 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 4 first. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 5 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the parties, or would you 3 specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. 7 agree that they can be admitted? 7 MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. 9 No objections, Your Honor. 10 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 11 Could I hear from the Johnsons? 11 Our position is PSE's position is that these 12 MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. 12 Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitsed well after the deadline for their submission of the stimony. 14 Could I hear from the Groesbecks? 14 Submitted well after the deadline for their submission of the stimony. 15 MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor. 16 We would also contend t | | | | |
| 1 where if they have any objections to the admission of the prefiled exhibits and testimony. 1 So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. 2 prefiled exhibits and testimony. 3 So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners 3 specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. 3 Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. 8 MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. 9 MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. 9 9 No objections, Your Honor. 10 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 10 MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. 11 Could I hear from the Johnsons? 11 Our position is PSE's position is that these 12 MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. 12 Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. 16 from the Grosebecks. 16 We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections that 1 noted with 42 through 45 and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled direct. 11 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 24 Sub Mit Argunov, PSE has raised this question of 24 | 20 | | 25 | general, when you when you open Gracle specifications. |
| 2prefiled exhibits and testimony.2So I just wanted to use particular specific3So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners3specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify,4first.4right, what what I'm claiming.5Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any6JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.6of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you6MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we8MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted.8JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have9No objections, Your Honor.9MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.10JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.19But our objection still stands that these were19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that 1 noted with 42 through 452021and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled2122JUDGE HOWARD: | | Page 27 | | Page 29 |
| 2prefiled exhibits and testimony.2So I just wanted to use particular specific3So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners3specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify,4first.4right, what what I'm claiming.5Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any6JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.6of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you6MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we8MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted.8JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have9No objections, Your Honor.9MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.10JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.19But our objection still stands that these were19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that 1 noted with 42 through 452021and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled2122JUDGE HOWARD: | 1 | where if they have any objections to the admission of the | 1 | So if you see PDF copies, it's about 374 pages. |
| 4first.4right, what what I'm claiming.5Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any6JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.6of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you6MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we7agree that they can be admitted?7cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me.8MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted.9No objections, Your Honor.99No objections, Your Honor.9any response?10JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these12MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor.12Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.13are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,16from the Groesbecks.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor,19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520 <td< td=""><td>2</td><td>and the state of the second second second</td><td></td><td></td></td<> | 2 | and the state of the second second second | | |
| 5Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted?5JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.7agree that they can be admitted?7cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response?8MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted.8JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response?9No objections, Your Honor.9910JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these12MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor.12Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,15testimony.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections til t sused for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4521JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled <td>2</td> <td>prefiled exhibits and testimony.</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> | 2 | prefiled exhibits and testimony. | 2 | |
| 6of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you6MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we7agree that they can be admitted?7cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me.8MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted.8JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have9No objections, Your Honor.9any response?10JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these12MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor.12Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,15We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled direct.21JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.2323JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov | | | | So I just wanted to use particular specific |
| 7agree that they can be admitted?7cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me.8MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted.8JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have9No objections, Your Honor.9any response?10JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these12MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor.12Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.13are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,15testimony.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners | 3 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, |
| 8MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted.8JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have9No objections, Your Honor.9any response?10JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these12MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor.12Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.13are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,15testimony.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has ra | 3 4 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. | 3 4 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. |
| 9No objections, Your Honor.9any response?10JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these12MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor.12Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.13are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,15testimony.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24 | 3 4 5 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any | 3 4 5 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. |
| 10JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.10MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor.11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these12MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor.12Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.13are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,15testimony.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant22direct.23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 6 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? | 3 4 5 6 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. |
| 11Could I hear from the Johnsons?11Our position is PSE's position is that these12MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor.12Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.13are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,15testimony.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 6 7 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? | 3 4 5 6 7 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. |
| 12MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor.12Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.13are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,16from the Groesbecks.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? |
| 13JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.13are used specifically for cross-examination. They were14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,15testimony.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.2323JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 14Could I hear from the Groesbecks?14submitted well after the deadline for their submission of15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor,15testimony.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.2323JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these |
| 15MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks.15testimony.16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 45 and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled direct.21JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they |
| 16from the Groesbecks.16We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were |
| 17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.17other objections if it is used for cross-examination18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of |
| 18Could I turn next to PSE?18testimony, which we can get to that point if needed.19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. |
| 19MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor.19But our objection still stands that these were20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant22direct.22PSE's objection to EACCH-42 through 45.23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have |
| 20Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 4520submitted well after the deadline.21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant22direct.22PSE's objection to EACCH-42 through 45.23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections if it is used for cross-examination |
| 21and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled21JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant22direct.22PSE's objection to EACCH-42 through 45.23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I turn next to PSE? | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections if it is used for cross-examination testimony, which we can get to that point if needed. |
| 22direct.22PSE's objection to EACCH-42 through 45.23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I turn next to PSE? MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections if it is used for cross-examination testimony, which we can get to that point if needed. But our objection still stands that these were |
| 23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.23The reason for that is the the deadline24So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of24for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I turn next to PSE? MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor. Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 45 | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections if it is used for cross-examination testimony, which we can get to that point if needed. But our objection still stands that these were submitted well after the deadline. |
| 24 So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of 24 for excuse me. Just a moment here. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I turn next to PSE? MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor. Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 45 and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections if it is used for cross-examination testimony, which we can get to that point if needed. But our objection still stands that these were submitted well after the deadline. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant |
| | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I turn next to PSE? MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor. Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 45 and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled direct. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections if it is used for cross-examination testimony, which we can get to that point if needed. But our objection still stands that these were submitted well after the deadline. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant PSE's objection to EACCH-42 through 45. |
| | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I turn next to PSE? MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor. Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 45 and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled direct. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections if it is used for cross-examination testimony, which we can get to that point if needed. But our objection still stands that these were submitted well after the deadline. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant PSE's objection to EACCH-42 through 45. The reason for that is the the deadline |
| | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | So I'm going to turn to each of the homeowners first. Ms. Argunov, do you have any objections to any of the exhibits from any of the parties, or would you agree that they can be admitted? MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. They all can be admitted. No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from the Johnsons? MR. JOHNSON: No objections, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from the Groesbecks? MS. GROESBECK: No objections, Your Honor, from the Groesbecks. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I turn next to PSE? MR. STARKEY: No objections, Your Honor. Other than the objections that I noted with 42 through 45 and whether or not those are considered cross or prefiled direct. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. So, Ms. Argunov, PSE has raised this question of | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | So I just wanted to use particular specific specific areas from Oracle to additionally clarify, right, what what I'm claiming. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. ARGUNOV: But I'm if you decide that we cannot use it, that's going to be fine with me. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, do you have any response? MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Our position is PSE's position is that these Exhibits 42 through 45 should not be admitted unless they are used specifically for cross-examination. They were submitted well after the deadline for their submission of testimony. We would also contend that Exhibit 42, we have other objections if it is used for cross-examination testimony, which we can get to that point if needed. But our objection still stands that these were submitted well after the deadline. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to grant PSE's objection to EACCH-42 through 45. The reason for that is the the deadline for excuse me. Just a moment here. |

3 (Pages 26 to 29)

| | Page 30 | | Page 32 |
|----|---|----|---|
| 1 | been February 24th. And I'm I'm not hearing | 1 | aware of some of the issues that might be related to AMR |
| 2 | circumstances that convince me there was exceptional | 2 | meter reliability, which is an issue that has been raised |
| 3 | circumstances that require extending that in some sense | 3 | in this case. And it is the basis for which Public |
| 4 | to March 10th when these were filed. | 4 | Counsel is arguing that fines or penalties should be |
| 5 | So I can and I'll just explain that I I | 5 | imposed. We think that position is relevant when |
| 6 | can give pro se parties some leeway. But I also have to, | 6 | considering the broader context of whether or not |
| 7 | in most respects, treat them like any other party and | 7 | penalties should be imposed for potential violations. |
| 8 | hold them to deadlines and things like that in the great | 8 | JUDGE HOWARD: I think for AT-6X sorry, I |
| 9 | majority of cases. | 9 | hope that is intelligible to court reporter I'm going |
| 10 | So I'm going to reject Exhibits EACCH-42 through | 10 | to reserve my ruling on AT-6X. I would like I would |
| 11 | 45. | 11 | like PSE to I have some concern that about crossing |
| 12 | Were there any other objections from PSE? I | 12 | any witness on exhibits that they may not have a lot of |
| 13 | believe that was it. | 13 | firsthand knowledge with. |
| 14 | MR. STARKEY: No, Your Honor. Those are the | 14 | So I would like PSE to be mindful of that as it |
| 15 | only objections we had. | 15 | seeks to offer this into evidence. And PSE can move that |
| 16 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I would normally | 16 | into evidence later. And we'll see how it goes depending |
| 17 | turn to Staff next but Staff is not a party to this case. | 17 | on the specific questions. |
| 18 | Mr. Callaghan, you can most adversely disagree with me if | 18 | And similar concerns apply to the issue of |
| 19 | you feel the need to. | 19 | relevance. It will depend on the specific questions. |
| 20 | I'm going to turn next to Public Counsel and see | 20 | All right. After hearing from the parties and |
| 21 | if Public Counsel has any objections or concerns with the | 21 | hearing the parties' objections, it appears that the |
| 22 | exhibits. | 22 | parties largely agree to the admission of the exhibits |
| 23 | MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Your Honor. | 23 | except for what we specifically discussed. |
| 24 | Public Counsel does object to the cross exhibit | 24 | So with that, I will admit all the prefiled |
| 25 | proposed by PSE for Aaron Tam, which is Cross Exhibit | 25 | exhibits and testimony except for those I have already |
| | | | |
| | Page 31 | | Page 33 |
| 1 | AT6X. The document in Cross Exhibit AT-6X. | 1 | mentioned, which would be EACCH-42 through 45, which are |
| 2 | The document in Cross Exhibit AT-6X is an | 2 | rejected. And I'm reserving a ruling on AT-6X. |
| 3 | excerpt from Public Counsel's post-hearing brief and | 3 | (Prefiled exhibits admitted.) |
| 4 | Public Counsel's 2019 general rate case, which was in | 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: After our hearing today, I will |
| 5 | Docket UE-190529 and UG-190530. | 5 | provide a copy of the exhibit list to court reporter so |
| 6 | Public Counsel's objection is based on relevance | 6 | that can be made part of the record. |
| 7 | and that the evidence is outside of the scope of this | 7 | So with that, we'll allow we'll now turn to |
| 8 | proceeding. The Commission issued its final order in the | 8 | opening statements. And as I indicated, we'll allow each |
| 9 | 2019 rate case on July 8, 2020, resolving the issues | 9 | party an opportunity for a short opening statement which |
| 10 | raised by the parties in that litigation. The issues in | 10 | I would I would picture being around ten minutes or |
| 11 | the rate case involved cost recovery, whereas the issue | 11 | less, if you desire. |
| 12 | here involve customer complaints relating to their | 12 | So I would turn first to Ms. Argunov. |
| 13 | specific meters and service. | 13 | OPENING STATEMENT |
| 14 | So, as a result, Public Counsel asks that Cross | 14 | MS. ARGUNOV: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 15 | Exhibit AT-6X be excluded. | 15 | So I've never done this before so I apologize |
| 16 | With respect to the remaining exhibits and | 16 | if and I'm a little bit nervous. And I thought that |
| 17 | testimony, Public Counsel has no objections and would | 17 | how I can start this opening statement and what should I |
| 18 | agree to the admission of those documents into the | 18 | say. So I and I treat it as a no nothing else like |
| 19 | record. | 19 | my project at work. So at work when we start meeting, we |
| 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. | 20 | always like to say "reflection," which, you know, |
| 21 | Would PSE like to respond briefly to that? | 21 | environment around us and kind of prepare everyone for |
| 22 | MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. | 22 | what is coming. And in my scenario, and when I was |
| 23 | The testimony or the brief that is excerpted | 23 | working on this, I think that this reflection would be |
| 24 | from that concerns the AMR meter reliability. And it | 24 | the best way to describe what I've done so far. |
| 25 | concerns whether one or not, one, Public Counsel was | 25 | And so you must always be willing to truly |
| | | 1 | |
| | | | |

4 (Pages 30 to 33)

| | Page 34 | Page 3 | 36 |
|----------|---|--|-----|
| 1 | consider evidence that contradicts your beliefs and admit | 1 on/off status of electric service. Smart meters | |
| 2 | that you may be wrong. Intelligent isn't knowing | 2 communicate these readings to utility for processing | |
| 3 | everything, is the ability to challenge everything you | ³ analysis and recommunication back to the customers for | |
| 4 | know. | 4 billing. | |
| 5 | So when I start looking at the things and issues | 5 So this is applicable for one-way meters, which | |
| 6 | that I thought at first I discovered, I start really | 6 is AMR. And two-way meters which is AMI smart meters. | |
| 7 | learning from the scratch. So considering that I don't | 7 So this is where I was saying that it actually | |
| 8 | know anything about it but I took time. It's been | 8 contradicts to the response of PSE because and I also | |
| 9 | almost a year where almost every day after work I was | 9 provided specifications from Oracle. I provided | |
| 10 | learning the subject. I was trying to go from the point | 10 specifications from SAP. Both of them, they have | |
| 11 | of, okay, I'm wrong. And then I learned that, okay, what | 11 specific modules to process billing, to process interval | |
| 12 | facts do I have to support either of the sides? Because | 12 related data. | |
| 13 | I was trying to see my opinion, I was trying to see PSE | 13 Also in Exhibit KM-1CT, I Ms. McClenahan, she | |
| 14 | perception. So it's this case, it's not really about | 14 provided on page 6, the link to SAP website. So this is | |
| 15 | what I think or what PSE thinks or about what anyone else | 15 the link. So when I open it and this is what one | |
| 16 | thinks. It's about real facts, documentation, technical | 16 of the stages, right, before all readings goes to the | |
| 17 | documentation, that describes the process that everyone | 17 billing. Even in this page, it says so when the order | |
| 18 | should follow who is involved, who is using platforms, | 18 output is going out, so this is the MDUS request. MDUS | |
| 19 | who is using the software, right? | 19 request is not MDMS. Because MDMS is just a manageme | ent |
| 20 | So I have ten minutes so I will be I will try | 20 system. MDUS, it's a module. It's that is in L+G | |
| 21 | to be as short as possible. | 21 software, it's a platform, right, that they're using as a | |
| 22 | So the first thing probably I will follow | 22 bridge to process afterwards all measurements and values | i |
| 23 | kind of the order that I had in my direct testimony. And | 23 over to the billing. Because there is a difference | |
| 24 | I probably the best way would be to read it, actually. | 24 between unit of measure and quantity. | |
| 25 | So the first was the overview of advance meter | 25 I think when I read Oracle specifications, I | |
| | Page 35 | Page 3 | 37 |
| 1 | infrastructure rates. | 1 think they they said it the best way. So the billing | |
| 2 | So let me share my screen for a sec. | 2 for smart meters, it's like reviewing measurements. And | b |
| 3 | So this is Exhibit EACCH-7. This is an overview | 3 then analyzing interval data and see what the actual | |
| 4 | of advanced metering infrastructure. | 4 consumption was. | |
| 5 | So I want us to go back to original answer of | 5 So in when we look at the meter | |
| 6 | PSE to my formal complaint where they said that answering | 6 specifications, right, let me see. Sorry. I have a lot | |
| 7 | paragraph 1 of the complaint, PSE denies all allegation | 7 of exhibits. | |
| 8 | in part one of the complaint. PSE provided information | 8 So the meter the meter specifications, right? | |
| 9 | to the Commission and its customers about meters | 9 There is a lot of exhibits. So the meter the meter | |
| 10 | meters consistent with the purpose and usage of a members | 10 specifications, right. So it clearly states what | |
| 11 | of the AMI meters. While AMI meters have the capability | 11 measurements they using. And so the demand metric, i | |
| 12 | to transmit readings in 15-minute intervals, this | 12 kilowatt, not kilowatt hours. I know that the PSE in one | |
| 13 | functionality is not used for calculation of total | 13 of their responses, they were referencing to the channel | Ι, |
| 14 | monthly usage when billing customers. | 14 which is kilowatt received. However, if you look at | |
| 15 | To determine the usage of the particular | 15 and it would be I'm just going to show the the one | |
| 16 17 | customer meter read is obtained at the end of each | 16 meter. But it's applicable to any other meter that we | |
| 17 18 | month monthly billing period, excuse me, by | 17 had. 18 Even if you look at this summary at the | |
| 18 | subtracting the beginning rate at the beginning of the month from the end rate at the end of the month. | 18Even if you look at this summary at the19summary, received kilowatt hours. It's zero. What it | |
| 20 | So what I was describing after that is I | 20 shows, kilowatt hours cumulative, which means it's just a | а |
| 20 | provided a phrase from here. So it's page No. 12. | 20 shows, knowait hours cumulative, which means it's just a 21 usage value. This is the raw data. And as I said, both | a |
| 21 | So the core element of AMI smart meter which | 22 SAP and Oracle, they have both specific modules to | |
| 23 | provide number of functions including measuring customer | 23 process the data. | |
| 24 | electricity consumption in 5-, 15-, 30- or 60-minute | 24 So MDMS, it's just a system that stores, right, | |
| 25 | intervals measuring voltage levels and monitoring the | all the all the data they receive from all the meters. | |
| | | | |

5 (Pages 34 to 37)

| | Page 38 | | Page 40 |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | But it's definitely not something that can be used for | 1 | and calculate the the amount you of kilowatt hours |
| 2 | the billing because those are particular steps, | 2 | at any time to the customer. The demand bill the |
| 3 | particular calculations, that need to take into | 3 | demand charges is different calculations. It's just |
| 4 | considerations like profile data. Profile data meaning | 4 | additional, I would say, feature. But in even if you |
| 5 | that they group each interval by the group because the | 5 | look at the general specifications, there is a reason why |
| 6 | scale is one hour, not 15 minutes. So these all the | 6 | I was always all along I was saying that the smart |
| 7 | values, the cumulative values, they have to be calculated | 7 | meters, they read kilowatt hours. Because it's clearly |
| 8 | before they go into the billing, before they go in | 8 | stating active energy, in parenthesis, kilowatt hours, |
| 9 | before PSE bills us for kilowatt hours. | 9 | kilowatts. The active energy measure the active power |
| 10 | Even if you look at the so this is SAP real | 10 | measures in watts, or kilowatts, in this particular |
| 11 | time real-time billing. So real-time billing, also | 11 | scenario. |
| 12 | known as a demand billing. If you even look at the | 12 | So there are several areas where I I thought |
| 13 | pictures, right, so this is kilowatt. In how would I | 13 | I was very clear that showed how those meters are not |
| 14 | call what would I call it? Because when we see the | 14 | even kept. Because calculations are not happening in the |
| 15 | interval data, they can use kilowatt or kilowatt hours in | 15 | meters. So this just measures how the amount of |
| 16 | general from the data perspective. It doesn't matter. | 16 | measure. And then it goes after that to specific module |
| 17 | Because all these measurements, all this amount of | 17 | that is supposed to calculate everything, meaning the |
| 18 | cumulative data, it goes to particular module. And from | 18 | quantity in service, quantity bill to customers. I hope |
| 19 | there, calculations, business rules, happening. And | 19 | that makes sense. |
| 20 | after that, as an end result, you get the amount of | 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, |
| 21 | consumption, the number of kilowatt hours we actually | 21 | Ms. Argunov. I was just going to remind you of your ten |
| 22 23 | used. | 22 | minutes. |
| 23 | Unfortunately, what's happening is that PSE billing us for raw, uncalculated data, which causing, as | 23 | But are you concluded? |
| 24 | I said, the charges being four times more than it's | 24 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. |
| 20 | i said, the charges being four times more than it's | 25 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| | | 1 | |
| | Page 39 | | Page 41 |
| 1 | | 1 | |
| 1 2 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. | 1 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to |
| | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the | 1 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. |
| 2 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not | 2 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give |
| 2 3 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. | 2 3 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? |
| 2 3 4 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not | 2 3 4 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give |
| 2 3 4 5 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to | 2 3 4 5 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is | 2 3 4 5 6 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, attention, so this is the billing options. The billing | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours per month, it appears. And then in May, it looks like |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, attention, so this is the billing options. The billing options, there are basically two. So time of use, which you see is not using but they're going to. And then | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours per month, it appears. And then in May, it looks like between 240 and 360. The house, it's illogical that this kind of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, attention, so this is the billing options. The billing options, there are basically two. So time of use, which you see is not using but they're going to. And then demand billing, also known as real time. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours per month, it appears. And then in May, it looks like between 240 and 360. The house, it's illogical that this kind of energy would be used in a house that had no finished |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, attention, so this is the billing options. The billing options, there are basically two. So time of use, which you see is not using but they're going to. And then demand billing, also known as real time. So I think where the confusion is coming from is | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours per month, it appears. And then in May, it looks like between 240 and 360. The house, it's illogical that this kind of energy would be used in a house that had no finished electrical in it, was still under construction. We had a |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, attention, so this is the billing options. The billing options, there are basically two. So time of use, which you see is not using but they're going to. And then demand billing, also known as real time. So I think where the confusion is coming from is that for some reason PSE considered demand only as | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours per month, it appears. And then in May, it looks like between 240 and 360. The house, it's illogical that this kind of energy would be used in a house that had no finished electrical in it, was still under construction. We had a power pole, temp power pole, which we have a separate |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, attention, so this is the billing options. The billing options, there are basically two. So time of use, which you see is not using but they're going to. And then demand billing, also known as real time. So I think where the confusion is coming from is that for some reason PSE considered demand only as a if they charge customers for the demand itself. But | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours per month, it appears. And then in May, it looks like between 240 and 360. The house, it's illogical that this kind of energy would be used in a house that had no finished electrical in it, was still under construction. We had a power pole, temp power pole, which we have a separate exhibit showing that invoice which has been paid. And to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, attention, so this is the billing options. The billing options, there are basically two. So time of use, which you see is not using but they're going to. And then demand billing, also known as real time. So I think where the confusion is coming from is that for some reason PSE considered demand only as a if they charge customers for the demand itself. But demand billing, it's interval billing. It's real-time | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours per month, it appears. And then in May, it looks like between 240 and 360. The house, it's illogical that this kind of energy would be used in a house that had no finished electrical in it, was still under construction. We had a power pole, temp power pole, which we have a separate exhibit showing that invoice which has been paid. And to be honest with, you moving forward with occupation |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, attention, so this is the billing options. The billing options, there are basically two. So time of use, which you see is not using but they're going to. And then demand billing, also known as real time. So I think where the confusion is coming from is that for some reason PSE considered demand only as a if they charge customers for the demand itself. But demand billing, it's interval billing. It's real-time billing. Meaning that if any time, if any time of the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours per month, it appears. And then in May, it looks like between 240 and 360. The house, it's illogical that this kind of energy would be used in a house that had no finished electrical in it, was still under construction. We had a power pole, temp power pole, which we have a separate exhibit showing that invoice which has been paid. And to be honest with, you moving forward with occupation starting in August, running air-conditioning full-time |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | supposed to be because each hour it's four intervals. And this is the if they would use those one of the modules that they were supposed to do. So that would not be happening. And I also, if I have still time, I wanted to show let me see. That would be yes. So this is Exhibit No. EACCH-30 which is describes in general FOCUS AX meters, right, and provides specific metrics around display options and everything. So this is the energy metric. So this is the plus kilowatt hours, kilowatt delivered, right, which I already showed you that which shows zero everywhere if you look at the meter configurations. There is no such even amount calculated from anywhere. So the other thing that if you put here, attention, so this is the billing options. The billing options, there are basically two. So time of use, which you see is not using but they're going to. And then demand billing, also known as real time. So I think where the confusion is coming from is that for some reason PSE considered demand only as a if they charge customers for the demand itself. But demand billing, it's interval billing. It's real-time | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | And, yes, when you cite exhibits, I tried to pull them up at the same time so you know. So all right. Would the Johnsons like to give an opening statement? MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we would. Thank you, Your Honor. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. JOHNSON: I would reference Exhibit 4 in our case. We're leaning heavily on Elena on her expertise in calculating data points that I don't have that kind of expertise. So we're going to rely on her testimony as far as the what the logic behind the inaccurate billing that we received. But, specifically, Exhibit 4 notes, that there was a March and April charge of 480-plus kilowatt hours per month, it appears. And then in May, it looks like between 240 and 360. The house, it's illogical that this kind of energy would be used in a house that had no finished electrical in it, was still under construction. We had a power pole, temp power pole, which we have a separate exhibit showing that invoice which has been paid. And to be honest with, you moving forward with occupation |

6 (Pages 38 to 41)

| | Page 42 | Page 44 |
|--|--|---|
| 1 | \$400. | 1 from all of our appliances and all of our systems. And |
| 2 | So for the fact that March and April and May, | 2 when we add up the cost per year of every appliance, |
| 3 | for that matter, reflecting the \$4,403.92 charged to us, | 3 it our bills are more than that in a month than what |
| 4 | electrically logically, it doesn't make any sense to | 4 these all these appliances should be costing us in an |
| 5 | us. | 5 entire year. |
| б | So my statement will be much shorter and brief, | 6 So that's that's all we have. Like I said, |
| 7 | briefer to the point that our allegations against PSE is | 7 we're relying heavily on Elena. But we've tried to |
| 8 | that this obviously is a miscalculation in some fashion. | 8 communicate with PSE about how it doesn't make sense. |
| 9 | We can't even fathom who would be in the house that would | 9 And when we call customer service, we've been told the |
| 10 | be using that much electricity, if any electricity at all | 10 first questions we've been asked is, well, how many |
| 11 | was being used, due to the fact that the furnace was | 11 Teslas are you charging? And the answer is none. We |
| 12 | installed but not active. We had heaters and blowers in | 12 have zero Teslas. We have a single-story home. |
| 13 | the that were running up to the temp power poles on | 13And there's been a lot of excuses on their part |
| 14 | extension cords to assist with the drywall situation. | about justifying the high bills. And there's just no |
| 15 | And were asked actually not to run the heat by the | 15 justifying it in our eyes. |
| 16 | drywallers in order to keep the ambient temperature in | 16 And that concludes my statement. |
| 17 | the house at a certain level. | 17 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 18 | We did run fans and we actually opened windows | 18 I turn next to the Company. |
| 19 20 | to help the drying process. Fortunately we don't live in the west side of the state, so the humidity is much less | 19 MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 OPENING STATEMENT |
| 20 | where we live, so it does assist in the drying situation. | 21 MR. STARKEY: The case in front of you today, |
| 21 | Again, back to the logical point of this. | it's about accuracy and whether or not Puget Sound Energy |
| 23 | In an unoccupied home that doesn't have any | 23 ultimately and accurately billed customers for the energy |
| 24 | finished electrical and has no appliances running in it, | that they used. And the testimony shows that it did. |
| 25 | the fact that PSE is stating that we spent 4,000 and | 25 Involved here are three different customers who |
| | | |
| | Page 43 | Page 45 |
| 1 | change in electrical costs seems illogical and not | 1 all built new homes in a remote neighborhood near Cle |
| 2 | substantiated. And, honestly, we haven't found anything | 2 Elum. Each customer had their own informal complaint and |
| | | |
| 3 | that PSE has produced to show how they can substantiate | their own unique set of facts. But they've combined it |
| 4 | these costs to us. | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is |
| 4 5 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. | under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is incorrectly billing customers. |
| 4 5 6 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case |
| 4 5 6 7 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: |
| 4 5 6 7 8 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi | under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is incorrectly billing customers. What the evidence and the testimony in this case shows, and will show, are three things: One, that the complainants have not met their burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the underlying theory is incorrect. And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to make it all make sense with our bills, especially since | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and 15 running that area. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to make it all make sense with our bills, especially since our extremely high bills were coming at a point where we were living in the home. And when our bills were 6-, \$700 a month when we were primarily heating with a wood | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and 15 running that area. 16 And, accordingly, the imposition of fines is not 17 necessary. 18 So there are three complainants; there's the |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to make it all make sense with our bills, especially since our extremely high bills were coming at a point where we were living in the home. And when our bills were 6-, \$700 a month when we were primarily heating with a wood stove during the winter. And now this year during the | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and 15 running that area. 16 And, accordingly, the imposition of fines is not 17 necessary. 18 So there are three complainants; there's the 19 Groesbecks, the Johnsons and Argunovs. And I'll take |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to make it all make sense with our bills, especially since our extremely high bills were coming at a point where we were living in the home. And when our bills were 6-, \$700 a month when we were primarily heating with a wood stove during the winter. And now this year during the same months, our bills were around \$200. It doesn't add | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and 15 running that area. 16 And, accordingly, the imposition of fines is not 17 necessary. 18 So there are three complainants; there's the 19 Groesbecks, the Johnsons and Argunovs. And I'll take 20 those in turn, and I'll address the larger allegation at |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to make it all make sense with our bills, especially since our extremely high bills were coming at a point where we were living in the home. And when our bills were 6-, \$700 a month when we were primarily heating with a wood stove during the winter. And now this year during the same months, our bills were around \$200. It doesn't add up. And it doesn't make sense for us, to put it shortly. | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and 15 running that area. 16 And, accordingly, the imposition of fines is not 17 necessary. 18 So there are three complainants; there's the 19 Groesbecks, the Johnsons and Argunovs. And I'll take 20 the end with the Argunov complaint. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to make it all make sense with our bills, especially since our extremely high bills were coming at a point where we were living in the home. And when our bills were 6-, \$700 a month when we were primarily heating with a wood stove during the winter. And now this year during the same months, our bills were around \$200. It doesn't add up. And it doesn't make sense for us, to put it shortly. And although we're not experts in any of these | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and 15 running that area. 16 And, accordingly, the imposition of fines is not 17 necessary. 18 So there are three complainants; there's the 19 Groesbecks, the Johnsons and Argunovs. And I'll take 20 those in turn, and I'll address the larger allegation at 21 the end with the Argunov complaint. 22 But the key across all three cases is that they |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to make it all make sense with our bills, especially since our extremely high bills were coming at a point where we were living in the home. And when our bills were 6-, \$700 a month when we were primarily heating with a wood stove during the winter. And now this year during the same months, our bills were around \$200. It doesn't add up. And it doesn't make sense for us, to put it shortly. And although we're not experts in any of these areas, it just with our house being brand-new and us | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and 15 running that area. 16 And, accordingly, the imposition of fines is not 17 necessary. 18 So there are three complainants; there's the 19 Groesbecks, the Johnsons and Argunovs. And I'll take 20 those in turn, and I'll address the larger allegation at 21 the end with the Argunov complaint. 22 But the key across all three cases is that they 23 were ultimately billed based off of actual energy used. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to make it all make sense with our bills, especially since our extremely high bills were coming at a point where we were living in the home. And when our bills were 6-, \$700 a month when we were primarily heating with a wood stove during the winter. And now this year during the same months, our bills were around \$200. It doesn't add up. And it doesn't make sense for us, to put it shortly. And although we're not experts in any of these areas, it just with our house being brand-new and us knowing the results of our blower door tests, knowing how | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and 15 running that area. 16 And, accordingly, the imposition of fines is not 17 necessary. 18 So there are three complainants; there's the 19 Groesbecks, the Johnsons and Argunovs. And I'll take 20 those in turn, and I'll address the larger allegation at 21 the end with the Argunov complaint. 22 But the key across all three cases is that they 23 were ultimately billed based off of actual energy used. 24 So I'll start with the Groesbecks. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | these costs to us. So that's my statement. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would the Groesbecks like to giving opening statement? Opening Statement MS. GROESBECK: Yeah. We are similar to the Johnsons as we're relying heavily on Elena's calculations and expertise throughout in her testimony. But we're in the same boat as Tom and Heidi where it's almost become a second job for me trying to make it all make sense with our bills, especially since our extremely high bills were coming at a point where we were living in the home. And when our bills were 6-, \$700 a month when we were primarily heating with a wood stove during the winter. And now this year during the same months, our bills were around \$200. It doesn't add up. And it doesn't make sense for us, to put it shortly. And although we're not experts in any of these areas, it just with our house being brand-new and us | 4 under now one broad, but inaccurate theory, that PSE is 5 incorrectly billing customers. 6 What the evidence and the testimony in this case 7 shows, and will show, are three things: 8 One, that the complainants have not met their 9 burden of proof that there is an underlying issue. 10 Two, PSE can affirmatively show that the 11 underlying theory is incorrect. 12 And, three, PSE has taken the necessary steps to 13 remediate any problems that existed, and those issues are 14 unlikely to repeat because the AMI network is up and 15 running that area. 16 And, accordingly, the imposition of fines is not 17 necessary. 18 So there are three complainants; there's the 19 Groesbecks, the Johnsons and Argunovs. And I'll take 20 those in turn, and I'll address the larger allegation at 21 the end with the Argunov complaint. 22 But the key across all three cases is that they 23 were ultimately billed based off of actual energy used. |

7 (Pages 42 to 45)

| | Page 46 | Page 48 |
|--|---|--|
| 1 | the issues that they experienced were primarily from the | 1 So while that should be enough, discovery in the |
| 2 | AMR meter network. The network that receives the reads | 2 case has shown that there's a plausible explanation for |
| 3 | from the AMR meter and transfers that information along | 3 why the high usage occurred contrary to the Johnsons' |
| 4 | for billing. | 4 claims. |
| 5 | The meter was giving accurate reads, though. So | 5 And for that, I direct you to SBH-4, which has |
| 6 | it was functional, but the network was not receiving | 6 discussions between the Johnsons and their contractor. |
| 7 | them. And when this happens, PSE has a procedure where | 7 What these discussions show is that they had permanent |
| 8 | it will send estimated bills as allowed under WAC | 8 power running to the house by December of 2021. They had |
| 9 | 480-100-178 and its tariff. | 9 their HVAC and electrical heating system up and running |
| 10 | And then it will reconcile future bills once it | 10 in early January. They did not have a garage door. They |
| 11 | receives an actual read from the meter. And that | 11 did not have a door sealing off the garage into the |
| 12 | reconciliation process is important here. It's how PSE | 12 house. And, instead, they were relying on plywood and |
| 13 | will make sure that a customer only pays for energy used. | 13 plastic to seal that. They also didn't have Sheetrock |
| 14 | So if the estimated bill was high, customers | 14 installed until later in March of 2022. |
| 15 | would receive a credit; if the estimated bill was low, | 15 All the while, according to their contractor, |
| 16 | then the balance will be made up in what is called a | 16 the heating system in the house was set to run at |
| 17 | true-up bill. But either way, the customer will only pay | 17 65 degrees. And the energy usage here shows a heating |
| 18 | for the actual energy used based off of the actual read | 18 system that is fighting a losing battle. A losing battle |
| 19 | from the meter. | ¹⁹ with the cold in one of the coldest areas of PSE service |
| 20 | For the Groesbecks, their estimated bills were | 20 territory. And a large house that is over 4,000 square |
| 21 | initially low because there was no data or historical | 21 feet that has not been properly sealed to the elements. |
| 22 | energy usage because there was a new construction. When | 22 It had cracked windows and a bevy of unreliable |
| 23 | PSE did eventually receive actual reads, they send | 23 subcontractors. |
| 24 | true-up bills based off of actual usage. But that AMR | 24 The key fact, though, is that the Johnsons' |
| 25 | meter, while it was still accurately measuring energy | ²⁵ meter was accurate, and they were billed for energy used. |
| | Page 47 | Page 49 |
| 1 | use, it continued to struggle with getting the reads | 1 Now the Argunovs also claim that their bills are |
| 2 | through the AMR network. | 2 not based off of energy use, but on a much different and |
| 3 | And the result was that the Groesbecks had | 3 also incorrect theory that has now been adopted and is |
| 4 | multiple estimated bills even though they had an accurate | 4 the foundation for the formal complaint. |
| 5 | true-up bill in between that. And PSE offered, and the | 5 The Argunovs claim that PSE's system is |
| 6 | Groesbecks enrolled in a payment plan, so they did not | 6 essentially quadrupling the amount of energy a customer |
| 7 | have to pay multiple months of a true-up on one go. And | 7 uses when it goes to billing. And that theory assumes |
| 8 | then eventually PSE did replace their AMR meter with an | 8 that PSE's meters measure and record energy in kilowatts |
| 9 | AMI meter. And that solved the network communication | ⁹ or as Ms. Argunov called, a unit of measure. And this |
| 10 | issues. | 10 theory assume and then extends it to MDMS and SAP, |
| 11 | | |
| 11 | Well, for the Groesbecks, PSE acknowledges that | 11 which improperly takes that data or does not convert the |
| 12 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were | 12 data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours. |
| 12 13 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to | data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours. But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory |
| 12 13 14 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts | data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours. But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly |
| 12 13 14 15 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. | data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours. But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all |
| 12 13 14 15 16 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the | data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours. But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all the way until the customer has a bill in hand. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the Johnsons had an AMI meter for their permanent service | 12data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours.13But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory14is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly15measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all16the way until the customer has a bill in hand.17Ian Hagan, an electrical engineer, explains how |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the Johnsons had an AMI meter for their permanent service from the outset, and that was in December of 2021. | data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours. But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all the way until the customer has a bill in hand. Ian Hagan, an electrical engineer, explains how the meters measure and record energy in kilowatt hours. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the Johnsons had an AMI meter for their permanent service from the outset, and that was in December of 2021. And their complaint is based on a three-month | data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours. But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all the way until the customer has a bill in hand. Ian Hagan, an electrical engineer, explains how the meters measure and record energy in kilowatt hours. Allison Sains and Kristina McClenahan show how that read |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the Johnsons had an AMI meter for their permanent service from the outset, and that was in December of 2021. And their complaint is based on a three-month period where they had particularly high bills in early | 12data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours.13But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory14is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly15measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all16the way until the customer has a bill in hand.17Ian Hagan, an electrical engineer, explains how18the meters measure and record energy in kilowatt hours.19Allison Sains and Kristina McClenahan show how that read20goes through the meter data management system, SAP, to |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the Johnsons had an AMI meter for their permanent service from the outset, and that was in December of 2021. And their complaint is based on a three-month period where they had particularly high bills in early 2022, ranging from 15,000 kilowatt hours in one month to | 12data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours.13But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory14is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly15measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all16the way until the customer has a bill in hand.17Ian Hagan, an electrical engineer, explains how18the meters measure and record energy in kilowatt hours.19Allison Sains and Kristina McClenahan show how that read20goes through the meter data management system, SAP, to21then bill customers on a monthly or bimonthly basis in |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the Johnsons had an AMI meter for their permanent service from the outset, and that was in December of 2021. And their complaint is based on a three-month period where they had particularly high bills in early 2022, ranging from 15,000 kilowatt hours in one month to about 8,000 kilowatt hours in another. And while that | 12data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours.13But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory14is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly15measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all16the way until the customer has a bill in hand.17Ian Hagan, an electrical engineer, explains how18the meters measure and record energy in kilowatt hours.19Allison Sains and Kristina McClenahan show how that read20goes through the meter data management system, SAP, to21then bill customers on a monthly or bimonthly basis in22kilowatt hours that are actually used. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the Johnsons had an AMI meter for their permanent service from the outset, and that was in December of 2021. And their complaint is based on a three-month period where they had particularly high bills in early 2022, ranging from 15,000 kilowatt hours in one month to about 8,000 kilowatt hours in another. And while that usage is higher than expected, PSE did send out a meter | 12data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours.13But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory14is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly15measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all16the way until the customer has a bill in hand.17Ian Hagan, an electrical engineer, explains how18the meters measure and record energy in kilowatt hours.19Allison Sains and Kristina McClenahan show how that read20goes through the meter data management system, SAP, to21then bill customers on a monthly or bimonthly basis in22And they also show how the system will estimate |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the Johnsons had an AMI meter for their permanent service from the outset, and that was in December of 2021. And their complaint is based on a three-month period where they had particularly high bills in early 2022, ranging from 15,000 kilowatt hours in one month to about 8,000 kilowatt hours in another. And while that usage is higher than expected, PSE did send out a meter technician to test that meter. And that meter tested | 12data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours.13But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory14is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly15measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all16the way until the customer has a bill in hand.17Ian Hagan, an electrical engineer, explains how18the meters measure and record energy in kilowatt hours.19Allison Sains and Kristina McClenahan show how that read20goes through the meter data management system, SAP, to21then bill customers on a monthly or bimonthly basis in22And they also show how the system will estimate24a bill, when needed, if a read is not received. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | there were multiple estimated bills. And there were corrected errors because the AMR meter was not able to send reads over the AMR network. But all amounts ultimately charged are based on actual energy used. So now we'll shift to the Johnsons. And the Johnsons had an AMI meter for their permanent service from the outset, and that was in December of 2021. And their complaint is based on a three-month period where they had particularly high bills in early 2022, ranging from 15,000 kilowatt hours in one month to about 8,000 kilowatt hours in another. And while that usage is higher than expected, PSE did send out a meter | 12data for billing purposes in kilowatt hours.13But the PSE witnesses explained why that theory14is incorrect. And it demonstrate how PSE will properly15measure energy usage in kilowatt hours from the meter all16the way until the customer has a bill in hand.17Ian Hagan, an electrical engineer, explains how18the meters measure and record energy in kilowatt hours.19Allison Sains and Kristina McClenahan show how that read20goes through the meter data management system, SAP, to21then bill customers on a monthly or bimonthly basis in22And they also show how the system will estimate |

8 (Pages 46 to 49)

| | Page 50 | | Page 52 |
|----------|---|----|---|
| 1 | specific particularities of each customer's account in | 1 | Can we hear from Public Counsel? |
| 2 | the general in the informal complaints. | 2 | MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Good morning. |
| 3 | And what these witnesses show is how the issues | 3 | OPENING STATEMENT |
| 4 | the customers faced are generally isolated and unlikely | 4 | MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel is the statutory |
| 5 | to occur again, which is contrary to Public Counsel's | 5 | party in Commission proceedings. And we are a party in |
| 6 | contention. | 6 | this case because three customers in the Cle Elum area |
| 7 | The complainants cannot meet the burden of | 7 | complained against PSE for meter and service issues. PSE |
| 8 | proof. They have not shown that this is a systemic | 8 | has been rolling out its advanced meter infrastructure, |
| 9 | problem. They have not shown that there are issues with | 9 | also called AMI, or smart meters, over the last several |
| 10 | their individual meters. | 10 | years. Meters are a critical component of a utility's |
| 11 | The evidence and the testimony show the | 11 | infrastructure because it reads the customer's usage for |
| 12 | opposite. That the AMI meter network is more reliable | 12 | billing and other purposes. |
| 13 | than the previous AMR network. The process for | 13 | With respect to the particular claims made by |
| 14 | estimating a bill follows the WAC. And the issues that | 14 | the complainant, Public Counsel has not taken a position. |
| 15 | these customers face are isolated and tied to that older | 15 | We honestly had hoped to solve the mystery here. But in |
| 16 | AMR meter network. It's the system that is being | 16 | the end, the issues are for the complainants and PSE to |
| 17 | replaced and has been replaced for the complainants. | 17 | present their arguments to the Commission. |
| 18 | And while multiple estimated bills did occur for | 18 | We do view the issues as warranting Commission |
| 19 | the Groesbecks, as Commission staff noted in the informal | 19 | review and input. And the customers deserve the |
| 20 | complaints, one the AMR meters were replaced by AMI | 20 | opportunity to present their case as does the Company. |
| 21 | meters, those issues, they dissipate. And that's | 21 | Public Counsel engaged in discovery to |
| 22 | important when considering whether to impose fines for | 22 | understand what transpired. The Argunovs, Johnson, and |
| 23 | potential violation. | 23 | Groesbeck families were building new homes during the |
| 24 | While Public Counsel has alluded that it might | 24 | relevant time period. Without going into the specifics |
| 25 | be tied to a larger issue, they don't have a basis for | 25 | of each customer's experience, as a group, they |
| | Page 51 | | Page 53 |
| 1 | that allegation or they at least ignore the proven | 1 | experienced various issues with both their AMR and AMI |
| 2 | reliability of the new AMI meters. Which ultimately that | 2 | meters. They contacted the Commission and availed |
| 3 | was the solution was to replace the AMR meters with the | 3 | themselves of the informal complaint process. |
| 4 | new AMI meters so that they could communicate with the | 4 | Because they were unsatisfied with the result |
| 5 | upgrade and more reliable network. | 5 | through that process, they filed this formal complaint. |
| 6 | And Public Counsel's recommendation flies in the | 6 | Commission staff identified ten violations |
| 7 | face of PSE's AMI rollout. Public Counsel has known | 7 | during the informal Commission complaint process. Those |
| 8 | since 2019 that the AMR network was not as reliable and | 8 | violations involved failure to conduct timely meter |
| 9 | the transition could not happen overnight. | 9 | tests, delayed billing, incorrectly charging to schedule |
| 10 | But PSE provided the customers here with the AMI | 10 | 24 instead of the residential tariff, estimating bills |
| 11 | meters ahead of schedule. They did the install | 11 | for longer than allowed under the rule, and billing for |
| 12 | themselves rather than waiting for a contractor to go out | 12 | corrections that went beyond the allowed time period. |
| 13 | and get around to their neighborhood. And that | 13 | Commission staff correctly identified the ten |
| 14 | ultimately resolved the network communication issues. | 14 | violations they note in the informal complaint records, |
| 15 | And we ask that you consider context and the | 15 | which I understand are part of the record in this case. |
| 16 | specific facts here that, given the circumstances, given | 16 | Public Counsel has identified 12 additional |
| 17 | the isolated nature of the issues, given the unlikelihood | 17 | violations during this formal complaint case as detailed |
| 18 | that they will happen again, you should follow the | 18 | in Aaron Tam's testimony and exhibits. Those violations |
| 19 | recommendation of the Commission staff in the informal | 19 | follow a similar pattern to the violations identified by |
| 20 | complaints and issue violations where appropriate, but | 20 | Commission staff. Mr. Tam details violations related to |
| 21 | find that fines are unnecessary. | 21 | estimating bills for longer than allowed, billing for |
| | The key question here is were the customers | 22 | corrections that went beyond the allowed time period, |
| 22 | ultimately accurately hilled? And the ensure is use | | |
| 23 | ultimately, accurately billed? And the answer is yes. | 23 | failure to meet service requirements, and failure to |
| 23 24 | Thank you. | 24 | maintain meters in good working order. |
| 23 | | | |

9 (Pages 50 to 53)

| | Page 54 | | Page 56 |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | irregularities in how PSE addressed the metering issues | 1 | MS. ARGUNOV: Oh, sorry. |
| 2 | experienced by the Argunovs, Johnson, and Groesbeck | 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hagan I will swear in |
| 3 | family as demonstrated by the 22 violations identified by | 3 | Mr. Hagan and then you may proceed. |
| 4 | Public Counsel and submission Commission staff. | 4 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Sorry. |
| 5 | The Commission should consider penalizing PSE | 5 | * * * * * |
| 6 | for those violations to encourage future compliance with | 6 | lan Hagan, having been first duly sworn, was |
| 7 | PSE's regulatory obligations. | | examined and testified as |
| 8 | Public Counsel recognizes that imposing | 7 | follows: |
| 9 | penalties under RCW 80.04.380 through a complaint brought | 8 | THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. |
| 10 | under RCW 80.04.110, would likely involve a separate | 9 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. |
| 11 | complaint brought in a new docket. | 10 | Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. |
| 12 | We ask that the Commission in its order in this | 11 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 13 | docket, instruct Commission staff to bring such a | 12 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: |
| 14 | complaint. Thank you. | 13 14 | Q. So, Mr. Hagan, would you please explain the |
| 15 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 15 | difference between AMR and AMI meters? |
| 16 | So we will turn now to the cross-examination of | 16 | A. Yes. So AMR meters are a one-way so AMR meters, they communicate over what's called a one-way |
| 17 | witnesses. | 17 | communication network. So the meter transmits an energy |
| 18 | Our first witness on the order of presentation | 18 | read in kilowatt hours. It's received by the network. |
| 19 | is Ms. Argunov. | 19 | It goes into MDMS. |
| 20 | So, Ms. Argunov, if you can turn your camera on | 20 | The AMI network, the key difference with that, |
| 21 | if it's not great. Thank you. | 21 | it's a two-way communication network where not only do we |
| 22 | And if you would please raise your right hand | 22 | receive kilowatt hour reads from the AMI meters, but we |
| 23 | and I'll swear you in. | 23 | can also send commands to the meters. So this helps us |
| 24 | * * * * * | 24 | in terms of the commands that, you know, for example, |
| 25 | Elena Argunov, having been first duly sworn, was | 25 | are, say, we can ping a meter. We can open and close a |
| | Page 55 | | Page 57 |
| 1 | | | |
| 1 | follows: | 1 | remote disconnect switch. We can download load profile |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | remote disconnect switch. We can download load profile reads. Things of that nature. |
| | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. | | reads. Things of that nature. |
| 2 | | 2 | |
| 2 3 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. | 2 3 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. |
| 2 3 4 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes | 2 3 4 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification |
| 2 3 4 5 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring | 2 3 4 5 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. | 2 3 4 5 6 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the |
| 2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian Hagan. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. Versus AMI, where it's two-way communication. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian Hagan. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, Mr. Hagan is walking | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. Versus AMI, where it's two-way communication. PSE communicates with the meter; the meter communicates |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian Hagan. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, Mr. Hagan is walking into the room, and he'll be here soon. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. Versus AMI, where it's two-way communication. PSE communicates with the meter; the meter communicates with the PSE. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian Hagan. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, Mr. Hagan is walking into the room, and he'll be here soon. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. Versus AMI, where it's two-way communication. PSE communicates with the meter; the meter communicates with the PSE. Is that would be a correct statement because I'm |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian Hagan. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, Mr. Hagan is walking into the room, and he'll be here soon. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. MR. STARKEY: So give us about ten seconds. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. Versus AMI, where it's two-way communication. PSE communicates with the meter; the meter communicates with the PSE. Is that would be a correct statement because I'm a little bit confused? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian Hagan. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, Mr. Hagan is walking into the room, and he'll be here soon. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. MR. STARKEY: So give us about ten seconds. JUDGE HOWARD: Sounds good. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. Versus AMI, where it's two-way communication. PSE communicates with the meter; the meter communicates with the PSE. Is that would be a correct statement because I'm a little bit confused? A. So when it comes to AMR, our the information |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian Hagan. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, Mr. Hagan is walking into the room, and he'll be here soon. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. MR. STARKEY: So give us about ten seconds. JUDGE HOWARD: Sounds good. MS. ARGUNOV: Good morning. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. Versus AMI, where it's two-way communication. PSE communicates with the meter; the meter communicates with the PSE. Is that would be a correct statement because I'm a little bit confused? A. So when it comes to AMR, our the information that could be sent over the AMR network was fairly |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian Hagan. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, Mr. Hagan is walking into the room, and he'll be here soon. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. MR. STARKEY: So give us about ten seconds. JUDGE HOWARD: Sounds good. MS. ARGUNOV: Good morning. THE WITNESS: Hi. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. Versus AMI, where it's two-way communication. PSE communicates with the meter; the meter communicates with the PSE. Is that would be a correct statement because I'm a little bit confused? A. So when it comes to AMR, our the information that could be sent over the AMR network was fairly limited. And this was limited to energy register reads |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank you. And PSE indicated I believe it was five minutes of cross for this witness. And you may proceed. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, sorry I didn't bring this up beforehand. But PSE doesn't have any questions for Ms. Argunov. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That's that is fine. In that case, Ms. Argunov, then, you won't be subject to cross today. But I imagine you will still attend because you're representing yourself. MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: Our next witness is PSE's Ian Hagan. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, Mr. Hagan is walking into the room, and he'll be here soon. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. MR. STARKEY: So give us about ten seconds. JUDGE HOWARD: Sounds good. MS. ARGUNOV: Good morning. THE WITNESS: Hi. MS. ARGUNOV: So I have a number of questions. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | reads. Things of that nature. Q. Thank you. So I have then a clarification clarification question. So I didn't submit an exhibit, but if you Google it, the AMR the difference between AMR and AMI meters. So AMR meters, the one with communication is where PSE basically, right, can communicate with the meter, but the actual profile data can also only be downloaded by actual technician. He doesn't have to be, like, a manually load the profile. But he can, from the car, having the tools, whatever they need, export the profile data. Versus AMI, where it's two-way communication. PSE communicates with the meter; the meter communicates with the PSE. Is that would be a correct statement because I'm a little bit confused? A. So when it comes to AMR, our the information that could be sent over the AMR network was fairly limited. And this was limited to energy register reads only. There wasn't any load profile data sent over the |

10 (Pages 54 to 57)

| | Page 58 | | Page 60 |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | Q. Well, just a quick note, as I said, this is what | 1 | A. More on the meter side of it, not on the back |
| 2 | l've learned so there is no really I couldn't find any | | end. MDMS or SAP end of it. |
| 3 | documentation about such thing like an AMR network. Just | 3 | MS. ARGUNOV: So I'm not sure, Your Honor, if |
| 4 | because considering that it's a one-way communication, | 4 | you would allow it, because I wanted to present the |
| 5 | the AMR data needs to be actually manually downloaded | 5 | discrepancies between interval data and meter reads. And |
| 6 | either with manually or with the specific tools that they | 6 | ask Mr. Hagan how he would explain where the differences |
| 7 | can communicate with the meter if the technician is close | 7 | are coming from. But I'm not sure if it's possible. So |
| 8 | to AMR meters. | 8 | let me know. |
| 9 | So, again, I'm not I don't really understand | 9 | JUDGE HOWARD: Well, if you'd like to ask |
| 10 | this conversation about AMR when they are not even | 10 | Mr. Hagan about a specific exhibit |
| 11 | designed to transfer the data into PSE. Versus AMI when | 11 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. |
| 12 | we switched, yes, then we have those interval | 12 | JUDGE HOWARD: you can certainly attempt to |
| 13 | interval readings that we can download from PSE account, | 13 | do that. I'm not I'm not going to I'm not sure if |
| 14 | et cetera. | 14 | Mr. Hagan is personally familiar with all of the exhibits |
| 15 | So the another question, let's | 15 | in the record. So sometimes this can get a little we |
| 16 | MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, I'm going to have to | 16 | have to see what the witness is actually familiar with. |
| 17 | object to that line. That was Ms. Argunov was | 17 | MS. ARGUNOV: Well, this is just multiple |
| 18 | testifying there. There was no question. | 18 | me, as a customer, asking for data integrity in general. |
| 19 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. | 19 | So let me share my screen. |
| 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Ms. Argunov, I I will | 20 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: |
| 21 | grant that objection. We want to be careful to you | 21 | Q. So all this data, it's combined together from |
| 22 | will want to be careful to limit yourself to posing | 22 | Exhibit EACCH-41. It's combined data for all four |
| 23 | questions to Mr. Hagan. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. | 23 24 | accounts including meter reads, MDMS and interval, plus |
| 24 25 | JUDGE HOWARD: And I'm going to give this | 24 | billing summary. |
| 20 | JUDGE HOWARD. And the going to give this | 25 | So my big concern and I wanted to ask |
| | Page 59 | | Page 61 |
| 1 | is a technical subject, of course. So I understand if | 1 | Mr. Hagan how he would explain that is that we have such |
| 2 | you need to refer to something and preface your question | 2 | big differences between meter, or MDMS what they call it, |
| 3 | describing what you're talking about. But it does need | 3 | billing totals and intervals. So when I when it says |
| 4 | to end in a question. | 4 | to me that AMI system is transparency between company and |
| 5 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. | | to the that Awi system is transparency between company and |
| - | | 5 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they |
| 6 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 5 6 | |
| | Q. So my second question. | 6 7 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they |
| 6 7 8 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system | 6 7 8 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the – the whole period of |
| 6 7 8 9 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. | 6 7 8 9 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt |
| 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not | 6 7 8 9 10 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to | 6 7 8 9 10 11 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the – the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary – and this, again, is for all |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the – the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary – and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the – the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary – and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to Allison Sains. | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a customer, looking at those numbers, can verify that where |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to Allison Sains. Q. Okay. I'll notate it. | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a customer, looking at those numbers, can verify that where is the truth? Which one which source is correct? |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to Allison Sains. Q. Okay. I'll notate it. Quick question about the VEE process. Would | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a customer, looking at those numbers, can verify that where is the truth? Which one which source is correct? Because, to me, the difference is too large. |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to Allison Sains. Q. Okay. I'll notate it. Quick question about the VEE process. Would that be you who can answer? | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a customer, looking at those numbers, can verify that where is the truth? Which one which source is correct? |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to Allison Sains. Q. Okay. I'll notate it. Quick question about the VEE process. Would | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a customer, looking at those numbers, can verify that where is the truth? Which one which source is correct? Because, to me, the difference is too large. It's not a couple hundred kilowatt hours. We're talking about almost 40-, closer to 50,000 kilowatt hours' |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to Allison Sains. Q. Okay. I'll notate it. Quick question about the VEE process. Would that be you who can answer? A. Unfortunately, no. When it comes to VEE, that | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a customer, looking at those numbers, can verify that where is the truth? Which one which source is correct? Because, to me, the difference is too large. It's not a couple hundred kilowatt hours. We're talking |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to Allison Sains. Q. Okay. I'll notate it. Quick question about the VEE process. Would that be you who can answer? A. Unfortunately, no. When it comes to VEE, that would either be Allison Sains or Kristina McClenahan. | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a customer, looking at those numbers, can verify that where is the truth? Which one which source is correct? Because, to me, the difference is too large. It's not a couple hundred kilowatt hours. We're talking about almost 40-, closer to 50,000 kilowatt hours' difference. |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to Allison Sains. Q. Okay. I'll notate it. Quick question about the VEE process. Would that be you who can answer? A. Unfortunately, no. When it comes to VEE, that would either be Allison Sains or Kristina McClenahan. Q. Okay. So from your testimony, it looks like you | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a customer, looking at those numbers, can verify that where is the truth? Which one which source is correct? Because, to me, the difference is too large. It's not a couple hundred kilowatt hours. We're talking about almost 40-, closer to 50,000 kilowatt hours' difference. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, two points. |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. So my second question. Going back to conversation about AMI system overview and L+G system that PSE is using. So would you please explain why PSE have not used the module called "MDUS"? That, according to Exhibit 37, is a platform and served as a breach between meters and billing processes? A. Unfortunately, I am not the proper witness to ask with regards to this module. I would refer you to Allison Sains. Q. Okay. I'll notate it. Quick question about the VEE process. Would that be you who can answer? A. Unfortunately, no. When it comes to VEE, that would either be Allison Sains or Kristina McClenahan. Q. Okay. So from your testimony, it looks like you stated that you're responsible for the integrity, meaning | 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | between customers and they can, you know, know what they what their daily consumption or monthly consumption. So when I look at all four accounts, so I see the totals for interval for the the whole period of time starting 2020 through 2023, it's 108,000 kilowatt hours. When I look at meter reads, I see 172,000. When I pull the billing summary and this, again, is for all four accounts, it's 209,000 kilowatt hours. So you, as a person that as you stated, you in charge of data integrity and accuracy, how I'm as a customer, looking at those numbers, can verify that where is the truth? Which one which source is correct? Because, to me, the difference is too large. It's not a couple hundred kilowatt hours. We're talking about almost 40-, closer to 50,000 kilowatt hours' difference. MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, two points. One, that is not an objection. I know |

11 (Pages 58 to 61)

| | Page 62 | | Page 64 |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| 1 | can make the exhibits available to PSE witnesses, I | 1 | Excuse me, page No. 8. |
| 2 | wanted to note that. | 2 | So row 6 through 14, when you're explaining the |
| 3 | And, two, I do have an objection to that line of | 3 | noncommunicating meters not equipped with a remote |
| 4 | questioning. That was argumentative. And we can contend | 4 | disconnect switch and must be disconnected manually. And |
| 5 | that Ms. Argunov was testifying there rather than setting | 5 | then you're talking about collection of the data from |
| 6 | up a question. | 6 | noncommunicating meters. |
| 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Ms. Argunov, we we | 7 | A. Yes. So when it comes to collection of the data |
| 8 | can't see your screen right now. | 8 | from the noncommunicating meters, the meter readers |
| 9 | Are you intending to share? | 9 | primarily go to the site and they take the read off of |
| 10 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. I will oh, I'm so | 10 | the display. |
| 11 | sorry. | 11 | However, there is an option to download the |
| 12 | JUDGE HOWARD: No, no, that's fine. | 12 | meter download the low-profile data from the meter, if |
| 13 | Are you intending to share Exhibit 41C? | 13 | necessary. |
| 14 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. As I e-mailed you a couple | 14 | Q. So meaning, profile data meaning the daily |
| 15 | days ago, so this is from Exhibit 41C, a combined data of | 15 | usage, right? |
| 16 | all four accounts. So this is the meter read which is | 16 | A. Load profile is what you would refer to what |
| 17 | one, showing 174,000 kilowatt. This is the billing | 17 | I believe you referred to as the interval data. |
| 18 | summary, showing 209 kilowatt 209,000 kilowatt. And | 18 | Q. Yes. Okay. Thank you. |
| 19 | this is all our intervals, right, which is 118,000 | 19 | THE REPORTER: Excuse me. This is the |
| 20 | kilowatt hours. | 20 | reporter. |
| 21 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 21 | Are you saying "load" or "low"? |
| 22 | Q. So my question is, so if we even add up the AMR | 22 23 | THE WITNESS: Oh, load. MS. ARGUNOV: Load. |
| 23 24 | values, right, so there is still a difference of almost | 23 | THE REPORTER: With a D? |
| 24 | 40,000 kilowatt hours between meter reads and kilowatt hours usage per billing summary. | 24 | THE WITNESS: With a D, yes. |
| 23 | nours usage per binning summary. | | |
| | Page 63 | | Page 65 |
| 1 | So how can again, my question to Mr. Hagan, | 1 | THE REPORTER: Thank you. |
| 2 | seeing those differences, how we can be sure and rely on | 2 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Well, I guess the rest of |
| 3 | PSE calculations if there is such huge discrepancies? | 3 | the question will have to go to Ms. Sains and |
| 4 | A. So I am not the proper person to be asking this | 4 | Ms. McClenahan. |
| 5 | line of questioning to. I would refer that to either | 5 | JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Starkey, was there |
| б | Allison Sains or Kristina McClenahan. | 6 | any redirect? |
| 7 | Q. Okay. Let me see. Okay. | 7 | MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Two really |
| 8 | So going back to your testimony on page 6, | 8 | short questions. |
| 9 | Exhibit 1H-1T? | 9 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 10 | JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Argunov, you may if | 10 | BY MR. STARKEY: |
| 11 | you're done with this for now, you may want to stop | 11 | Q. Mr. Hagan, Ms. Argunov was asking about the |
| 12 13 | sharing your screen. | 12 13 | difference between the AMR and the AMI meters. And is the AMI network or is one next work |
| 14 | MS. ARGUNOV: Stop sharing. Just give me a second. | 14 | more reliable than another when it comes to those meters? |
| 15 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 15 | A. Yes. The AMI network is more reliable than the |
| 16 | Q. Okay. I would like to go back again to AMR and | 16 | AMR network. |
| 17 | NCR meters also. So you stated in this exhibit that | 17 | Q. And when those meters are measuring energy, what |
| 18 | there is an option to load the profile data. Does it | 18 | unit of energy are both meters measuring for purposes of |
| 19 | mean that PSE technician still has the ability to load | 19 | billing? |
| 20 | daily usage from NCR meter as well, noncommunicating | 20 | A. Kilowatt hours. |
| 21 | meter? | 21 | MR. STARKEY: Thank you. Nothing further, |
| 22 | A. I apologize. Which page is this? | 22 | Your Honor. |
| 23 | Q. Number 6 where where you're talking about AMR | 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 24 | and NCR NCR meters. Just give me a second. I'll find | 24 | I think that it might be a good time before we |
| 25 | the rows. | 25 | begin with our next witness, would be Allison Sains, that |
| | | | |

12 (Pages 62 to 65)

| | Page 66 | Page 68 |
|--|--|---|
| 1 | we take, let's say, a 10- or 15-minute break. Let's say | 1 A. Well, the FOCUS AX is the actual meter model |
| 2 | a ten-minute midmorning break. And let's resume here at | 2 itself. And that would questions about the meter |
| 3 | 10:48 a.m. | 3 itself would be for Mr. Ian Hagan. |
| 4 | And, Mr. Hagan, thank you for your testimony | 4 Q. Well, it's not about meter configuration. |
| 5 | today. You would be excused from the rest of the | 5 What I'm asking is what PSE is using for |
| 6 | hearing. | 6 billing. There are two options according to the |
| 7 | THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. | 7 description. It's time of use or demand billing. |
| 8 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. We are off the | 8 So which one you're when you're talking MDMS, |
| 9 10 | record. | ⁹ which one you're talking about, time of use or demand? |
| TO | (A break was taken from 10:38 a.m. to 10:50 a.m.) | 10 A. Well, when I read when I look at this |
| 11 | 10.50 a.m. to 10.50 a.m.j | 11 document, those are display options on the meter itself |
| 12 | JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the record. We're | 12 and not talking about how PSE carries out its billing in |
| 13 | returning after our midmorning break. | 13 the SAP or MDMS. |
| 14 | Our next witness is PSE's Allison Sains. Am I | 14 Q. Okay. |
| 15 | saying your last name correctly? | 15 A. It's specific to the meter display. |
| 16 | THE WITNESS: Yes, you are. | 16 Q. Okay. Then that would be my next question. |
| 17 | JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. | 17 So in the several testimonies from in your |
| 18 | If you would please raise your right hand and | 18 testimony as well as Ms. McClenahan, you were you were |
| 19 | I'll swear you in. | 19 referencing to L+G platform. And the I was in one |
| 20 | Allison Sains. having been first duly sworn, was | 20 of the testimonies, there was a link. |
| 21 | Allison Sains, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as | 21 So I followed the link and on the first page, |
| 22 | follows: | so what I notice is that the billing order. And I notice |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. | the this thing which called MDUS. |
| 24 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 24 So from my understanding, PSE is not using this |
| 25 | Ms. Argunov, you indicated cross for this | 25 module at all, MDUS. Is that a correct statement? |
| | | |
| | Page 67 | Page 69 |
| 1 | witness. | 1 MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, I'm going to object |
| 2 | You may proceed. | 2 to this. I'm not sure what Ms. Argunov is sharing, or if |
| - | CROSS-EXAMINATION | 2 Abia is an autobility and an internal in the surgery and this is |
| 3 | CROSS-EXAMINATION | 3 this is an exhibit submitted in a cross exhibit. I |
| 3 4 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 4 would object to that. |
| | | |
| 4 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 4 would object to that. |
| 4 5 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me |
| 4 5 6 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. |
| 4 5 6 7 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So it looks like it's – it was mentioned here. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So it looks like it's – it was mentioned here. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from I don't know if this is from Ms. Sains or if it's |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So it looks like it's – it was mentioned here. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. Which which one is PSE the one is using, time | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from I don't know if this is from Ms. Sains or if it's from Ms. McClenahan. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So it looks like it's – it was mentioned here. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. Which which one is PSE the one is using, time of use or demand? | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from I don't know if this is from Ms. Sains or if it's JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I believe it's it is |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So it looks like it's it was mentioned here. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. Which which one is PSE the one is using, time of use or demand? A. So I am not an expert in the meter | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from I don't know if this is from Ms. Sains or if it's from Ms. McClenahan. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I believe it's it is from McClenahan, KM-1CT, page 6. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So it looks like it's – it was mentioned here. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. Which which one is PSE the one is using, time of use or demand? A. So I am not an expert in the meter configuration. But we are not using either time of use | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from Ms. McClenahan. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I believe it's it is from McClenahan, KM-1CT, page 6. MR. STARKEY: Then, yes, that does appear to |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. Which which one is PSE the one is using, time of use or demand? A. So I am not an expert in the meter configuration. But we are not using either time of use nor demand billing at PSE. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from Ms. McClenahan. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I believe it's it is from McClenahan, KM-1CT, page 6. MR. STARKEY: Then, yes, that does appear to be correct. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. Which which one is PSE the one is using, time of use or demand? A. So I am not an expert in the meter configuration. But we are not using either time of use nor demand billing at PSE. Q. So I'm very confused. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from Ms. McClenahan. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I believe it's it is from McClenahan, KM-1CT, page 6. MR. STARKEY: Then, yes, that does appear to be correct. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. Which which one is PSE the one is using, time of use or demand? A. So I am not an expert in the meter configuration. But we are not using either time of use nor demand billing at PSE. Q. So I'm very confused. So you said that your expertise is MDMS module. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from Ms. McClenahan. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I believe it's it is from McClenahan, KM-1CT, page 6. MR. STARKEY: Then, yes, that does appear to be correct. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. You may proceed, Ms. Argunov. |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So it looks like it's - it was mentioned here. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. Which which one is PSE the one is using, time of use or demand? A. So I am not an expert in the meter configuration. But we are not using either time of use nor demand billing at PSE. Q. So I'm very confused. So you said that your expertise is MDMS module. And this is part of the billing. So should I ask, then, | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from Ms. McClenahan. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I believe it's it is from McClenahan, KM-1CT, page 6. MR. STARKEY: Then, yes, that does appear to be correct. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. You may proceed, Ms. Argunov. MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Is |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Good morning, Ms. Sains. So not to confuse between witnesses, so would you mind describing your area of expertise? A. So I support PSE's meter data management system. Q. Okay. So my first question will be going back to Exhibit EACCH-30. And I will share my screen this time. So this is a specification for FOCUS AX meters. And it describes the display options along with type of billings that this meter supports. So there are two options, time of use and demand billing. Which which one is PSE the one is using, time of use or demand? A. So I am not an expert in the meter configuration. But we are not using either time of use nor demand billing at PSE. Q. So I'm very confused. So you said that your expertise is MDMS module. | would object to that. MS. ARGUNOV: This was a link in Ms let me see. It was a link provided in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 6. So I followed this link. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. One moment. Let me catch up. Mr. Starkey, are you able to my browser is a little slow at the moment. Are you able to confirm that this is the link from your witness's testimony? Because I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to take official notice of this technical standard. MR. STARKEY: Yeah, Your Honor. I think it's from Ms. McClenahan. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I believe it's it is from McClenahan, KM-1CT, page 6. MR. STARKEY: Then, yes, that does appear to be correct. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. You may proceed, Ms. Argunov. |

13 (Pages 66 to 69)

| | Page 70 | | Page 72 |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| 1 | statement? Or is he is he confirming this is an | 1 | So all both systems, largest ERP system, I |
| 2 | accurate document? I'm making sure because he did object | 2 | would say, they have separate modules for processing |
| 3 | to the submission. | 3 | interval data and handing it off to billing. And as you |
| 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Starkey, do you do you | 4 | can see, this document was printed in January 6th. But |
| 5 | have any continued objection to her displaying this | 5 | I it's been there for a while now. |
| 6 | document? | 6 | So my question is if SAP states that the billing |
| 7 | MR. STARKEY: We might have other objections. | 7 | of interval-related data profiles is called real-time |
| 8 | I'll object to foundation. | 8 | pricing billing so this is something that is required |
| 9 | But I'll let Ms. Argunov ask her question. | 9 | as well, as I mentioned, in a my overview. So all |
| 10 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 10 | interval data-related profiles are subject to separate |
| 11 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 11 | billing process and calculations. |
| 12 | Q. So my question was because I in any of | 12 | So, again, I'm going back to my question is that |
| 13 | I in any of testimonies, I haven't heard any reference | 13 | why PSE chose to recreate something by themselves |
| 14 | to this particular model, MDUS. And this is the module | 14 | disregarding the actual requirements of their own system, |
| 15 | that processing data for further billing. | 15 | basically, their PC system that they're working with? |
| 16 | So I I see in multiple testimonies reference | 16 | A. Is the question about why we're not using MDUS? |
| 17 | to L+G software. I saw MDMS. But I didn't see any | 17 | Q. The question if you're if you said that it |
| 18 | reference to MDUS. | 18 | wasn't available at that time, why you didn't use the one |
| 19 | Which is, according to Exhibit EA-37 just let | 19 | that are available in SAP? |
| 20 | me put okay. So this is the Exhibit EACCH-37 where it | 20 | A. So, again |
| 21 | says that Landis+Gyr is the premier smart metering | 21 | Q. Because it's a requirement. |
| 22 | solution. And together with SAP, we have developed a | 22 | A. So MDUS is not a requirement of exchanging data |
| 23 | solution that acts as a bridge between smart metering and | 23 | between an MDMS system and SAP. It is just a an |
| 24 | the SAP for utility systems. | 24 | application you can purchase so you don't have to build |
| 25 | So my question is why PSE is always referencing | 25 | it in in-house. |
| | Page 71 | | Page 73 |
| 1 | MDMS which is not even designed for interval processing | 1 | Again, we had already built our interfaces |
| 2 | but doesn't use the MDUS instead? | 2 | in-house. So there was no need to purchase another |
| 3 | A. So MDUS stands for meter data unification and | 3 | application to exchange that data. |
| 4 | synchronization. It is a tool, a standard Landis+Gyr | 4 | We are not using interval data for billing in |
| 5 | tool, or application, that allows the exchange of data | 5 | any way. So this document, that RTP billing does not |
| б | between an SAP and a meter data management system. | 6 | apply to us. We are not using interval billing. |
| 7 | When PSE implemented their MDMS system, the | 7 | Q. But this is the link that I was provided, right? |
| 8 | Landis+Gyr MDUS was not yet available. So we built all | 8 | This is what I was this is what you guys were |
| 9 | of those interfaces in-house. There's no need for us to | 9 | referring to, right? |
| 10 | replace those standard in-house built interfaces with | 10 | And if you go into the chapter of quantity |
| 11 | this standard application. | 11 | determination, right, so it clearly states where they |
| 12 | It is just to exchange, or as they say, bridge | 12 | talk about a quantity determination during period that |
| 13 | data between the two systems. | 13 | these this processes, they are relevant for discrete |
| 14 | Q. So just to confirm that I understand it | 14 | measurement data. |
| 15 | correctly. | 15 | So as I stated, I don't know, were you |
| 16 | So PSE are the ones who developed their own | 16 | present I can reshare. Just give me a sec. |
| 17 | tool, right, for the billing, basically? | 17 | Let me see if I can so it might be another |
| 18 19 | A. To exchange data between Landis+Gyr MDMS and SAP, correct. | 18 19 | requirement to use particular platform which is MDUS. But, again, according to U.S. Department of Energy, the |
| 20 | Q. So then that would be another question. | 20 | consumption on 5-, 15-, 30-, 60-minute intervals, they |
| 20 | So in and this is the Exhibit EACCH-2.1. | 20 | are subject to communicating back to customers for |
| 21 | So this is a capture from SAP website. They | 22 | billing, energy feedback, and time-based rates. |
| 23 | call it real-time pricing. Oracle call it interval | 23 | Also SAP documentation also references and I |
| 24 | billing in the description. Of the meter that I showed | 24 | have it in my in my exhibits where the real time |
| 25 | before, it's called demand billing. | 25 | all interval related and it clearly states here that |
| | , | | |

14 (Pages 70 to 73)

| | Page 74 | | Page 76 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | all interval-related data profiles are subject to | 1 | you you will be able to answer it? |
| 2 | specific module. | 2 | A. I can you repeat the question? I'm not sure. |
| 3 | So if you didn't use the MDUS, or if you're not | 3 | Q. If I wanted to present the discrepancy for a |
| 4 | using the SAP, which they require, so you the PSE was | 4 | particular billing period, the one that I discovered |
| 5 | supposed to mirror at least whatever requirements SAP has | 5 | between interval readings and billing summary and meter |
| б | for their billing. Because my because I'm not quite | 6 | reads, so would that be okay to ask you this question to |
| 7 | sure so because it was PSE choice not to use any of | 7 | try and explain the discrepancy? |
| 8 | the required platforms, either from L+G or SAP. So you | 8 | Or it's better to address it to Ms. McClenahan? |
| 9 | guys created your own and it causes the problem. | 9 | A. So I can speak to the interval and daily data |
| 10 | So I'm just trying to understand where the | 10 | stored in our MDMS system. And I can speak to what was |
| 11 | disconnect is. | 11 | sent to the SAP system. |
| 12 | So if you could, again | 12 | Q. Okay. Well, let's try so, again, I wanted to |
| 13 | MR. STARKEY: Your Honor | 13 | share the screen. |
| 14 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 14 | So all the data is taken from Exhibit 41C, all |
| 15 | Q clarify why you didn't use the real-time | 15 | four accounts. Meter reads, interval, MDMS, and billing |
| 16 | price billing pricing for SAP. This is a module that | 16 | summary. |
| 17 | was there for a long time. | 17 | So, Ms. Sains, there was a couple billings |
| 18 | MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, I'm going to object | 18 | charged to large amounts were charged to my account. |
| 19 | to that line of questioning as testifying. | 19 | So I took the billing range for meter reads to make sure |
| 20 | I'm also going to object to the grounds that | 20 | I compare like apples to apples, right? And this is what |
| 21 | foundation. | 21 | I'm seeing. |
| 22 | And I also want to object to the use of compound | 22 | So according to meter read, daily meter read, |
| 23 | question. | 23 | the total for this particular billing period, which is |
| 24 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. And I will I will | 24 | from December 16th, 2029 to February 10, 2022, the total |
| 25 | grant those objections. | 25 | usage daily usage was 19 1,900, right? I'm looking |
| | Page 75 | | Page 77 |
| 1 | Ms. Argunov, again, I do recognize this is a | 1 | at the interval and daily and it's 29. |
| 2 | technical matter. I would encourage you to try to pose | 2 | However, looking at the billing, the same period |
| 3 | specific, discrete questions to Ms. Sains. | 3 | of time, everything is the same, it is 8,300. |
| 4 | And if you're going to share a different exhibit | 4 | So my question is how would you explain those |
| 5 | on your screen, like a moment ago you were sharing | 5 | huge discrepancies between meter reads, intervals, and |
| 6 | EACCH-7, just kind of verbally say what you're sharing so | 6 | billing? |
| 7 | the court reporter can note it and then ask your specific | 7 | A. So Landis+Gyr had a network issue in this area |
| 8 | question. | 8 | during that time frame. And MDMS was not receiving all |
| 9 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. So I'll rephrase. | 9 | of the reads on the meters during that period of time. |
| 10 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 10 | So when you're looking at the daily cumulative |
| 11 | Q. Again, my question is if PSE, major ERP system | 11 | usage, you can see there are days where information is |
| | | | |
| 12 | required a specific module for all interval-related data, | 12 | missed. We were also receiving partial interval reads |
| 13 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? | 13 | for those days. That's why you have some values for |
| 13 14 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it?A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an | 13 14 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. |
| 13 14 15 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not | 13 14 15 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So |
| 13 14 15 16 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not using that functionality in SAP. | 13 14 15 16 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So they will not reconcile. |
| 13 14 15 16 17 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not using that functionality in SAP. Q. When you say the real time pricing, can you | 13 14 15 16 17 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So they will not reconcile. The billing summary was based on the |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not using that functionality in SAP. Q. When you say the real time pricing, can you define what real pricing is? | 13 14 15 16 17 18 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So they will not reconcile. The billing summary was based on the point-in-time cumulative billing reads. So that is just |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not using that functionality in SAP. Q. When you say the real time pricing, can you define what real pricing is? A. So I'm not here to testify to SAP functionality. | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So they will not reconcile. The billing summary was based on the point-in-time cumulative billing reads. So that is just the billing read minus the prior billing read to |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not using that functionality in SAP. Q. When you say the real time pricing, can you define what real pricing is? A. So I'm not here to testify to SAP functionality. I would have to defer to Kristina McClenahan on SAP | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So they will not reconcile. The billing summary was based on the point-in-time cumulative billing reads. So that is just the billing read minus the prior billing read to determine your billing usage. |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not using that functionality in SAP. Q. When you say the real time pricing, can you define what real pricing is? A. So I'm not here to testify to SAP functionality. I would have to defer to Kristina McClenahan on SAP functionality. | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So they will not reconcile. The billing summary was based on the point-in-time cumulative billing reads. So that is just the billing read minus the prior billing read to determine your billing usage. Q. So I wanted to go back to AMI system benefits, |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not using that functionality in SAP. Q. When you say the real time pricing, can you define what real pricing is? A. So I'm not here to testify to SAP functionality. I would have to defer to Kristina McClenahan on SAP functionality. Q. Okay. Thank you. | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So they will not reconcile. The billing summary was based on the point-in-time cumulative billing reads. So that is just the billing read minus the prior billing read to determine your billing usage. Q. So I wanted to go back to AMI system benefits, right, where it says that we, customer, can keep track of |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not using that functionality in SAP. Q. When you say the real time pricing, can you define what real pricing is? A. So I'm not here to testify to SAP functionality. I would have to defer to Kristina McClenahan on SAP functionality. Q. Okay. Thank you. So question, Ms. Sains, about the discrepancies | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So they will not reconcile. The billing summary was based on the point-in-time cumulative billing reads. So that is just the billing read minus the prior billing read to determine your billing usage. Q. So I wanted to go back to AMI system benefits, right, where it says that we, customer, can keep track of their daily usage and everything. |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | why PSE doesn't use it doesn't use it? A. Interval billing is not a requirement of a an AMI meter. This describes real-time pricing. We are not using that functionality in SAP. Q. When you say the real time pricing, can you define what real pricing is? A. So I'm not here to testify to SAP functionality. I would have to defer to Kristina McClenahan on SAP functionality. Q. Okay. Thank you. | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | for those days. That's why you have some values for intervals. When you sum those up, there's data missing. So they will not reconcile. The billing summary was based on the point-in-time cumulative billing reads. So that is just the billing read minus the prior billing read to determine your billing usage. Q. So I wanted to go back to AMI system benefits, right, where it says that we, customer, can keep track of |

15 (Pages 74 to 77)

| | Page 78 | Page | 80 |
|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | So how would I know which which values are | 1 months, number one. And even if I look the previous | |
| 2 | correct? Because I don't have I don't have any | 2 months in 2022, so I cannot find the average of 108 | |
| 3 | reports. And I tried to figure out if PSE has any. So I | kilowatt hours anyways anywhere. | |
| 4 | don't have any reports showing the validation estimation | 4 So where those numbers could possibly come f | rom? |
| 5 | process that was applied to both sides of because | 5 A. So this appears to be from the SAP billing | |
| 6 | meter read and interval data are coming from the same | 6 statements. And I can't speak to that information. | |
| 7 | source, which is smart meter. They are not different. | 7 Kristina or Stacey Stacey Halsen would be able to tal | x |
| 8 | The problem is that there is no consolidated | 8 to these numbers. | |
| 9 | system that would reconcile those values, right? So, to | 9 Q. Okay. Ms. Sains, VEE, validation estimation ar | d |
| 10 | me, looking at this, my actual usage was 2,900, and I was | editing process, is mandatory to all profile data at | |
| 11 | billed for 8,300. | 11 least? | |
| 12 | So how would I reconcile that? How the PSE | 12 A. We run VEE processes against our daily and our | |
| 13 | customer will be able to obtain the data? | 13 interval reads in MDMS. | |
| 14 | A. So your billing statement would have the | 14 Q. Mm-hmm. So going back to 41C and MDMS re | ads. |
| 15 | cumulative reads and dates that it used to determine your | 15 right? So if I look let me unfilter the filters. | , |
| 16 | billing usage. From this data, when there's data not | 16 So when I look at my account, right wrong | |
| 17 | received from the meter, you won't be able to sum up what | 17 page. | |
| 18 | those cumulative daily values are. You would have to | 18 So when I'm looking at my account and I see that | at |
| 19 | refer to just those the point-in-time read for your | 19 a value and this is actually in meter read, neither in | |
| 20 | bill. | 20 MDMS or meter read in the daily does not request. I | |
| 21 | Q. Thank you. | add that because I I wanted to see what's going to | |
| 22 | My next question would be about estimations. | 22 the total of kilowatt hours. | |
| 23 | Is this something that it's okay to address with | 23 So when I look at MDMS readings, all I see is a | |
| 24 | you? | cumulative of 32,000 kilowatt hours. There is no | |
| 25 | Or you would like me to ask this question of | daily there is no records of it. | |
| | | | |
| | Page 79 | Page | 81 |
| 1 | Ms. McClenahan? | 1 So would that be correct statement if I say that | • |
| 2 | A. I can speak to the estimations that are | 2 none of the old all of those daily daily reads that | L |
| | | | t |
| 3 | completed in MDMS via the VEE process. | 3 are including included into this 32,000, went through | t Igh |
| 4 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In | are including included into this 32,000, went through a validation check? Would that be correct statement | t Igh |
| 4 5 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. | are including included into this 32,000, went throw a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it | t Igh |
| 4 5 6 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE | are including included into this 32,000, went through a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. | t ıgh nt? |
| 4 5 6 7 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for | are including included into this 32,000, went through a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce | t ugh nt? ss |
| 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, | are including included into this 32,000, went through a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with | t ugh ht? ss the |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. | are including included into this 32,000, went throw a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation processor | t ugh ht? ss the |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statements A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proceties mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation proposed for those records? | t ugh ht? ss the |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. | are including included into this 32,000, went throw a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation pro- for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So I | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statements A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profor those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month consumption. | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profor those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month consumption. And then I tried to see where those estimations | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profit for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And ther I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profor for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And ther I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proces is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profor for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And then I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. So my question, going back to estimation rules, | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proces is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profile for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is putting in those estimation values. | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And then I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. So my question, going back to estimation rules, how the estimation rules work. And because in this | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proces is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation procession for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is putting in those estimation values. Q. So | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And ther I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. So my question, going back to estimation rules, how the estimation rules work. And because in this particular case, it says "previous month." There was no | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profile for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is putting in those estimation values. Q. So A. If the meter recorded the information, then it's | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And then I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. So my question, going back to estimation rules, how the estimation rules work. And because in this particular case, it says "previous month." There was no previous months, right? | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profile for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is putting in those estimation values. Q. So - A. If the meter recorded the information, then it's good. | t ugh ht? ss the cess |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And then I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. So my question, going back to estimation rules, how the estimation rules work. And because in this particular case, it says "previous month." There was no previous months, right? | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profile for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is putting in those estimation values. Q. So A. If the meter recorded the information, then it's good. Q. It's good. | t ugh nt? ss the cess be |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And then I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. So my question, going back to estimation rules, how the estimation rules work. And because in this particular case, it says "previous month." There was no previous months, right? So and then, actually, those charges were charged in August of 2022, right? So we're talking | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profile for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is putting in those estimation values. Q. So A. If the meter recorded the information, then it's good. Well, I about being it's good, we don't know, | t ugh nt? ss the cess be |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And then I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. So my question, going back to estimation rules, how the estimation rules work. And because in this particular case, it says "previous month." There was no previous months, right? So and then, actually, those charges were charged in August of 2022, right? So we're talking about, like, seven, eight months apart. | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profile for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is putting in those estimation values. Q. So A. If the meter recorded the information, then it's good. Well, I about being it's good, we don't know, | t ugh nt? ss the cess be |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And then I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. So my question, going back to estimation rules, how the estimation rules work. And because in this particular case, it says "previous month." There was no previous months, right? So and then, actually, those charges were charged in August of 2022, right? So we're talking about, like, seven, eight months apart. So how is it that this note stating that it was | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proces is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profile for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is putting in those estimation values. Q. So A. If the meter recorded the information, then it's good. Well, I about being it's good, we don't know, right, because it didn't go through the validation | t ugh nt? ss the cess be |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. Okay. Let me let me just bring this up. In a moment I will be presenting Exhibit EACCH-4. So this that happened already after VEE because these are summaries of the billing statements for Groesbecks' account. So the data was requested from PSE, right? And I was looking into their accounts. So it says that estimation formula based formula based on previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. So the previous month's consumption. And then I tried to see where those estimations could possibly come from. So the averages, daily averages, would not come even close to 108.71. So my question, going back to estimation rules, how the estimation rules work. And because in this particular case, it says "previous month." There was no previous months, right? So and then, actually, those charges were charged in August of 2022, right? So we're talking about, like, seven, eight months apart. | are including included into this 32,000, went throut a validation check? Would that be correct statement A. MDMS did not receive that information. So it couldn't run VEE on something it didn't have. Q. So if you say that in general the VEE proce is mandatory. So why how PSE can validate with amount that was billed to me without validation profile for those records? A. So when reads are received by the meters, the VEE process isn't you know, reads are assumed to good unless they aren't in line with other information. Primarily what we're doing is we're filling in gaps when reads are not received. You know, it's validation estimating and editing so that editing is putting in those estimation values. Q. So A. If the meter recorded the information, then it's good. Well, I about being it's good, we don't know, | t ugh nt? ss the cess be |

16 (Pages 78 to 81)

| | Page 82 | | Page 84 |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| 1 | A. I have no reason to doubt the meter. I believe | 1 | kilowatt hours that were billed to my account without |
| 2 | it was tested. At some point the meters went through | 2 | even proper VEE validation process. |
| 3 | testing. | 3 | So is there any other investigation that was |
| 4 | Q. Well, do you do you have, like, any | 4 | conducted when I addressed those billing issues with PSE? |
| 5 | statistical energy consumption around Washington state? | 5 | MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, I am going to object |
| 6 | Like what would be the average per household per | 6 | to this line of questioning as testifying. |
| 7 | month, the kilowatt hours? | 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. |
| 8 | A. That's not yeah. That's not information that | 8 | Ms. Argunov, there was a fair amount of |
| 9 | I have. | 9 | testimony preceding that question. |
| 10 | Q. So I wanted to present Exhibit 9C. EACCH-9C. | 10 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. |
| 11 | Sorry. My laptop is syncing. | 11 | JUDGE HOWARD: And I've I've noticed that |
| 12 | MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, while Ms. Argunov is | 12 | in a few of your preceding questions as well, and I |
| 13 | looking for that information, can I chime in with a quick | 13 | haven't commented on it. But I cannot consider that |
| 14 | question. | 14 | testimony preceding your question. |
| 15 | JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Johnson, the parties did | 15 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. |
| 16 | have an opportunity to indicate their plan for cross | 16 | JUDGE HOWARD: I'm also a little concerned at |
| 17 | time. | 17 | this point that the witness might not be that there |
| 18 | MR. JOHNSON: Okay. | 18 | might be a what we call a foundation issue. The |
| 19 | JUDGE HOWARD: So I would be hesitant to allow | 19 | witness might not be familiar with these issues you're |
| 20 | that. | 20 | talking about. |
| 21 | MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. | 21 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Well, this is what I'm |
| 22 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 22 | trying to understand because I already asked questions |
| 23 24 | Q. I'm trying to find the part with the when UTC was allowing the rate increase where they were talking | 23 24 | about Mr. Hagan. He asked me to ask those questions to Ms. Sains. |
| 24 | about average Washington usage kilowatt hours per month. | 25 | Now I'm asking those questions to Ms. Sains and |
| 20 | | | |
| | Page 83 | | Page 85 |
| 1 | And I'm sorry, I couldn't find but I will find it. | 1 | now I so I'm trying I'm a little bit confused on |
| 2 | But it it's on UTC website as well. | 2 | who I can ask those questions right now at this point, |
| 3 | So the average consumption per household, it's | 3 | you know. Because so far it's it's very challenging. |
| 4 | about 843 kilowatt hours. | 4 | In general, for example, Mr. Hagan, right, he |
| 5 | So my question is seeing this amount of 32,000 | 5 | has from his testimony this is why I asked those |
| 6 | kilowatt hours and it's less than the year which makes | 6 | questions because he said that he was responsible for |
| 7 | it almost 2,700 per month so knowing that we lived in | 7 | data integrity, MDMS, et cetera, and interval readings. |
| 8 | trailer, used propane as a main source of heating, do you | 8 | And my questions were two words, those systems. But then |
| 9 | think from your perspective, 2,700 kilowatt hours per | 9 | I was then I was told to ask Ms. Sains those |
| 10 | month, this is something that could actually happen while | 10 | questions. |
| 11 | we were not even living in the house? | 11 | So my concern is that is there any witness, so I |
| 12 13 | A. So I'm not an expert in the average usage for homes and trailers in the Cle Elum area. I would expect, | 12 13 | won't waste anyone's time, that I can ask all of these |
| 13 | due to weather conditions, it would be higher than | 14 | questions and who is comfortable to answer them? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, I certainly see that I |
| 15 | - | 15 | mean, this is a you know, this is a multifaceted |
| 16 | average. Q. So agree about the weather conditions. | 16 | issue. As I understood Mr. Hagan's testimony was |
| 17 | But you I also wanted to point it out that | 17 | primarily focused on the meters themselves. And |
| 18 | 90 percent of Cle Elum residents, they do not use | 18 | Ms. Sains and the other witnesses were more focused on |
| 19 | electronic heaters or anything. They use wooden stoves | 19 | the later processes for how that data is processed. |
| 20 | or propane. So we lived in our trailer using propane as | 20 | But your last question of Ms. Sains was about |
| 21 | a main source of heating. | 21 | your actual energy usage and comparing that to statewide |
| 22 | And to me, 2,700 is not even close to what it | 22 | averages. |
| 23 | might be what it should be what it should have | 23 | So I do feel we are going from topic to topic a |
| 24 | been. | 24 | little bit. |
| 0.5 | So this is why I was asking you about 32,000 | 25 | BY MS A BOLINOV |
| 25 | So this is why I was asking you about 52,000 | 25 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: |

17 (Pages 82 to 85)

| | Page 86 | | Page 88 |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | Q. Okay. Well, the my initial question was if I | 1 | A. So an MDMS, it's the the cumulative read that |
| 2 | see this lump sum cumulative in MDMS and don't see daily, | 2 | we're using. It's like a car odometer. It's tracking |
| 3 | my ultimate question was does it if it's correct | 3 | that total off from the meter. And so that total number |
| 4 | statement, does it mean that none of the daily usage went | 4 | minus the number that was used in the prior month, the |
| 5 | through the validation process? | 5 | difference between those two is your usage. |
| 6 | So if we could confirm that, that would be | 6 | Q. And that total number, what unit of measurement |
| 7 | great. | 7 | is that in? |
| 8 | A. So MDMS did not receive daily reads from the AMR | 8 | A. It's in kilowatt hours. |
| 9 | meter. So we could not run VEE against data we did not | 9 | MR. STARKEY: Thank you. That's all I have. |
| 10 | receive. | 10 | Nothing further, Your Honor. |
| 11 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Perfect. Thank you very | 11 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, |
| 12 | much. | 12 | Ms. Sains, for your testimony today. And you would be |
| 13 | Thank you. That was my last question. | 13 | excused from the rest of the hearing. |
| 14 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 14 | Our next witness and sorry, again, for my |
| 15 | Mr. Starkey, any redirect? | 15 | horse voice here our next witness would be Kristina |
| 16 | MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. Three very | 16 | McClenahan. |
| 17 | brief questions. | 17 | MS. ARGUNOV: Your Honor, can I ask for |
| 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Argunov, could | 18 | five-minute break, please? |
| 19 | you stop sharing your screen? | 19 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Certainly. |
| 20 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. Sorry. | 20 | MS. ARGUNOV: Thank you. |
| 21 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. It's all right. | 21 | JUDGE HOWARD: Let's go off the record. And |
| 22 | MS. ARGUNOV: I have three screens I'm trying | 22 23 | so we are off the record, and we'll go back on in five |
| 23 | to navigate as soon as I can. | 23 | minutes. |
| 24 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION | 24 | (A break was taken from |
| 24 | BY MR. STARKEY: | 25 | 11:29 a.m. to 11:36 a.m.) |
| 2.5 | DI MIL OFFICIET. | 25 | |
| | Page 87 | | D 00 |
| | | | Page 89 |
| 1 | Q. Ms. Sains, you mentioned earlier about not using | 1 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on |
| 1 2 | Q. Ms. Sains, you mentioned earlier about not using demand. | 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. |
| | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers | 2 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. |
| 2 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? | 2 3 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. |
| 2 3 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use | 2 3 4 5 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could |
| 2 3 4 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. | 2 3 4 5 6 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. |
| 2 3 4 5 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential | 2 3 4 5 6 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ***** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Hello, Ms. McClenahan. Good morning we're |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go we will get a read a daily read most closely aligned with the date that that cycle should be billed. And so that day is what we use the read for. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Hello, Ms. McClenahan. Good morning we're still morning, right? Good morning. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go we will get a read a daily read most closely aligned with the date that that cycle should be billed. And so that day is what we use the read for. And and then the prior read would be from the prior | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Hello, Ms. McClenahan. Good morning we're still morning, right? Good morning. So I wanted to go back through your testimony, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go we will get a read a daily read most closely aligned with the date that that cycle should be billed. And so that day is what we use the read for. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Hello, Ms. McClenahan. Good morning we're still morning, right? Good morning. So I wanted to go back through your testimony, Exhibit KM-1CT and that link that you provided in that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go we will get a read a daily read most closely aligned with the date that that cycle should be billed. And so that day is what we use the read for. And and then the prior read would be from the prior | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ***** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Hello, Ms. McClenahan. Good morning we're still morning, right? Good morning. So I wanted to go back through your testimony, Exhibit KM-1CT and that link that you provided in that testimony. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go we will get a read a daily read most closely aligned with the date that that cycle should be billed. And so that day is what we use the read for. And and then the prior read would be from the prior cycle that was billed. And those two the difference | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Hello, Ms. McClenahan. Good morning we're still morning, right? Good morning. So I wanted to go back through your testimony, Exhibit KM-1CT and that link that you provided in that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go we will get a read a daily read most closely aligned with the date that that cycle should be billed. And so that day is what we use the read for. And and then the prior read would be from the prior cycle that was billed. And those two the difference between those two is that customer's usage for billing. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Hello, Ms. McClenahan. Good morning we're still morning, right? Good morning. So I wanted to go back through your testimony, Exhibit KM-1CT and that link that you provided in that testimony. So let me reshare my screen really quick. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go we will get a read a daily read most closely aligned with the date that that cycle should be billed. And so that day is what we use the read for. And and then the prior read would be from the prior cycle that was billed. And those two the difference between those two is that customer's usage for billing. Q. I apologize. I'm going to go over because I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Hello, Ms. McClenahan. Good morning we're still morning, right? Good morning. So I wanted to go back through your testimony, Exhibit KM-1CT and that link that you provided in that testimony. So let me reshare my screen really quick. So this is the link that I followed, right, and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | demand. Could you clarify, is that for these customers or just for customers in general? A. So for residential customers, we do not use demand reads for billing. Q. Great. And does PSE use real-time pricing, or interval pricing, for these customers or residential customers like them? A. No. We only use the cumulative daily reads. Q. And could you explain what a point-in-time read is and how that relates to a billing customer? A. So each billing cycle has a billing day and a month. There's 21 different cycles. And we will go we will get a read a daily read most closely aligned with the date that that cycle should be billed. And so that day is what we use the read for. And and then the prior read would be from the prior cycle that was billed. And those two the difference between those two is that customer's usage for billing. Q. I apologize. I'm going to go over because I want to clarify something there. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We're returning after a five-minute break. Our next witness is Kristina McClenahan. I see you are I see your camera feed. Could you please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in? ****** Kristina McClenahan, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And, Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Hello, Ms. McClenahan. Good morning we're still morning, right? Good morning. So I wanted to go back through your testimony, Exhibit KM-1CT and that link that you provided in that testimony. So let me reshare my screen really quick. So this is the link that I followed, right, and so I'm looking at this screen. And as Ms. Sains already |

18 (Pages 86 to 89)

| | Page 90 | | Page 92 |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| 1 | A. If you're sharing your screen, I'm not seeing | 1 | And I also would object that it's a compound |
| 2 | anything yet. | 2 | question. |
| 3 | Q. Oh, I'm sorry. | 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: I I will grant the |
| 4 | A. Thank you. | 4 | objection. |
| 5 | Q. So this is, in general, describing the billing | 5 | I think you know, Ms. Argunov, it's we |
| 6 | process, right? Where the output and there is a module | 6 | have a lot of formalities that we have to follow but |
| 7 | that it's mentioned in a couple steps here, MDUS. | 7 | there are reasons behind them. And perhaps we can we |
| 8 | So Ms. Sains says that PSE does not use this | 8 | can just make clear as initial starting point that you're |
| 9 | current module, right? | 9 | referring to Exhibit EACCH-7. |
| 10 | A. That is correct. These are different options | 10 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. |
| 11 | that SAP has available because they do have a very | 11 | JUDGE HOWARD: And if you can try to have a |
| 12 | flexible system. | 12 | relatively minimal introduction to your question and just |
| 13 | Q. Okay. So go I wanted to share this again. | 13 | pose one question at a time to the witness. |
| 14 | So going back to real-time pricing. | 14 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. |
| 15 | So in SAP documentation, it says that the | 15 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: |
| 16 | billing of interval-related data, which our AMI meters | 16 | Q. So let me try to put a shorter question. Okay. |
| 17 | are, is subject to separate module and they have a | 17 | So I'll try to rephrase that. |
| 18 | separate process before it goes to let me before it | 18 | Our AMI meters have two components, meter reads |
| 19 | goes to let me before it goes to IS-USAP module. | 19 | and interval data. According to SAP, ERP information as |
| 20 | So my question is why PSE does not use the | 20 | I shared in the exhibit before as well as AMI system or |
| 21 | real-time pricing billing? | 21 | overview, the interval data related is a subject for a |
| 22 | A. PSE does not bill on interval data or use | 22 | billing. |
| 23 | real-time pricing for billing purposes. | 23 | My question is why PSE is not using interval |
| 24 | Q. Well, that's where I think a little bit of | 24 | billing interval data for billing? |
| 25 | disconnect. Because as I stated in my prefiled | 25 | A. PSE provides interval data as a courtesy to our |
| | Page 91 | | Page 93 |
| 1 | testimonies, and as stated in U.S. Department of Energy. | 1 | customers so they can see how they're utilizing data. |
| 2 | So when you have an AMI meter and I can read this I | 2 | PSE uses SAP's standard periodic processes which |
| 3 | already read it, but I can read it again. | 3 | enables us to bill monthly or bimonthly by receiving a |
| 4 | So the core element of AMI is smart meters which | 4 | read through MDMS. We use the start read and the ending |
| 5 | provide a number of functions, including measuring | 5 | read and then we subtract them. And the difference is |
| 6 | customer electricity consumption at 5, 15, 30, and | 6 | what we bill in kilowatt hours. |
| 7 | 60 minutes, measuring voltage levels and monitoring the | 7 | So we utilize the standard periodic processes |
| 8 | on/off status of electric service. Smart meters | 8 | with an SAP to bill our customers with their monthly |
| 9 | communication these readings to utilities for | 9 | or bimonthly kilowatt hours. |
| 10 | processing for processing analysis and communication | 10 | Q. Well, that was my question that according to |
| 11 | back to customers for billing. | 11 | SAP, there is a different standard which all |
| 12 | So this is something that we we know for a | 12 | interval-data related interval-related data should be |
| 13 | fact. So it is interval-related data. | 13 | processed according to. |
| 14 | The meter readings and interval data, if it | 14 | My question is why PSE doesn't follow the |
| 15 | was - it would be properly used, supposed to match one | 15 | requirements of this ERP system because you're using ASP, |
| 16 | to another. | 16 | correct? |
| 17 | So in SAP in Oracle, they both have similar | 17 | MR. STARKEY: Objection. Your Honor, I'm |
| 18 | modules for interval-related data. Our AMI meters, they | 18 | going to object to that as argumentative. |
| 19 | read data in 15-minute intervals. | 19 | JUDGE HOWARD: I will I will grant the |
| 20 | So my question is why PSE chooses not to bill | 20 | objection as as essentially assuming facts not in |
| 21 | accordingly, according to the requirements of their own | 21 | evidence. |
| 22 | ERP system? | 22 | Ms. Argunov, perhaps perhaps we can pose this |
| 23 | MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, I'm going to object | 23 | question of why without without asserting if we |
| 24 25 | to that line of questioning which was testifying for the vast majority of it. | 24 25 | haven't already established it through another question, without asserting that PSE has failed to comply with some |
| 10 | | | |

19 (Pages 90 to 93)

| | Page 94 | Page 96 |
|--|---|---|
| 1 | sort of specific standard. Maybe ask why they're not | 1 a customer or disconnected. |
| 2 | doing what you think they should be doing. | 2 So my question is how is it after 19 consecutive |
| 3 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 3 times there were no employee from PSE that would come and |
| 4 | Q. Okay. So why PSE doesn't use the real-time | 4 check this meter test or test it was the meter because |
| 5 | price billing where it says that the interval-related | 5 it clearly shows the error that I didn't I didn't even |
| 6 | data is subject to specific module in SAP? | 6 see on any of our accounts. |
| 7 | A. So SAP is a very flexible system. It enables | 7 MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, I'm going to object |
| 8 | lots of different options for utility companies. PSE | 8 to foundation on that one. |
| 9 | does not use real-time billing or real-time pricing at | 9 BY MR. STARKEY: |
| 10 | this time. | 10 Q. I will rephrase. |
| 11 | Q. Okay. So the AMI meters do read and transfer | 11 So considering the number of consecutive errors |
| 12 | the data into meter reads and interval profile data in | 12 on the account where you stating in your testimony the |
| 13 | intervals, right, 15-minute intervals, correct? | 13 errors would result in employee review and there was no |
| 14 | A. I'm not an expert on how our meters read or | 14 such review. So why it didn't happen with Johnsons' |
| 15 | process that data. | 15 account? |
| 16 | However, my understanding is the interval data | 16 A. These errors are specific to MDMS and are not |
| 17 | is used as a courtesy for our customers and is not | 17 errors within SAP. And I'm not an expert in MDMS. I |
| 18 | transmitted to SAP. It is not transmitted to SAP for any | 18 would refer to Allison Sains' testimony around what those |
| 19 | billing purposes as we do not bill interval data. | 19 errors mean. |
| 20 | Q. Thank you. I guess I can proceed to the next | 20 The SAP validation, the tools and the way that |
| 21 | question. | ²¹ what you expressed in Exhibit KM-1CT, page 15, with my |
| 22 | Ms. Halsen I'm sorry. McClenahan. Okay. So | 22 response 12 through 21, is what happens within SAP once |
| 23 | quick question. | 23 we receive, or don't receive, a meter read from MDMS in |
| 24 | On your testimony, exhibit let me just grab | 24 kilowatt hours. |
| 25 | really quick. | 25 Q. So there are different types of errors, correct, |
| | Page 95 | Page 97 |
| 1 | Pages 16 and 17, when you were discussing our | 1 that you reviewed or not reviewed by PSE Staff, correct? |
| 2 | accounts, you were talking about the reasoning behind | 2 A. I'm unclear what the question is. |
| 3 | very catch up bills, right, that's what we call it. | 3 For SAP specifically, I can speak to the |
| 4 | And you mentioned the COVID protocols. | 4 validations that we check. Once we receive or do not |
| 5 | So what was the time frame when those processed | 5 receive meter reads from MDMS. There are validation |
| б | calls were in effect? Could you specify the time period? | 6 checks within SAP. |
| 7 | A. I would need to defer to Stacey Halsen as I | 7 MS. ARGUNOV: Thank you. Let me just go over |
| 8 | don't have the exact dates that those COVID protocols | 8 the question really quick. |
| 9 | were in place. | 9 Yeah. I think my next question would be |
| 10 | Q. Okay. Thank you. | 10 addressed to Ms. Halsen. This is this was my last |
| 11 | | |
| | My next question give me a second, please. | 11 question. Thank you. |
| 12 | So I wanted to refer to your to your | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any |
| 12 13 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect? |
| 12 13 14 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two |
| 12 13 14 15 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two15questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you, |
| 12 13 14 15 16 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two15questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you,16Ms. Argunov. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use tools like meter data linked to attempt to call the meter | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two15questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you,16Ms. Argunov.17REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use tools like meter data linked to attempt to call the meter to see if they are able to receive an actual read. | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two15questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you,16Ms. Argunov.17REDIRECT EXAMINATION18BY MR. STARKEY: |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use tools like meter data linked to attempt to call the meter to see if they are able to receive an actual read. So question about account Johnsons' account, | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two15questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you,16Ms. Argunov.17REDIRECT EXAMINATION18BY MR. STARKEY:19Q. So, Ms. McClenahan, is there a requirement that |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use tools like meter data linked to attempt to call the meter to see if they are able to receive an actual read. So question about account Johnsons' account, the one that was charged for 15,000 kilowatt hours per | 11 question. Thank you. 12 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any 13 redirect? 14 MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two 15 questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you, 16 Ms. Argunov. 17 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. STARKEY: 19 Q. So, Ms. McClenahan, is there a requirement that 20 PSE use interval data for billing? |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use tools like meter data linked to attempt to call the meter to see if they are able to receive an actual read. So question about account Johnsons' account, the one that was charged for 15,000 kilowatt hours per month. | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two15questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you,16Ms. Argunov.17REDIRECT EXAMINATION18BY MR. STARKEY:19Q. So, Ms. McClenahan, is there a requirement that20PSE use interval data for billing?21A. There is not. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use tools like meter data linked to attempt to call the meter to see if they are able to receive an actual read. So question about account Johnsons' account, the one that was charged for 15,000 kilowatt hours per month. So there were 19 consecutive times the error on | 11 question. Thank you. 12 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any 13 redirect? 14 MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two 15 questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you, 16 Ms. Argunov. 17 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. STARKEY: 19 Q. So, Ms. McClenahan, is there a requirement that 20 PSE use interval data for billing? 21 A. There is not. 22 Q. And does PSE use real-time pricing for billing? |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use tools like meter data linked to attempt to call the meter to see if they are able to receive an actual read. So question about account Johnsons' account, the one that was charged for 15,000 kilowatt hours per month. So there were 19 consecutive times the error on the account showing let me see what is it called? | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two15questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you,16Ms. Argunov.17REDIRECT EXAMINATION18BY MR. STARKEY:19Q. So, Ms. McClenahan, is there a requirement that20PSE use interval data for billing?21A. There is not.22Q. And does PSE use real-time pricing for billing?23A. Not for these residential customers, no. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use tools like meter data linked to attempt to call the meter to see if they are able to receive an actual read. So question about account Johnsons' account, the one that was charged for 15,000 kilowatt hours per month. So there were 19 consecutive times the error on the account showing let me see what is it called? USN estimation rule error which states that it | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two15questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you,16Ms. Argunov.17REDIRECT EXAMINATION18BY MR. STARKEY:19Q. So, Ms. McClenahan, is there a requirement that20PSE use interval data for billing?21A. There is not.22Q. And does PSE use real-time pricing for billing?23A. Not for these residential customers, no.24MR. STARKEY: Great. Thank you. That's all I |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | So I wanted to refer to your to your testimony in Exhibit KM KM-1CT, page 15. Rows 10-15 through sorry. Hold on. Yeah, page 15 rows, 12-21. Where you state that if there is a validation failure, the employer will use tools like meter data linked to attempt to call the meter to see if they are able to receive an actual read. So question about account Johnsons' account, the one that was charged for 15,000 kilowatt hours per month. So there were 19 consecutive times the error on the account showing let me see what is it called? | 11question. Thank you.12JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any13redirect?14MR. STARKEY: Yes, Your Honor. One, maybe two15questions. I'll wait for yep. Perfect. Thank you,16Ms. Argunov.17REDIRECT EXAMINATION18BY MR. STARKEY:19Q. So, Ms. McClenahan, is there a requirement that20PSE use interval data for billing?21A. There is not.22Q. And does PSE use real-time pricing for billing?23A. Not for these residential customers, no. |

20 (Pages 94 to 97)

| | Page 98 | | Page 100 |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| 1 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. That I would | 1 | A. Well, what actually caused the catch-up bill is |
| 2 | like to thank you for your testimony. | 2 | kind of a combination of many factors. COVID is one of |
| 3 | We would next turn to the next witness would | 3 | those meaning that during the COVID even during the |
| 4 | be Stacey Halsen. We're a few minutes away from noon | 4 | COVID protocol where we were limited to central duties, |
| 5 | right now. It would probably make sense to take a lunch | 5 | we still were sending meter readers out to get actual |
| 6 | break. For a Zoom hearing, I normally take a 45-minute | 6 | reads on the actual meter. |
| 7 | lunch break. You know, let's let's go off the record. | 7 | As far as the delay and certain types of work |
| 8 | (A break was taken from | 8 | due to the proclamation, even though it only lasted for |
| 0 | 11:53 a.m. to 12:45 p.m.) | 9 | two months, during those two months, even one day getting |
| 9 10 | JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. | 10 | behind on work for a company as large of ours with a |
| 11 | It's 12:46. We're returning after lunch. | 11 | service territory over a million electric customers, that |
| 12 | Our next witness is Stacey Halsen. And I see | 12 | one day multiplied over two months, that's a lot of |
| 13 | that her video feed is on. | 13 | backlog to catch up on. You have to remember back during |
| 14 | Ms. Halsen, could you please raise your right | 14 | COVID, people that were getting sick, when they were |
| 15 | hand and I'll swear you in. | 15 | tested positive for COVID, they automatically had to be |
| 16 | * * * * * | 16 | quarantined for ten days. So you're taking people out of |
| 17 | Stacey Halsen, having been first duly sworn, was | 17 | the workforce for ten days. That puts the company even |
| 1.0 | examined and testified as | 18 | further behind. |
| 18 19 | follows: THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. | 19 | We did, like I said, put meter reads, actual |
| 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 20 | reads off of the meters themselves to get those billing |
| 21 | Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. | 21 | corrections processed. And like it was referred to |
| 22 | CROSS-EXAMINATION | 22 | earlier like the true-up bills, to correct the estimates |
| 23 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 23 | that were underestimated, or overestimated, and bill for |
| 24 | Q. Hello, Ms. Halsen. So my first | 24 | the actual usage. |
| 25 | A. Good afternoon. | 25 | Q. Thank you. |
| | | | |
| | Page 99 | | Page 101 |
| 1 | Q. Good afternoon. | 1 | My second question would be is validation, |
| 2 | My first question would be about the COVID | 2 | estimation, and editing process. |
| 3 | protocols time period. | 3 | Is this a mandatory step for billing well, I |
| 4 | So when was the start the beginning and the | 4 | would say before it goes to the billing. |
| 5 | end of the COVID protocols? | 5 | MR. STARKEY: I'm going to objection to |
| 6 | A. The governor's proclamation was effective | 6 | foundation there, Your Honor. |
| 7 8 | March 23, 2020. At that time, we went into actually | 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Argunov, I think the |
| | the company created a team called the COVID crisis management team. And we based off of the governor's | | objection is going to foundation which would be is the witness familiar with this with this topic. |
| 9 10 | | 10 | - |
| 11 | proclamation, made decisions on how we were going to follow and be in compliance with his proclamation. That | 11 | So perhaps we could ask Ms. Halsen if she's familiar with this subject area first about the |
| 12 | was effective March 24, 2020. And that proclamation | 12 | validation I believe your question was about the |
| 13 | ended May 31, 2020. | 13 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. |
| 14 | Q. So May 31, 2020. Okay. | 14 | THE WITNESS: No. I do not understand your |
| 15 | So in a couple testimonies, I think | 15 | question. |
| 16 | Ms. McClenahan, and you also, were explaining the delays | 16 | Can you rephrase that and I will see if it's |
| 17 | for the catch-up bills, right, due to COVID protocols. | 17 | something that I feel I am knowledgeable in? |
| 18 | Our account didn't start until July of 2020. | 18 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: |
| 19 | This is where AMR meters were installed. | 19 | Q. I thought when I asked Ms. McClenahan, she said |
| 20 | So I'm I still wanted to follow up with you | 20 | that I can address this with Ms. Halsen, if I'm not |
| 21 | and understand that if I understand correctly, the | 21 | mistaken. But it's okay. |
| 22 | protocols COVID were not in effect already when the my | 22 | Ms. Halsen, on the page 2 of the Exhibit |
| 22 | AMR meter was installed. | 23 | SBH-1CT, you were stating that if I was right and PSE |
| 23 | ANNA INGLEI WAS INSLANCE. | | |
| 23 24 | So what actually cost the the catch-up bill | 24 | quadruples our energy bills, then the customer average |
| | | 24 25 | quadruples our energy bills, then the customer average consumption would be 200, 250 kilowatts month. |

21 (Pages 98 to 101)

| | Dom- 100 | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Page 102 | | Page 104 |
| 1 | My question is do you have a data source showing | 1 | What I'm reading the testimony. And what it |
| 2 | your calculations? | 2 | says is the allegations that the PSE AMI meters are |
| 3 | A. I'm not sure what you mean by "data source." | 3 | quadrupling the kilowatt hour measurement would mean that |
| 4 | Q. Any kind of reports where because you stated | 4 | the kilowatt hour per customer would be approximately |
| 5 6 | that if I would I was correct, the monthly usage for | 5 | 200, 250 kilowatt hours. Which would be impractical |
| 0 7 | our houses would be 200, 250 kilowatt hours. | 7 | practically below the average for all the utilities in |
| 8 | So do you have something to or any exhibit to present your calculations that you mentioned? | 8 | the state of Washington. Q. And what is the average usage per customer in |
| 9 | MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, I'm going to object | 9 | Washington State? |
| 10 | to misstating testimony. That is not what her testimony | 10 | A. Well, that varies. It depends on several |
| 11 | states. And it applies to customers and PSE service | 11 | different factors. It depends on what the customer has |
| 12 | territory in general and not the specific customers here. | 12 | inside their home, where they live, what the average |
| 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Argunov, I will grant the | 13 | temperatures are outside. What their individual habits |
| 14 | objection. I think I'm grasping the distinction that the | 14 | are, usage habits. What they keep their heat on. Their |
| 15 | testimony was about customers in general. | 15 | hot water, how many showers they take. How much laundry |
| 16 | But please feel free to pose that question about | 16 | is being done. Whether they're washing in hot or cold. |
| 17 | customers in general because that is what she's | 17 | It's not really possible to answer your question with a |
| 18 | testifying. | 18 | definite number. There's just too much different |
| 19 | MS. ARGUNOV: I'm not sure how I can rephrase | 19 | factors. |
| 20 | that. It wasn't really I was not talking about our | 20 | Q. Okay. So meaning that the statement from your |
| 21 | accounts. I was just talking about the general statement | 21 | testimony, so how is it the numbers that you provided |
| 22 | where where Ms. Halsen stated that if I if I | 22 | because you did mention the average for the customer, |
| 23 | would what I was stated would be right and they | 23 | right? So we don't really know. |
| 24 | quadrupling their energy bills, right, so then the | 24 | A. If you take the 250 kilowatt hours and multiply |
| 25 | average consumption would be 200, 250 kilowatt hours. | 25 | that by four, that's an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours. |
| | | | |
| | Dama 103 | 1 | Dama 105 |
| | Page 103 | | Page 105 |
| 1 | So I was just wondering if there is any any | 1 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 |
| 2 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see | 2 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. |
| 2 3 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. | 2 3 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers |
| 2 3 4 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining | 2 3 4 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what |
| 2 3 4 5 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which | 2 3 4 5 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. | 2 3 4 5 6 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt hours per month. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe just a word in there that made it sound like | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe just a word in there that made it sound like MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. I'll remove "our." | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt hours per month. MS. ARGUNOV: Excuse me. Your Honor, I'm not |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe just a word in there that made it sound like MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. I'll remove "our." JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt hours per month. MS. ARGUNOV: Excuse me. Your Honor, I'm not a lawyer and so I really wanted to object to the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe just a word in there that made it sound like MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. I'll remove "our." JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt hours per month. MS. ARGUNOV: Excuse me. Your Honor, I'm not a lawyer and so I really wanted to object to the because I hear all over again and, again, my theory, my |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe just a word in there that made it sound like MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. I'll remove "our." JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt hours per month. MS. ARGUNOV: Excuse me. Your Honor, I'm not a lawyer and so I really wanted to object to the because I hear all over again and, again, my theory, my theory. So I think I was very clear for both both of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe just a word in there that made it sound like MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. I'll remove "our." JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Again, on page 2 of the exhibit of the SBH-1, you stated, if I was right, and PSE quadruples their | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt hours per month. MS. ARGUNOV: Excuse me. Your Honor, I'm not a lawyer and so I really wanted to object to the because I hear all over again and, again, my theory, my theory. So I think I was very clear for both both of my testimonies that I'm not presenting my theory. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe just a word in there that made it sound like MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. I'll remove "our." JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Again, on page 2 of the exhibit of the SBH-1, you stated, if I was right, and PSE quadruples their energy bills, then the customer average consumption would | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt hours per month. MS. ARGUNOV: Excuse me. Your Honor, I'm not a lawyer and so I really wanted to object to the because I hear all over again and, again, my theory, my theory. So I think I was very clear for both both of my testimonies that I'm not presenting my theory. Instead I'm presenting this technical specifications from |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe just a word in there that made it sound like MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. I'll remove "our." JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Again, on page 2 of the exhibit of the SBH-1, you stated, if I was right, and PSE quadruples their energy bills, then the customer average consumption would be 200, 250 average kilowatt hours per month. Do you have any data source showing these calculations document, Excel format, whatever that is? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt hours per month. MS. ARGUNOV: Excuse me. Your Honor, I'm not a lawyer and so I really wanted to object to the because I hear all over again and, again, my theory, my theory. So I think I was very clear for both both of my testimonies that I'm not presenting my theory. Instead I'm presenting this technical specifications from ERP systems and other sources. So I'm just asking PSE, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | So I was just wondering if there is any any document that can be shared or presented so we can see those calculations. Because according to my calculations pertaining to our four accounts, it would be different amounts which is around 600 kilowatt hours. This is why I was asking about this specific statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I certainly I believe if I'm recalling correctly, I think maybe you just had used the phrase "our accounts" or something like that in your original phrasing of the question. But do feel free to pose a question about that testimony to the witness. I think that there's maybe just a word in there that made it sound like MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. I'll remove "our." JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. BY MS. ARGUNOV: Q. Again, on page 2 of the exhibit of the SBH-1, you stated, if I was right, and PSE quadruples their energy bills, then the customer average consumption would be 200, 250 average kilowatt hours per month. Do you have any data source showing these | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | And that's what that's based on is an average of 1,000 kilowatt hours per month per customer. If you spread out all of our different customers throughout our territory and exclude, or include, what they actually have, whether they have gas, propane, electric, is there heating, water heater heat and water heater are your largest consumers. So that can really affect your average price per kilowatt hour. If you take all of the rates, all of the residential customers, it averages out to about 1,000 per month. And that's where that 250 comes from. If your theory that we were quadrupling our usage, our customer's usage, then that would to mean that we're only billing an average of 200 to 250 kilowatt hours per month. MS. ARGUNOV: Excuse me. Your Honor, I'm not a lawyer and so I really wanted to object to the because I hear all over again and, again, my theory, my theory. So I think I was very clear for both both of my testimonies that I'm not presenting my theory. Instead I'm presenting this technical specifications from ERP systems and other sources. So I'm just asking PSE, even though it's almost the end of the meeting, just |

22 (Pages 102 to 105)

| | Page 106 | | Page 108 |
|----|---|----|---|
| 1 | supporting presentation. | 1 | home when the permanent meter was set and when they |
| 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: Well, I see | 2 | started using the electrical heat inside the home. That |
| 3 | MS. ARGUNOV: I apologize. | 3 | is in the Exhibit 4. Are you familiar with that? |
| 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Argunov, I do see what | 4 | Q. Yes. I I read the exhibit. What was there |
| 5 | you're getting at. I won't tell the witnesses | 5 | is that contractors required 65 degrees inside of the |
| 6 | necessarily to use a different word. I don't think | 6 | house while they do the walls and everything. As I |
| 7 | that's necessarily an argument an improper | 7 | stated in testimony, Johnsons did not use a furnace, |
| 8 | argumentative term. | 8 | electrical furnace. Instead they use the heaters that |
| 9 | But I can tell you I will give all the weight | 9 | were connected to the temporary power. This is why they |
| 10 | the evidence the weight it deserves when I review | 10 | actually filed the complaint because they knew that they |
| 11 | everything in light of the record. | 11 | didn't use the permanent power at all. So that's why |
| 12 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. | 12 | that's when they called customer service and then filed |
| 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: And one person saying something | 13 | an informal complaint. |
| 14 | is a theory will not will not control the entire case. | 14 | So this is why I was asking, do you recall any |
| 15 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Thank you very much. | 15 | detail? So background of Johnsons' side of the things, |
| 16 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 16 | right? Because I read that testimony. I know what |
| 17 | Q. Ms. Halsen, I have a question about the | 17 | you're talking about. So |
| 18 | complaint informal complaint and also complaint first | 18 | MR. STARKEY: Excuse me. I would like to |
| 19 | was original with customer service that Johnsons | 19 | object to that line of that line of questioning. It |
| 20 | addressed with their extremely high energy bills. | 20 | was argumentative. It was testifying, and it also |
| 21 | My question is were you involved into | 21 | assumes facts not in evidence. |
| 22 | investigation of this particular account? | 22 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Ms. Argunov, it's I |
| 23 | A. Yes, I was. | 23 | think what happened was the witness asked you a question |
| 24 | Q. And what steps were taken and when to | 24 | and you described your answer. |
| 25 | investigate the situations that the Johnsons were | 25 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. |
| | Page 107 | | Page 109 |
| 1 | complaining about? | 1 | JUDGE HOWARD: So and, of course, I can't |
| 2 | A. When the Johnsons first contacted our customer | 2 | consider that because I have to rely on your testimony at |
| 3 | service department, our agents reviewed their usage. | 3 | other points when you're when it's essentially your |
| 4 | They saw that there were no estimated reads. They were | 4 | turn to testify. |
| 5 | all actual reads. They did offer to have the customers' | 5 | So I'll grant the objection. |
| 6 | meter tested, and it was tested. They also offered to | 6 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yeah. Okay. |
| 7 | have the customer speak to an energy advisor who can | 7 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: |
| 8 | better go through their home and what it is using and | 8 | Q. So, Ms. Halsen, how long was the test performed |
| 9 | help them find ways to reduce their electric consumption. | 9 | for Johnsons' meter? |
| 10 | At no time during the review with the customer | 10 | A. How long did the meter test take when the meter |
| 11 | service department, or during the informal complaint, did | 11 | tester was out there? |
| 12 | we find anything wrong with PSE's billing of the usage or | 12 | Q. Yeah, yeah. How much time did it take to |
| 13 | our system's calculation of the usage. | 13 | measure and test? |
| 14 | Q. Do you remember specific details that the | 14 | A. That's not my testimony. I think that might |
| 15 | Johnsons provided to customer service and then informal | 15 | have been part of Ian Hagan's testimony as far as how |
| 16 | complaint supporting their issues with the meter? | 16 | long the test. I can just provide that with the data |
| 17 | A. What do you mean by rephrase your question. | 17 | provided in the informal complaint, it's just that the |
| 10 | O The besterneying situation Why they the whitit | 10 | motor was to stad, and found to to start a support within the |

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

meter was tested and found to test accurate within the

requirements from the WAC. And it was verified in the

Q. Were you aware of multiple -- well, 20 -- 30, to

be exact, consecutive different type of errors on their

account looking -- and if you had a chance to look at

their MDMS readings when you investigated their claims.

23 (Pages 106 to 109)

informal complaint that the Johnsons were billed for

actual usage on their permanent meter.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

account.

Q. The background situation. Why they thought it

can't be that much of a kilowatt hours charged to their

A. Yes. What I recall is that saying there was no

discovery, we were presented with communication in --

specifically about what electricity was being used in the

electrical outlets wired inside the home. And in the

with the Johnsons and their contractor that talks

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

| | Page 110 | | Page 112 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | Sorry. | 1 | coming from? |
| 2 | MR. STARKEY: I'm going to object to that on | 2 | A. This was actually part of Kristina McClenahan's |
| 3 | foundation, Your Honor. | 3 | testimony. Not mine. |
| 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: I think Ms. Argunov was asking | 4 | Did you have a question more about the |
| 5 | if she was aware of it. I'm going to I'm going to | 5 | estimation process in general? Is that what you're |
| 6 | allow the question. She's asking if she's aware of these | 6 | asking? |
| 7 | MDUS readings. | 7 | Q. Yes. Because I was trying to do the math, and |
| 8 | THE WITNESS: Did you say MDS or MDUS, Ms. | 8 | it didn't match up. So I was going to ask so it would |
| 9 | Argunov? | 9 | be a question to Ms. McClenahan? |
| 10 | MS. ARGUNOV: MDMS. | 10 | A. Yes. That would that's part of |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: MDMS. Okay. | 11 | Ms. McClenahan's testimony. |
| 12 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 12 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Then I think I think |
| 13 | Q. Yes. | 13 | that was my last question to you. Thank you very much. |
| 14 | A. Okay. MDMS reads were not part of the informal | 14 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 15 | complaint. The informal complaint is based on the | 15 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any |
| 16 | billing reads. So you have an actual read at the | 16 | redirect? |
| 17 | beginning of the billing period and an actual read at the | 17 | MR. STARKEY: No, we do not, Your Honor. |
| 18 | end of the billing period. | 18 | Thank you. |
| 19 | So the informal complaint the compliance | 19 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Public Counsel also |
| 20 | check on my end is that they were billed accurately. | 20 | indicated cross for this witness. You may proceed. |
| 21 | There was no estimated usage. The usage was accurate. | 21 | MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. |
| 22 | There were no errors in the billing. | 22 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 23 | Q. So just to confirm, so you during this | 23 | BY MS. GAFKEN: |
| 24 | investigation, you have not reviewed their MDMS readings, | 24 | Q. Good afternoon. My name is Lisa Gafken. I'm an |
| 25 | correct? | 25 | assistant attorney general representing Public Counsel. |
| | Page 111 | | Page 113 |
| 1 | A. It was not necessary to review the MDMS readings | 1 | How would you like me to address you today? |
| 2 | because that is not part of the kilowatt hours billed for | 2 | A. Oh, Ms. Halsen is fine. |
| 3 | the usage during the billing period. | 3 | Q. Great. Ms. Halsen, would you turn to your cross |
| 4 | Q. Okay. Thank you. | 4 | answering testimony, which is Exhibit SBH-7T and go to |
| 5 | Oh, yeah. So I wanted to share with you the | 5 | page 6, lines 9 through 11. |
| 6 | Exhibit EACCH and it's okay if you don't know the | 6 | A. One moment, please. I need to find that in my |
| 7 | answer, but I thought it doesn't hurt to ask. | 7 | exhibits here. |
| 8 | A. Sure. | 8 | Q. Sure. Take your time and let us know when you |
| 9 | Q. Let me share my screen with you. | 9 | get there. |
| 10 | JUDGE HOWARD: Do you have the exhibit number | 10 | A. Okay. I have it here. |
| 11 | so we can note that for the record? | 11 | Q. At lines 9 through 11, you state both the |
| 12 | MS. ARGUNOV: Yes. It's EACCH-4. | 12 | Argunovs and Groesbecks received an AMI meter around the |
| 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 13 | same time in 2021, in July and August respectively. This |
| | | 14 | was before the AMI rollout was scheduled for the area. |
| 14 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | | |
| 14 15 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the | 15 | Is that correct? |
| 15 16 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August | 15 16 | A. That is correct. |
| 15 16 17 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August of 2021, where they were billed for previous eight | 16 17 | A. That is correct.Q. Would you please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-8X? |
| 15 16 17 18 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August of 2021, where they were billed for previous eight months, I believe. | 16 17 18 | A. That is correct.Q. Would you please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-8X?A. Did you say page 8? |
| 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August of 2021, where they were billed for previous eight months, I believe. And when we requested the data from PSE, so we | 16 17 18 19 | A. That is correct. Q. Would you please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-8X? A. Did you say page 8? Q. It's Exhibit 8 - 8X. |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August of 2021, where they were billed for previous eight months, I believe. And when we requested the data from PSE, so we were given this explanation of how the estimation formula | 16 17 18 19 20 | A. That is correct. Q. Would you please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-8X? A. Did you say page 8? Q. It's Exhibit 8 - 8X. A. Just a moment, please. |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August of 2021, where they were billed for previous eight months, I believe. And when we requested the data from PSE, so we were given this explanation of how the estimation formula works. So in this particular scenario, the 108 kilowatt | 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. That is correct. Q. Would you please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-8X? A. Did you say page 8? Q. It's Exhibit 8 - 8X. A. Just a moment, please. All right. I have that now. Thank you. |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August of 2021, where they were billed for previous eight months, I believe. And when we requested the data from PSE, so we were given this explanation of how the estimation formula works. So in this particular scenario, the 108 kilowatt hours per day, this was the estimation. | 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. That is correct. Q. Would you please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-8X? A. Did you say page 8? Q. It's Exhibit 8 - 8X. A. Just a moment, please. All right. I have that now. Thank you. Q. Thank you. And I just want to make sure that I |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August of 2021, where they were billed for previous eight months, I believe. And when we requested the data from PSE, so we were given this explanation of how the estimation formula works. So in this particular scenario, the 108 kilowatt hours per day, this was the estimation. So, Ms. Halsen, can you specify maybe the | 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. That is correct. Q. Would you please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-8X? A. Did you say page 8? Q. It's Exhibit 8 - 8X. A. Just a moment, please. All right. I have that now. Thank you. Q. Thank you. And I just want to make sure that I understand what was happening. I'm not raising an |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August of 2021, where they were billed for previous eight months, I believe. And when we requested the data from PSE, so we were given this explanation of how the estimation formula works. So in this particular scenario, the 108 kilowatt hours per day, this was the estimation. So, Ms. Halsen, can you specify maybe the specific rules or maybe you can looking at this data, | 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. That is correct. Q. Would you please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-8X? A. Did you say page 8? Q. It's Exhibit 8 - 8X. A. Just a moment, please. All right. I have that now. Thank you. Q. Thank you. And I just want to make sure that I understand what was happening. I'm not raising an objection. |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. So this is the Groesbecks' account. And the estimations and charges on the account back in August of 2021, where they were billed for previous eight months, I believe. And when we requested the data from PSE, so we were given this explanation of how the estimation formula works. So in this particular scenario, the 108 kilowatt hours per day, this was the estimation. So, Ms. Halsen, can you specify maybe the | 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. That is correct. Q. Would you please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-8X? A. Did you say page 8? Q. It's Exhibit 8 - 8X. A. Just a moment, please. All right. I have that now. Thank you. Q. Thank you. And I just want to make sure that I understand what was happening. I'm not raising an |

24 (Pages 110 to 113)

| | Page 114 | | Page 116 |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| 1 | A. Yes. The exhibits. Yes. That's not something | 1 | A. Correct. |
| 2 | I have printed or have memorized. | 2 | Q. Could you explain what that means, what |
| 3 | So, yes, I have those now. | 3 | investigation of noncommunication I'm sorry, |
| 4 | Q. All right. Thank you. | 4 | noncommunicating AMR meter means? |
| 5 | So Cross Exhibit SBH-8X is a copy of Puget Sound | 5 | A. Yes. That would actually mean sending out |
| 6 | Energy's response to Public Counsel's data request No. 7; | 6 | someone who is educated to look at the meter and |
| 7 | is that correct? | 7 | determine why it is not communicating with the network. |
| 8 | A. Yes. | 8 | Q. Okay. So I just want to make sure that I'm |
| 9 | Q. And the response date set installations for | 9 | understanding this correctly. So I'm going to ask you |
| 10 | Cle Elum in June of 2021, correct? | 10 | whether you can confirm or correct my understanding. |
| 11 | A. Yes. Deployment for that sector, that ZIP code, | 11 | Did Puget then continue to send people out to do |
| 12 | began in Q2 of 2021. | 12 | basic meter reads but not people to figure out if there |
| 13 | Q. Okay. Would you please turn back to your cross | 13 | was anything wrong with the meter reads because it wasn't |
| 14 | answering testimony, Exhibit SBH-7T? And return to | 14 | communicating? |
| | | 15 | A. That is correct. In order to be in compliance |
| 15 16 | page 6. And this time we'll look at lines 7 to 9. A. Yes. | 16 | with the estimated rule WAC, we did send meter readers |
| 16 17 | | 1 | out on meters that were not communicating with the |
| 17 | Q. Okay. There you state that PSE stopped all | 17 18 | network to be able to obtain actual reads from the meters |
| 18 | noncritical fieldwork, including work related to | 1 | |
| 19 | malfunctioning or nonfunctioning meters, correct? | 19 | registered so that we could bill them for actual usage. |
| 20 | A. Correct. | 20 | Q. Okay. Thank you. |
| 21 | Q. Okay. I'm going to refer you to another cross | 21 | Please turn to Cross Exhibit SBH-10X. |
| 22 | exhibit. So if you can please turn to Cross Exhibit | 22 | A. I'm sorry. Repeat that. SBH |
| 23 | SBH-9X. | 23 | Q. Sure. SBH-10X. |
| 24 | A. Okay. | 24 | A. 10X? |
| 25 | Q. Okay. Cross Exhibit SBH-9X is a copy of Puget | 25 | Q. Correct. |
| | Page 115 | | Page 117 |
| 1 | Sound Energy's response to Public Counsel's data request | 1 | A. One moment, please. |
| 2 | No. 36, correct? | 2 | Q. Sure. |
| 3 | A. Correct. | 3 | A. Okay. Thank you. |
| 4 | Q. And in that data request, Puget Sound Energy was | 4 | Q. Perfect. Cross Exhibit SBH-10X is Puget Sound |
| 5 | asked about how COVID 19 protocols prevented timely | 5 | Energy's response to Public Counsel's data request |
| 6 | replacement of the Argunovs' and Groesbecks' meters, | 6 | No. 23. Is that correct? |
| 7 | correct? | 7 | A. Correct. |
| 8 | A. Correct. | 8 | Q. In response to subsection (a), PSE responded |
| 9 | Q. Okay. I would like you to look at the response | 9 | that the first enhanced message management case was |
| 10 | that's in subsection (a). And there Puget Sound Energy | 10 | created on March 15, 2021, for the Groesbecks' account, |
| 11 | refers to Governor Inslee's Stay Home, Stay Healthy | 11 | correct? |
| 12 | Proclamation, correct? | 12 | A. Correct. |
| 13 | A. Correct. | 13 | Q. Can you explain what the enhanced message |
| 14 | Q. On page 2 of that exhibit, utility workers were | 14 | management case also calls EMMA, E-M-M-A case is? |
| 15 | identified as essential workforce, correct? | 15 | A. Yes. EMMA case is a system-generated work order |
| 16 | A. For the electric industry, correct. | 16 | that goes to, depending on what type of case it is, goes |
| 17 | Q. And you testified earlier in response to | 17 | to a certain department to be worked manually. In this |
| 18 | Ms. Argunov's questioning that PSE was still sending | 18 | case, these EMMA cases were worked by our billing |
| 19 | people out for meter reads during the Stay Home, Stay | 19 | performance team. And they were to determine or to |
| 20 | Healthy proclamation; is that correct? | 20 | review the number of estimates on the accounts and |
| 21 | A. Correct. | 21 | determine what steps needed to be taken to obtain actual |
| 22 | Q. Okay. Looking back at page 2 of Cross Exhibit | 22 | usage from the meters. |
| 23 | SBH-9X, please refer to subsection (b). And there Puget | 23 | Q. On page 2 of Exhibit SBH-10X, the response to |
| 24 | responds that it seized working on investigations of | 24 | subsection (a) describes a second EMMA I'm sorry. Let |
| 25 | noncommunicating AMR meters; is that correct? | 25 | me start that over again. I'm stumbling over my words. |
| | | | |

25 (Pages 114 to 117)

| | Page 118 | | Page 120 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | On page 2 of Exhibit SBH-10X, the response to | 1 | installing that meter? |
| 2 | subsection (a) describes a second EMMA case that was | 2 | A. Someone else is usually installing that meter. |
| 3 | generated on May 13, 2021; is that correct? | 3 | For the first time an AMI meter is installed, it's |
| 4 | A. Correct. | 4 | typically with the vendor through our mass deployment |
| 5 | Q. And that second case was completed on August 18, | 5 | program. |
| 6 | 2021; is that correct? | 6 | MR. STARKEY: Okay. Thank you. That's all I |
| 7 | A. Correct. | 7 | have. |
| 8 | Q. And it was during the second EMMA case that it | 8 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your |
| 9 | became clear that the Groesbecks' meter required | 9 | testimony today. |
| 10 | replacement, correct? | 10 | Our next witness would be Aaron Tam with Public |
| 11 | A. Those service orders that were created were to | 11 | Counsel. Sorry for my voice there. |
| 12 | go out and obtain actual reads from the meters to bill | 12 | Mr. Tam, can you hear me all right? |
| 13 | the customers for actual usage. They weren't cases to | 13 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 14 | determine the functionality of the meter or the | 14 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. If you |
| 15 | communication issues with the meter. | 15 16 | would please raise your right hand, I will swear you in. |
| 16 | Q. Okay. But the the response on page 2, still | 17 | Aaron Tam, having been first duly sworn, was |
| 17 | looking at section (a), did state that at this time it | | Aaron Tam, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as |
| 18 | became clear the meter needed to be replaced and the | 18 | follows: |
| 19 | service notification was created. Correct? | 19 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. |
| 20 | A. Yes. What that is is that they had previously | 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. |
| 21 | obtained reads from the meter, and the meter reads were | 21 | And let me review my notes here. I believe PSE |
| 22 | still estimating. Meaning that the communication with | 22 | indicated a brief cross for this witness. |
| 23 | the network was still not communicating reads to our | 23 | MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 24 | system for billing. | 24 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 25 | And that, yes, there would need to be a meter | 25 | BY MR. STARKEY: |
| | Page 119 | | Page 121 |
| | | | |
| 1 | replacement . We were not replacing AMP with AMP meters | 1 | _ |
| 1 | replacement. We were not replacing AMR with AMR meters | 1 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? |
| 2 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. | 2 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this |
| 2 3 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. | 2 3 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. |
| 2 3 4 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions | 2 3 4 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty |
| 2 3 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I | 2 3 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. | 2 3 4 5 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public |
| 2 3 4 5 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. | 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. But as I stated earlier in my objection, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STARKEY: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STARKEY: Q. Ms. Halsen, are you aware of whether or not it | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. But as I stated earlier in my objection, Commission has already ruled those issues are settled. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STARKEY: Q. Ms. Halsen, are you aware of whether or not it was PSE or a contractor that was installing AMI meters or | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. But as I stated earlier in my objection, Commission has already ruled those issues are settled. And I would argue that they are irrelevant to the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STARKEY: Q. Ms. Halsen, are you aware of whether or not it was PSE or a contractor that was installing AMI meters or replacing AMR meters with AMI meters? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. But as I stated earlier in my objection, Commission has already ruled those issues are settled. And I would argue that they are irrelevant to the complaint here. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STARKEY: Q. Ms. Halsen, are you aware of whether or not it was PSE or a contractor that was installing AMI meters or replacing AMR meters with AMI meters? A. For two of these customers, they were replaced | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. But as I stated earlier in my objection, Commission has already ruled those issues are settled. And I would argue that they are irrelevant to the complaint here. JUDGE HOWARD: 1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STARKEY: Q. Ms. Halsen, are you aware of whether or not it was PSE or a contractor that was installing AMI meters or replacing AMR meters with AMI meters? A. For two of these customers, they were replaced by PSE ahead of schedule for the AMI deployment in that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. But as I stated earlier in my objection, Commission has already ruled those issues are settled. And I would argue that they are irrelevant to the complaint here. JUDGE HOWARD: 1 MR. STARKEY: Your Honor |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STARKEY: Q. Ms. Halsen, are you aware of whether or not it was PSE or a contractor that was installing AMI meters or replacing AMR meters with AMI meters? A. For two of these customers, they were replaced by PSE ahead of schedule for the AMI deployment in that area. One of them was in September. That was actually replaced by our contractor. That was deploying the AMI | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. But as I stated earlier in my objection, Commission has already ruled those issues are settled. And I would argue that they are irrelevant to the complaint here. JUDGE HOWARD: 1 MR. STARKEY: Your Honor JUDGE HOWARD: I will please respond, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STARKEY: Q. Ms. Halsen, are you aware of whether or not it was PSE or a contractor that was installing AMI meters or replacing AMR meters with AMI meters? A. For two of these customers, they were replaced by PSE ahead of schedule for the AMI deployment in that area. One of them was in September. That was actually | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. But as I stated earlier in my objection, Commission has already ruled those issues are settled. And I would argue that they are irrelevant to the complaint here. JUDGE HOWARD: I JUDGE HOWARD: I JUDGE HOWARD: I will please respond, Mr. Starkey. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | because it was the AMR communication that was obsolete. And, therefore, those needed to be AMI meters. MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I don't have any questions to ask about Cross Exhibits SBH-11X, 12X, or 13X. But I understand that those are in the record. So I can conclude my cross-examination here. Thank you, Ms. Halsen. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect following that cross? MR. STARKEY: Yes. Just one or two questions, Your Honor. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STARKEY: Q. Ms. Halsen, are you aware of whether or not it was PSE or a contractor that was installing AMI meters or replacing AMR meters with AMI meters? A. For two of these customers, they were replaced by PSE ahead of schedule for the AMI deployment in that area. One of them was in September. That was actually replaced by our contractor. That was deploying the AMI meters with our mass deployment process. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tam. How are you doing? A. I'm a little sick as well. But luckily this will be pretty short. Thank you. Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'll keep this pretty short. So, Mr. Tam, isn't it true that in 2019, Public Counsel opposed PSE's transition to AMI meters? MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to raise my objection again. This is going to be about the cross exhibit and the advocacy in the 2019 rate case. Which is the issues in that case are completely different from the issues in this case. Rate cases that the utilities rates and one of the issues was cost recovery of the AMI system. But as I stated earlier in my objection, Commission has already ruled those issues are settled. And I would argue that they are irrelevant to the complaint here. JUDGE HOWARD: 1 MR. STARKEY: Your Honor JUDGE HOWARD: I will please respond, Mr. Starkey. |

26 (Pages 118 to 121)

| | Page 122 | | Page 124 |
|----|---|----------|---|
| 1 | necessary relevance. | 1 | MR. STARKEY: Thank you. That's all I have. |
| 2 | And point number two is that the relevance here | 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Tam, thank you |
| 3 | is pretty clear because Public Counsel is advocating for | 3 | for your testimony today. |
| 4 | | 4 | Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I was |
| | potentially leveraging penalties based off of whether or | | |
| 5 | not the AMI meters were replaced quick enough and the AMR | 5 | MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. |
| 6 | meter functionality as well. | 6 | JUDGE HOWARD: I went off script. |
| 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: I | 7 | Ms. Gafken, please go ahead with your redirect. |
| 8 | MS. GAFKEN: May | 8 | MS. GAFKEN: A very brief redirect. And |
| 9 | JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead. | 9 | actually I wasn't sure if my audio had glitched because |
| 10 | MS. GAFKEN: I'm sorry, Judge. I was just | 10 | my headphones just told me they are low. So hopefully |
| 11 | going to quickly respond to that, if I may. | 11 | they hold out for just a moment. |
| 12 | JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead. | 12 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 13 | MS. GAFKEN: We're not asking Commission to | 13 | BY MS. GAFNEY: |
| 14 | penalize the company in this docket because those would | 14 | Q. I just have one redirect question, I think, |
| 15 | be subject to a separate complaint. | 15 | Mr. Tam. |
| 16 | What we are asking is that the Commission issue | 16 | Are systemwide AMI failure rates the same as |
| 17 | a complaint against Puget to look into the violations | 17 | individual customer experiences with failure rates? |
| 18 | that both us and Commission staff have identified. | 18 | A. No, I do not believe so. |
| 19 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 19 | Q. How are they different? |
| 20 | I have considered Public Counsel's objection. | 20 | A. In this case, the general rate case was speaking |
| 21 | For the time being, I will allow Mr. Starkey to explore | 21 | to the recovery of wide scale large-scale deployment |
| 22 | this issue, and I will give it to the weight it deserves. | 22 | of AMI meters. |
| 23 | I do believe that there is some some some relevance | 23 | In this case, we're talking about a a few |
| 24 | here or likely relevance. | 24 | customers that were experiencing issues with their AMI |
| 25 | So please proceed, Mr. Starkey. | 25 | meters. And there were ways to address those issues such |
| | Page 123 | | Page 125 |
| | | | |
| 1 | MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. | 1 | as obtaining manual meter reads and a timely fashion. |
| 2 | BY MR. STARKEY: | 2 | As well as potentially replacing them with functioning |
| 3 | Q. Mr. Tam, I'm going to repeat that again just so | 3 | AMR or AMI meters. |
| 4 | that it's clear for the record. | 4 | Q. If a customer is experiencing meter failure, |
| 5 | Isn't it true in 2019 Public Counsel opposed | 5 | does it matter whether the company as a whole is |
| 6 | PSE's transition to AMI meters. | 7 | experiencing either a high or a low failure rate from that customer's perspective? |
| 7 | A. So that that 2019 general rate case, just | 8 | A. From the customer's perspective? |
| 8 | as for some context, that predated my employment at | 9 | SO. |
| 9 | the Public Counsel unit. I began employment in | 10 | MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. That's all I have, |
| 10 | November 2021. But from my reading of the post-hearing | 11 | Your Honor. |
| 11 | brief, it's my understanding that Public Counsel opposed | 12 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And |
| 12 | the wild the large-scale deployment of AMI meters and | 13 | thank you, Mr. Tam, for your testimony. |
| 13 | did not oppose AMI meters as a whole. | 14 | We will next move to Staff's witness, Sheri |
| 14 | Q. Okay. And isn't it true that in 2019 Public | 15 | Hoyt. And I believe Ms. Argunov indicated approximately |
| 15 | Counsel was not concerned with the AMR network failure | 16 | 15 minutes of cross-examination for Ms. Hoyt. |
| 16 | rates? | 17 | Do we have Ms. Hoyt joining us? I see her |
| 17 | A. That is correct. Public Counsel stated that the | 18 | camera feed. Can you hear me all right? |
| 18 | AMR failure rates, based on PSE's own research, was less | 19 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 19 | than 5 percent. | 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: If you would please raise your |
| 20 | Q. And my question was a little different. | 21 | right hand I'll swear you in. |
| 21 | Was Public Counsel concerned with those failure | 22 | * * * * * |
| 22 | rates? | 23 | Sheri Hoyt, having been first duly sworn, was |
| | A Ne they were not. They hallowed that they a | 1 | examined and testified as |
| 23 | A. No, they were not. They believed that there | 1 | |
| 24 | were other measures that could be taken to address those | 24 | follows: |
| | | 24 25 | |

27 (Pages 122 to 125)

| | Page 126 | | Page 128 |
|--------|--|----|--|
| 1 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 1 | exhibit what the information is in the exhibit. |
| 2 | Ms. Argunov, you may proceed. | 2 | Q. So the tool, my informal complaint, I attached |
| 3 | CROSS-EXAMINATION | 3 | the Excel file with all the information from my account |
| 4 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 4 | including some resources. So my question was if this was |
| 5 | Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Hoyt. | 5 | reviewed during the investigation with PSE? |
| 6 | My first question to you is a little bit to know | 6 | A. Cory Cook [phonetic] was the complaint |
| 7 | more about the informal complaint structure. | 7 | investigator. And I also spoke with you about the |
| 8 | So when a customer there is a customer | 8 | complaint. We both reviewed that data and had no |
| 9 | complaint about billing or other type of the billings, is | 9 | feedback for it. |
| 10 | there any particular divisions that investigate each | 10 | Q. Okay. Yeah. I remember Cory too. |
| 11 | particular type? Or all all division, like, can | 11 | So does Cory have any background in accounting, |
| 12 | answer or file help with the complaint investigation | 12 | or billing, or data management? |
| 13 | for any type of complaint? | 13 | A. I'm sorry. I couldn't answer what Cory's |
| 14 | A. So we have a team of five complaint investigator | 14 | background is. I would not want to misspeak about what |
| 15 | plus myself. And we investigate all of the complaints | 15 | his background is. |
| 16 | that the consumer protection office receives that are | 16 | Q. Okay. |
| 17 | regulated issues. We don't specialize or divide up the | 17 | So what thank you for your answers. |
| 18 | complaints. | 18 | Another question would be what is the time frame |
| 19 | Q. So the when I filed my informal complaint, | 19 | for the informal complaint to kind of the whole to |
| 20 | the staff or person who is reviewing and investigating it | 20 | finish the whole circle? |
| 21 | based on what I provided, do they have any knowledge of | 21 | For example, today I filed an informal |
| 22 | AMI system and well, in this particular case, billing | 22 | complaint. How - how is it working? How much time do |
| 23 | process? Not at high level, I'm talking more detailed | 23 | you think is appropriate to spend investigating some more |
| 24 | level. | 24 | complicated cases or informal complaints? |
| 25 | A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat? | 25 | A. There's a lot of factors that go into an |
| 1 | Did you say when you filed your formal or | 1 | informal complaint investigation. Not in any order of |
| 2 | informal? | 2 | importance; staffing, number of complaints, the type of |
| 3 | Q. Informal. Whoever was investigating it. | 3 | complaint. We have about six or seven industries we |
| 4 5 | A. So we have a basic knowledge Commission staff | 4 | regulate. We take complaints about all of them. And |
| 6 | has a basic knowledge of what an AMI meter can do for | 6 | it's hard to say. It's what the complaint needs. We |
| 7 | customers. It's two-way communication, to our | 7 | keep at it. I don't really know how to we don't have |
| 8 | understanding. There's also features that a company may offer to its customers such as looking at daily usage | 8 | a time limit. Companies have a set limit for when |
| 9 | through its website account. It's AMI is slightly | 9 | they're supposed to respond. But there are no set |
| 10 | different than AMR. Our understanding is that AMR is one | 10 | timeline to follow for the for Staff to investigate.Q. So quick question. |
| 11 | way, meaning that the company can't communicate to the | 11 | When my informal complaint was closed, I haven't |
| 12 | meter such as a remote reconnect or disconnect. And the | 12 | been provided any support documentation for PSE. |
| 13 | meter doesn't an AMR meter doesn't provide doesn't | 13 | Is this so is this something that, like, |
| 14 | tell the company whether the power is out. | 14 | normal that you you to see would do so if I file an |
| 15 | Q. Okay. And so during investigation of my | 15 | informal complaint with the files and supporting |
| 16 | formal informal complaint, excuse me, informal | 16 | documentation, should I get some kind of supporting |
| 17 | complaint, there was a file similar to what I have in | 17 | documentation, should riger some kind of supporting documentation in exchange when you guys closing the |
| 18 | EACCH-41 where I provided some facts and some sources to | 18 | the informal complaint? |
| 19 | look at, right? Because I knew that it's a little bit | 19 | Or you just saying it's closed, we agreed with |
| 20 | more getting more technical, right, data management. | 20 | PSE, for example? |
| 21 | So have during any step in your | 21 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, at this point I'm |
| 22 | investigation, was this file reviewed with PSE? | 22 | going to object on relevance grounds. This is Nash |
| 23 | A. So I'm not familiar with the exhibits as | 23 | Callaghan. There are specific violations of Commission |
| 24 | Commission staff isn't a party. So I'm afraid I don't | 24 | rule laid out in the formal complaint. I'm not seeing |
| 25 | know how to answer that question if I don't know what | 25 | how this question gets at information that would make |
| | | 1 | |

28 (Pages 126 to 129)

| | | - | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | Page 130 | | Page 132 |
| 1 | whether or not those violations occurred more or less | 1 | Can you tell me the date it was filed? I |
| 2 | relevant. | 2 | received copies of these, but I have not been following |
| 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Argunov, would you like to | 3 | it religiously. |
| 4 | respond? | 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: It was I believe it was |
| 5 | I think the issue is that we've we've kind | 5 | filed on February 9th. |
| 6 | of that we have escalated this to a formal complaint | 6 | THE WITNESS: Okay. That helps. |
| 7 | level. And now we're taking a fresh look at whether | 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: And I don't I'm not sure |
| 8 | these violations have occurred. | 8 | what's going on with our Cases app. My browser is |
| 9 | So your going into exactly how the informal | 9 | sometimes slow to load things from Cases the last few |
| 10 | complaint was handled may may not be informative if | 10 | days. |
| 11 | we're trying to | 11 | Ms. Gafken, would you happen to have a page site |
| 12 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. | 12 | handy in Aaron Tam's testimony for where Public Counsel |
| 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: decide if these violations | 13 | is asserting the violations it's asserting? |
| 14 | occurred. | 14 | MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Let me see if I can get |
| 15 | MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Agreed. | 15 | something that's helpful. There's a summary, both at the |
| 16 | BY MS. ARGUNOV: | 16 | beginning and the end of the testimony. And I'm trying |
| 17 | Q. My last question would be, Ms. Hoyt, so could | 17 | to get my hands on a site for you. |
| 18 | you please explain the status of informal complaint | 18 | MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I'm looking |
| 19 | showing as Company upheld? | 19 | through that testimony now. It looks to me like the |
| 20 | A. I'm not sure what you mean by "status." | 20 | beginning of page 8 might be where it is it starts to |
| 21 | Could you rephrase that? | 21 | talk about the additional violations. |
| 22 | Q. So when you look at the public records, there is | 22 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That's right. Yes. |
| 23 | a type of informal complaint which is service, et cetera. | 23 | It's page 8. I just opened it myself. |
| 24 | And another one is let's say result. Either | 24 | Ms. Hoyt, do you have that? |
| 25 | customer held or Company upheld. | 25 | THE WITNESS: Not yet. Mine is mine is |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Page 131 | | Page 133 |
| 1 | Page 131 When it says "Company upheld," what does it | 1 | Page 133 not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of |
| 1 2 | | 1 | |
| | When it says "Company upheld," what does it | | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of |
| 2 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? | 2 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to |
| 2 3 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff | 2 3 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. |
| 2 3 4 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. | 2 3 4 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I |
| 2 3 4 5 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very | 2 3 4 5 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. | 2 3 4 5 6 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's testimony in this docket from Aaron Tam? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. THE WITNESS: All right. I have the document |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's testimony in this docket from Aaron Tam? THE WITNESS: I reviewed Public Counsel's | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. THE WITNESS: All right. I have the document open. What page would you like me to go to? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's testimony in this docket from Aaron Tam? THE WITNESS: I reviewed Public Counsel's testimony. I'm sorry, I don't recall whose name was on | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. THE WITNESS: All right. I have the document open. What page would you like me to go to? JUDGE HOWARD: I believe page 8. Let's start |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's testimony in this docket from Aaron Tam? THE WITNESS: I reviewed Public Counsel's testimony. I'm sorry, I don't recall whose name was on it. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. THE WITNESS: All right. I have the document open. What page would you like me to go to? JUDGE HOWARD: I believe page 8. Let's start with page 8. So |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's testimony in this docket from Aaron Tam? THE WITNESS: I reviewed Public Counsel's testimony. I'm sorry, I don't recall whose name was on it. JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, that's fine. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. THE WITNESS: All right. I have the document open. What page would you like me to go to? JUDGE HOWARD: I believe page 8. Let's start with page 8. So THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's testimony in this docket from Aaron Tam? THE WITNESS: I reviewed Public Counsel's testimony. I'm sorry, I don't recall whose name was on it. JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, that's fine. Do you and we can we can open this | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. THE WITNESS: All right. I have the document open. What page would you like me to go to? JUDGE HOWARD: I believe page 8. Let's start with page 8. So THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And are you familiar with I |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's testimony in this docket from Aaron Tam? THE WITNESS: I reviewed Public Counsel's testimony. I'm sorry, I don't recall whose name was on it. JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, that's fine. Do you and we can we can open this document if you if that would be helpful to you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. THE WITNESS: All right. I have the document open. What page would you like me to go to? JUDGE HOWARD: I believe page 8. Let's start with page 8. So THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And are you familiar with I believe you indicated you have reviewed this in the past, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's testimony in this docket from Aaron Tam? THE WITNESS: I reviewed Public Counsel's testimony. I'm sorry, I don't recall whose name was on it. JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, that's fine. Do you and we can we can open this document if you if that would be helpful to you. Do you have that handy, Aaron Tam's testimony | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: 1 will do that, Ms. Hoyt. 1 will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: 1 sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. THE WITNESS: All right. I have the document open. What page would you like me to go to? JUDGE HOWARD: I believe page 8. Let's start with page 8. So THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And are you familiar with I believe you indicated you have reviewed this in the past, does this look familiar to you? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | When it says "Company upheld," what does it mean? A. Just what it implies. That Commission staff found in favor of the company. MS. ARGUNOV: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. And if those are all the oh, I remember you had some questions for Ms. Hoyt. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: I believe I have a couple of questions. They might there might just be one. Ms. Hoyt, have you reviewed Public Counsel's testimony in this docket from Aaron Tam? THE WITNESS: I reviewed Public Counsel's testimony. I'm sorry, I don't recall whose name was on it. JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, that's fine. Do you and we can we can open this document if you if that would be helpful to you. Do you have that handy, Aaron Tam's testimony AT-1T. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | not if somebody could drop me a link to it out of Cases, that would probably be quicker than me trying to scroll through for it. MR. CALLAGHAN: I will do that, Ms. Hoyt. I will send it to you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: We'll give you just a moment. MS. CALLAGHAN: I sent it in an e-mail. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not actually sure I'm still connected. JUDGE HOWARD: It looks like your video is frozen, but I can hear you. I may be having issues hearing you right now. THE WITNESS: All right. I have the document open. What page would you like me to go to? JUDGE HOWARD: I believe page 8. Let's start with page 8. So THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And are you familiar with I believe you indicated you have reviewed this in the past, does this look familiar to you? THE WITNESS: I have read this. Yes. |

29 (Pages 130 to 133)

| | Page 134 | | Page 136 |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | Counsel asserts took place? | 1 | numbers. |
| 2 | THE WITNESS: Well, I don't for the service | 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: Ah. |
| 3 | responsibility under 480-100-148. I have not seen that | 3 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 4 | applied before to a not to a meter that was having | 4 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Sorry. |
| 5 | problems communicating with the network. | 5 | THE WITNESS: No, that's okay. I'm sorry. I |
| 6 | There were also recommendations about penalties, | 6 | was looking at the PDF document. |
| 7 | I believe scrolling quickly. My apologies for the | 7 | Okay. Yes. I'm there now. |
| 8 | 7th month that the Company billed but then credited in | 8 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So there's the |
| 9 | that corrected bill. | 9 | assertion that there's a violation for issuing billing |
| 10 | Is that the other one you're asking about? | 10 | corrections after the deadline establishing rule. |
| 11 | JUDGE HOWARD: Well, there's a few. Let me | 11 | Do you have any opinion as to that claim? |
| 12 | see. | 12 | THE WITNESS: Give me one moment to look at |
| 13 | So one of them well, let's take we'll just | 13 | that, the complaint. |
| 14 | take them basically one category at a time. | 14 | I don't. I'm sorry, Judge Howard. I don't |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: In order. Okay. | 15 | really understand the question in that do I have a |
| 16 | JUDGE HOWARD: One is Public Counsel asserts | 16 | recommendation. No violations were recorded for that by |
| 17 | that PSE did not have a single billing period which was | 17 | the investigator. |
| 18 | based on actual beginning and ending reads for a year, | 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you have any |
| 19 | which would be a violation of WAC 480-100-178(1)(i)(ii). | 19 | basis to agree or disagree with the Public Counsel's |
| 20 | Do you have an opinion as to that claim? | 20 | opinion that there was a violation of that particular |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: For which customer? All three | 21 | Commission rule? |
| 22 | customers had slightly different circumstances. | 22 | THE WITNESS: For the Argunovs? |
| 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: I believe it was it was | 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: For the Argunovs. |
| 24 | pertaining to the Argunovs. | 24 | THE WITNESS: To be honest, the reason I'm |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: Okay. One moment. | 25 | stumbling on this is because there was three separate |
| | | | |
| | Page 135 | | Page 137 |
| 1 | Page 135 JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on | 1 | |
| 1 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on | 1 2 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of |
| | | | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. |
| 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. | 2 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of |
| 2 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a | 2 3 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a |
| 2 3 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. | 2 3 4 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three |
| 2 3 4 5 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too | 2 3 4 5 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. | 2 3 4 5 6 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind |
| 2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six months from the date the error occurred." | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. And 480-100-178(8) speaks to a true-up for bills |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six months from the date the error occurred." Did I read that correctly? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm not seeing that on page 8. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. And 480-100-178(8) speaks to a true-up for bills that were estimated as estimated usage once the Company gets an actual reading, that those are not considered billing corrections for the purpose of (5)(a). |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six months from the date the error occurred." Did I read that correctly? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm not seeing that on page 8. JUDGE HOWARD: Page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. And 480-100-178(8) speaks to a true-up for bills that were estimated as estimated usage once the Company gets an actual reading, that those are not considered billing corrections for the purpose of (5)(a). So the corrected bill that I saw was kind of a |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six months from the date the error occurred." Did I read that correctly? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm not seeing that on page 8. JUDGE HOWARD: Page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, lines 11 through 14. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. And 480-100-178(8) speaks to a true-up for bills that were estimated as estimated usage once the Company gets an actual reading, that those are not considered billing corrections for the purpose of (5)(a). So the corrected bill that I saw was kind of a mash-up. It was a true-up for the estimated usage that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six months from the date the error occurred." Did I read that correctly? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm not seeing that on page 8. JUDGE HOWARD: Page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, lines 11 through 14. THE WITNESS: Page 8 of 13? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. And 480-100-178(8) speaks to a true-up for bills that were estimated as estimated usage once the Company gets an actual reading, that those are not considered billing corrections for the purpose of (5)(a). So the corrected bill that I saw was kind of a mash-up. It was a true-up for the estimated usage that had been correctly displayed on the original bills as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six months from the date the error occurred." Did I read that correctly? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm not seeing that on page 8. JUDGE HOWARD: Page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, lines 11 through 14. THE WITNESS: Page 8 of 13? JUDGE HOWARD: Lines 11 through 14 on page 8. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. And 480-100-178(8) speaks to a true-up for bills that were estimated as estimated usage once the Company gets an actual reading, that those are not considered billing corrections for the purpose of (5)(a). So the corrected bill that I saw was kind of a mash-up. It was a true-up for the estimated usage that had been correctly displayed on the original bills as estimated usage. But they PSE had got a an actual |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six months from the date the error occurred." Did I read that correctly? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm not seeing that on page 8. JUDGE HOWARD: Page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, lines 11 through 14. THE WITNESS: Page 8 of 13? JUDGE HOWARD: Lines 11 through 14 on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. And 480-100-178(8) speaks to a true-up for bills that were estimated as estimated usage once the Company gets an actual reading, that those are not considered billing corrections for the purpose of (5)(a). So the corrected bill that I saw was kind of a mash-up. It was a true-up for the estimated usage that had been correctly displayed on the original bills as estimated usage. But they PSE had got a an actual read off the meter and they had corrected that. And |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six months from the date the error occurred." Did I read that correctly? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm not seeing that on page 8. JUDGE HOWARD: Page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, lines 11 through 14. THE WITNESS: Page 8 of 13? JUDGE HOWARD: Lines 11 through 14 on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Ms. Hoyt, based on the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. And 480-100-178(8) speaks to a true-up for bills that were estimated as estimated usage once the Company gets an actual reading, that those are not considered billing corrections for the purpose of (5)(a). So the corrected bill that I saw was kind of a mash-up. It was a true-up for the estimated usage that had been correctly displayed on the original bills as estimated usage. But they PSE had got a an actual read off the meter and they had corrected that. And during the time they were investigating it, they had |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: And that's referred to on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a recommendation. The rules do allow them to estimate. Violations were recorded because they had estimated too many billing periods in a row. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I might ask you about one more here in particular. If you look to line 11 on page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, it is starting at line 11 going to line 14, it says, "Additionally on July 29, 2021, PSE issued billing corrections to the Argunovs' electricity bill for the past year in violation of WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). Underbilled amounts may only be billed for up to six months from the date the error occurred." Did I read that correctly? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm not seeing that on page 8. JUDGE HOWARD: Page 8 of Mr. Tam's testimony, lines 11 through 14. THE WITNESS: Page 8 of 13? JUDGE HOWARD: Lines 11 through 14 on page 8. THE WITNESS: Yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | complaints. I was not the investigator for either of them for any of them. But I did review them. In one of the complains, PSE had issued a corrected bill for reestimating usage as well as three months of delayed service charges. And they had credited this what they called the seventh month. And put on the spot like this, I'm so sorry. I'm trying to find out which customer that was for. Because I did disagree with Public Counsel that that there should be violations or penalties. The reason was the corrected bill was kind of a hybrid in that 480-100-178(5)(a) speaks about corrected bills for underbilled or overbilled usage. And that can only go back six months for underbilled amounts, or up to six years for overbilled, for crediting. And 480-100-178(8) speaks to a true-up for bills that were estimated as estimated usage once the Company gets an actual reading, that those are not considered billing corrections for the purpose of (5)(a). So the corrected bill that I saw was kind of a mash-up. It was a true-up for the estimated usage that had been correctly displayed on the original bills as estimated usage. But they PSE had got a an actual read off the meter and they had corrected that. And |

30 (Pages 134 to 137)

| | Page 138 | | Page 140 |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| | | | |
| 1 | so then they released the bills for the three months that | 1 | statement because it's just easier to put it all |
| 2 3 | had not billed. | 2 | together. |
| 4 | So I didn't see that as seven months of a billing correction. I saw that as four months corrected | 4 | I just wanted to summarize everything that I was trying to show in my testimonies and go back to |
| 5 | usage as estimated, a true-up. And three months of | 5 | conversation about billing requirements when it comes to |
| 6 | unbilled usage that had been delayed. | 6 | AMI system and AMI meters, in general. |
| 7 | The delay would have qualified as a corrected | 7 | So when any utility company implements a |
| 8 | bill because the rule states for any reason usage wasn't | 8 | brand-new system, there are always some optional features |
| 9 | billed. But it was only three months of delayed charges. | 9 | such as analytics, reporting part of it, et cetera. But |
| 10 | So I felt that PSE kind of erred on the side of | 10 | as I presented in several exhibits, there are also |
| 11 | the customer in that they credited the seventh month when | 11 | specific requirements for billing based on the tape |
| 12 | perhaps it wasn't necessary. | 12 | type of the data that's coming from the smart meters. |
| 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. | 13 | The AMR and AMI smart meters do read data in 15-minute |
| 14 | THE WITNESS: I would not say that penalties | 14 | intervals. And it also has a source of discrete, which |
| 15 | were warranted here. But that's just my opinion. | 15 | is summarized data or meter reads which must be |
| 16 | JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Well, thank you. That's | 16 | synchronized. And this is not happening in PSE case. |
| 17 | all the questions I had. I just wanted to clarify | 17 | The PSE decided to create their own process |
| 18 | Staff's position on those additional violations. | 18 | disregarding all required calculations and work flows. |
| 19 | , Mr. Callaghan, did you have any requests for any | 19 | The AMR calculator reads have not gone through a proper |
| 20 | clarifying redirect following my questions? | 20 | process. Another good example would be noncommunicating |
| 21 | MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you. | 21 | meter. It was installed back in June July of 2022. |
| 22 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Hoyt, thank you | 22 | If you look at the MDMS reads, there is not even one |
| 23 | for your testimony and for appearing here even though | 23 | value there that is pertaining to this particular meter. |
| 24 | Staff is not appearing formally as a party today. | 24 | So all from all I know, the only read that |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. | 25 | PSE takes from my noncommunicating meter is the end read. |
| | | <u> </u> | |
| | Page 139 | | Page 141 |
| 1 | JUDGE HOWARD: I appreciate it. | 1 | That's all. That's all I have. So meaning that those |
| 2 | So that would conclude the examination of | 2 | values are also not going through any validation process. |
| 3 | witnesses. And we will now allow the parties a chance | 3 | So another thing that I was going to mention is |
| 4 | for brief oral closing statement, hopefully limited to | 4 | the MDUS module that we were talking during |
| 5 6 | approximately 15 minutes. And I will follow the same order of parties that I have been following today. If | 5 | cross-examination. So there are two model modules. |
| 7 | we if anyone would like to request a break, we can | 6 | One in L+G platform. Which is MDUS, stands for meter |
| 8 | take a short break. Otherwise, I am happy to to | 7 | data unification and synchronization. |
| 9 | continue on through. | 8 | Just wanted to mention that the exhibit which is |
| 10 | Is there any request from a party for a break at | 9 10 | EACCH-37, at the end of this brochure, it has date on it which is March 30, 2017. |
| 11 | this time? | 11 | During this cross-examination we were told that |
| 12 | MS. ARGUNOV: Your Honor, if five minutes | 12 | this module did not exist. Well, it was there all along |
| 13 | could be granted, that would be great. | 13 | since 2017. So by the when PSE start working on their |
| 14 | JUDGE HOWARD: That's perfectly fair. So | 14 | AMI system, this module was already available. |
| 15 | let's be off the record. | 15 | So this module, what it does is it synchronize |
| 16 | (A break was taken from | 16 | both billing components, that's what they call it, meter |
| 1 7 | 1:51 p.m. to 1:56 p.m.) | 17 | read on one side and interval register on another. And |
| 17 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on | 18 | then both of them, they go through the VEE validation, |
| 19 | the record. | 19 | right, validation estimation and editing process. And |
| 20 | We're going to resume our hearing with the oral | 20 | then it pushes after that, it pushes all of the data |
| 21 | closing statements from the parties. And I would turn | 21 | into another module where it calculates already the |
| 22 | first to Ms. Argunov. | 22 | actual consumption. And those formulas are embedded in |
| 23 | MS. ARGUNOV: Thank you, Your Honor. | 23 | those modules. |
| 24 | CLOSING ARGUMENTS | 24 | So the alternative module in SAP is it's |
| 25 | MS. ARGUNOV: So I just wanted to read my | 25 | called IS-U-EDM. They also saying was was saying they |
| | | | |

31 (Pages 138 to 141)

| | Page 142 | | Page 144 |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | didn't use this as an option either. So which is, again, | 1 | JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. |
| 2 | both modules, either of them is a required step to | 2 | CLOSING ARGUMENTS |
| 3 | calculate the interval data. But PSE keeps saying that | 3 | MS. GROESBECK: My final thoughts on this |
| 4 | there's no such requirements. I might be not an | 4 | matter are when building a new home, specifically in |
| 5 | excellent speaker and there is no one else who can do | 5 | Kittitas County, many energy credits are needed to be met |
| 6 | this for us. And we don't really have unlimited sources | 6 | in order to get your plans approved in the beginning and, |
| 7 | as PSE, a multibillion company. But I hope that my | 7 | again, in order to get a certificate of occupancy to move |
| 8 | testimonies will tell a better story. | 8 | into your home. Those include, but they are not limited, |
| 9 | The fact of the matter is that there are | 9 | to energy efficient appliances, faucets with a low |
| 10 | requirements for AMI system that live in different ERP | 10 | gallons per minute usage, specific windows designed for |
| 11 | and software platform such as L+G, Oracle, and SAP. And | 11 | maximum insulation, and efficient hot water tanks that |
| 12 | PSE refuses to admit that. Instead they invent something | 12 | utilize a heat pump, for example. |
| 13 | that is obviously not working properly. And as a result, | 13 | Additionally, a blower door test is required to |
| 14 | we, their customers, are struggling with energy bills. | 14 | show that the room does not leak air which would cause |
| 15 | The bottom line, this is this is not up to | 15 | the heating system to work overtime. |
| 16 | PSE to decide whether they want to follow the ERP system | 16 | After meeting all required energy credits and |
| 17 | requirements or not. This is a must for each case. | 17 | speaking with energy advisors and adjusting our lifestyle |
| 18 | There are requirements they have to follow and I provided | 18 | in order to use the least amount of energy possible, we |
| 19 20 | multiple sources as evidence. Those there is no room | 19 20 | still wonder why we are receiving such high bills, bills |
| | for their creativity. | 1 | that are much higher than similar homes in our area. Homes that we have confirmed are extremely similar in |
| 21 22 | I found it very challenging to cross-examine sorry, PSE witnesses that do not have the knowledge of a | 21 22 | size and type of heat source used. I simply ask that the |
| 22 | complete process from the beginning to the end. It | 23 | following is considered. |
| 23 | caused a lot of confusion on my side. And but, I | 23 | Some part of the system is clearly wrong and |
| 25 | guess, it might be just an intent from and basically | 25 | that might not be so easy for Puget Sound Energy to |
| 23 | guess, it might be just an intent nom and basically | | that hight hot be so easy for hight bound Energy to |
| | Page 143 | | |
| | 1490 119 | | Page 145 |
| 1 | | 1 | |
| 1 2 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if | 1 | understand because they're not the ones who have |
| | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope | | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due |
| 2 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to | 2 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our |
| 2 3 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope | 2 3 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due |
| 2 3 4 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. | 2 3 4 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. |
| 2 3 4 5 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to | 2 3 4 5 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to | 2 3 4 5 6 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and studying about AMI system. And in believe me when I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the AMR network. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and studying about AMI system. And in believe me when I say it took a toll on my job, on my family, my health, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the AMR network. We also know that for the testimony of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and studying about AMI system. And in believe me when I say it took a toll on my job, on my family, my health, and my life in general. So it wasn't in any way very | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the AMR network. We also know that for the testimony of Ian Hagan, for the testimony of Allison Sains, for the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and studying about AMI system. And in believe me when I say it took a toll on my job, on my family, my health, and my life in general. So it wasn't in any way very easy thing to do for me. Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the AMR network. We also know that for the testimony of Ian Hagan, for the testimony of Allison Sains, for the testimony of Kristina McClenahan, and the testimony of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and studying about AMI system. And in believe me when I say it took a toll on my job, on my family, my health, and my life in general. So it wasn't in any way very easy thing to do for me. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And would | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the AMR network. We also know that for the testimony of Ian Hagan, for the testimony of Allison Sains, for the testimony of Kristina McClenahan, and the testimony of Stacey Halsen, the process that PSE will go through to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and studying about AMI system. And in believe me when I say it took a toll on my job, on my family, my health, and my life in general. So it wasn't in any way very easy thing to do for me. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And would Mr. Johnson like to do a closing? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the AMR network. We also know that for the testimony of Ian Hagan, for the testimony of Allison Sains, for the testimony of Kristina McClenahan, and the testimony of Stacey Halsen, the process that PSE will go through to ensure that eventually, and that ultimately, customers |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and studying about AMI system. And in believe me when I say it took a toll on my job, on my family, my health, and my life in general. So it wasn't in any way very easy thing to do for me. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And would Mr. Johnson like to do a closing? All right. Hearing none, would the Groesbecks | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the AMR network. We also know that for the testimony of Ian Hagan, for the testimony of Allison Sains, for the testimony of Kristina McClenahan, and the testimony of Stacey Halsen, the process that PSE will go through to ensure that eventually, and that ultimately, customers are billed for the energy that they used. It starts with |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and studying about AMI system. And in believe me when I say it took a toll on my job, on my family, my health, and my life in general. So it wasn't in any way very easy thing to do for me. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And would Mr. Johnson like to do a closing? All right. Hearing none, would the Groesbecks like to give any closing comments? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the AMR network. We also know that for the testimony of Ian Hagan, for the testimony of Allison Sains, for the testimony of Kristina McClenahan, and the testimony of Stacey Halsen, the process that PSE will go through to ensure that eventually, and that ultimately, customers are billed for the energy that they used. It starts with the meter, which lan Hagan explains measures in kilowatt |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | there is basically no one to help us with support. So if I wasn't clear enough today, I apologize. But I hope that all the exhibits and testimonies will help us to bring to bring closure and justice. PSE has mentioned that they're going to implement time of use, meaning that they will be able to charge a higher price for the peak hours during the day. Due to incomplete implementation of their current system, we're already struggling with PSE bills. I wonder how much longer it will take us to not being able to afford to have lights in our house. The arranged payment that PSE so genuinely offers to everyone is not what we want. We want to actually pay for what we actually use and not what they force us to pay because they decided to create their own processes. It's been a year since I started learning and studying about AMI system. And in believe me when I say it took a toll on my job, on my family, my health, and my life in general. So it wasn't in any way very easy thing to do for me. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And would Mr. Johnson like to do a closing? All right. Hearing none, would the Groesbecks | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | understand because they're not the ones who have experienced the financial hardship that we have faced due to this issue or how much stress it has brought into our lives. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I'll now turn to PSE. CLOSING ARGUMENTS MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to start with what is clear here. And it's that the complainants were ultimately billed based on actual energy used in kilowatt hours. And that's to the primary allegation. And it has not been proven, which is their obligation. Now, how do we know that? We know that, one, that actual reads were received by meter readers that went out when reads were not being communicated over the AMR network. We also know that for the testimony of Ian Hagan, for the testimony of Allison Sains, for the testimony of Kristina McClenahan, and the testimony of Stacey Halsen, the process that PSE will go through to ensure that eventually, and that ultimately, customers are billed for the energy that they used. It starts with |

32 (Pages 142 to 145)

| tistelf counters many of the points that Ms. Argunov is raising. The meter istelf measures energy usage in kilowat hours. There does not need to be any sort of conversion when that data and that information goes from the meter to MDMS. Or from MDMS to SAP. Ms. Sams, for example, explained why there might be a gap in the information that Ms. Argunov was point breve to MDMS. Or from MDMS to SAP. Ms. Sams, for example, explained why there might be a gap in the information that Ms. Argunov was point breve to MDMS. Or from MDMS to SAP. Ms. Sams, for example, explained why there might be a gap in the information that Ms. Argunov was the physical read from the meter, tawas able to do to so on the information that it provides to customers. But a key point there is that PSE does not use timerval data for billing. And it is not required to do so. PSE bills customers. Market and for the month. And how it does that is that is specific to whether or not the electric meters are any that would show you that the energy used; it works like an ocharder. Whare if you look at the evidence, you'll see that a would show you that that energy used; it works like an ocharder. Whare if you look at the evidence, you'll see that any the submerse and the fill and that need to the end from the beginning read. So there really are two questions here. Page 147 One, which is what violations might have corrected if an optimal state, adequate, and difticant service, and quote. The kay any of the submet have an ingher serve which and end formal complaint that there was an ingher there and the read with that there was a violation there. Sam and the informal complaint is that the advance of the informal complaint is that the advance of the advance o | | Page 146 | | Page 148 |
|--|----|---|----|--|
| 2 Now Public Coursel is required packards. 3 The moter iteeff measures energy usage in 2 4 kilowait hours. There does not need to be any sort of 2 5 conversion when that data and that information goes from 4 6 the meter is that both and that information table SAP. 5 7 Ms. Sains, for example, explained why there 5 7 might be again the thinformation that it 6 7 Ms. Sains, for example, explained why there 5 7 mode table SAP. 7 8 add that for billing. 10 add table SAP. 10 provides to customers. 7 11 doesn't show up in the interval information that it 1 12 provides to customers. 1 13 But a key point there is that PSE does not use 1 14 interval data for billing. 1 and the ending read of the month. 13 Dut a key point there is what PSE does not use 1 happening here. And then put 12 customer's reading mead or the month. 1 another wo | 1 | itself counters many of the points that Ms. Arounov is | 1 | you should find that there was good cause for that delay |
| 3 The meter itself measures energy usage in kilovant hours. There does not need to be any sort of conversion when that data and that information goes from the meter to MDMS. Or from MDMS to SAP. violations be found. And I want the highlight two WACs 6 the meter to MDMS. Or from MDMS to SAP. the meter were not in working order. And this is incorrect. The meters were working properly because when PSE sent out meter readers to pointing to That when if you have MDMS and there might doesn't you have MDMS and there might and the ending read for the month. And here and provide to outsomers. The meter were and it wasn't doesn't you have MDMS and there might the ending read for the month. And here and provide to doesn't and the ending read for the month. And here and that needs to be doen other that 1,000 kilowat hours were used between these months. So there readily are two questions here. The meters were registering energy usage as nearly correct as practical. That wasn't questions and point that that work that doesn't apply. 7 One, which is what violations might have corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the Groesbecks received a couple of bills that were receiving that. Those were mission staff found houldiatons for the them. Yeage 147 Fage 149 7 And ApeSE does admit that there were to conany eetimated bills nocertain that new there to consi | | · · · - | 1 | |
| 4 kilowatt hours. There does not need to be any sort of somersion when that data and that information goes from the meter to MDMS. Or from MDM is SAP. that are cited that do not apply here is claiming that the meters were not in working order. And this is incorrect. The meters were not in working properly. The issue was the AMR network. We know that that the meters were pointing to. That when if you have MDMS and there might have been estimated reads or estimated breads breads or estimated breads breads and breads the breads brea | 3 | • | 3 | · - |
| 5 conversion when that data and that information goes from 5 the meters were not in working proder). And this is 6 the meter to MOMS. Or from MOMS to SAP. 6 incorrect. The meters were working properly. The issue was the AMR network. We know that the meters were working properly. The issue is that the meter sades or estimated balls, that data is thow up in the interval information that Ms. Argunov was provides to customers. 5 the meters were not in working properly. The issue was the AMR network. We know that the meters was object to be a special read from the meter, it was able to do 10 have been estimated reads or estimated balls, that data is thow up in the interval information that its data is that hereary in the reis that PSE does not use interval the oning read. The meters were more marking properly. The issue with that is that is is that ending read for the month, and how it does that is that the energy used, it works like and other is not required to do so. PSE balls 10 14 is that the energy used, it works like and other put is a specific to whether or not the electric meters are registering usege narry correct as practical. That was the public counsel identifies 11 15 billing, And this sout count is a specific to whether or not the electric meters are registering usege narry correct as practical. 12 16 registering usege narry correct as practical. 13 17 and the ending read form the beginning read. 14 18 so there sain | 4 | | | 0 0 |
| 6 the meter to MOMS. Or from MOMS to SAP. 6 incorrect. The meters were working properly. The issue meter sage working properly. The issue were working properly. The issue were working properly because when PSE sent out meter readers to get a physical read from the meters. 7 Max be AMR network. We know that the meters were working properly. The issue work ing properly. The issue working properly because when PSE sent out meter readers to get a physical read from the meters. 7 Max be AMR network. We know that the meters were working properly. The issue work ing properly. The issue work ing properly because when PSE sent out meter readers to get a physical read from the meters. 7 Max be ends meted from onth. And the source is properly. The work is the AMR network. We know that the meters were ends meter add is the same with that is that is the issue with that is that is the interval that is that is the issue with that is that is the interval that is that is the ending read for the month. And how it does that is that is that is that is the ending read for the widnes, you'll the issue there. And thould also point out that that WAC 480-100-482 (0.100- | 5 | | 5 | |
| 7 Ms. Sains, for example, explained why there 7 was the AMR network. We know that the meters were 8 might be ago in the information that Mk. Argunov was 8 working property because when PSE sent our meter readers 10 have been estimated reads or estimated bills, that data 10 10 11 doesn't show up in the interval information that it 11 11 11 12 provides to customers. 11 11 11 13 But a key point there is that PSE does not use interval 11 11 11 14 interval data for billing. It does not use interval 11 11 11 15 billing., And it is not required to do so. PSE bills 11 11 11 16 customers read might work in the adometer. 12 11 11 11 17 and the andig read for the month, and how it does that 12 11 11 11 16 customers read might work work work at the weters are 12 11 11 11 11 16 customers read might work work at the weter norm the electrin meters are 11 11 11 11 17 where firy ou look at the evidence, you'll see that a 12 11 11 11 18 by t | 6 | - | 6 | - |
| 9 pointing to. That when if you have MDMS and there might have been estimated reads or estimated bills, that data doesn't show up in the interval information that it provides to customers. 9 to get a physical read from the meter, it was able to do so. And that meter read, it was poing up. It wasn't going down. It wasn't going backwards. It continued to read. 12 The takey point there is that PSE does not use interval data for billing. It does not use interval is that the energy used, it works like an odometer. 10 so. And that meter read the issue with that is that is spacific to whether or not the electric meters are registering usage nearly correct as practical. That was happening here. And I would also point out that that WAC applies to whether or not the electric meters are trading usage nearly correct as practical. That was happening here. And I would also point out that that WAC applies to whether or not the electric meters are trading usage nearly correct as practical. That was happening here. And I would also point out that that WAC applies to whether or not the electric meters are trading usage nearly correct as practical. That was happening here. And I would also point out that that WAC applies to whether or not the electric meters are trading usage as nearly correct as practical. Another WAC that Public Counsel cless is WAC 480-100-148(2)(c). But the issue there, and whet that was a condition that wells are bedoen other. 12 One, which is what violations might have coursered? Fage 147 13 Consebecks. PSE achowideges that and is not consider penalties in another proceeding? a condition that will enable it to quote, mether adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The was pool cause for the Groesbecks, and the fister meter was | 7 | Ms. Sains, for example, explained why there | 7 | |
| 10 have been estimated reads or estimated bills, that data desrift show up in the interval information that it provides to customers. 10 so. And that meter read, it was going up. It wasn't going backwards. It continued to going down. It wasn't going backwards. It c | 8 | might be a gap in the information that Ms. Argunov was | 8 | working properly because when PSE sent out meter readers |
| 11 deesn't show up in the interval information that it 11 going down. It wasn't going backwards. It continued to read. 12 provides to customers. 12 read. 13 But a key point there is that PSE does not use interval data for billing. It does not use interval data for billing. It does not use interval data for the month. And how it does that 14 WAC 480-100-333. But the issue with that is that is is that is specific to whether or not the electric meters are especific to whether or not the electric meters are an entry is initially up at that the energy usage asent you correct as practical. That was happening here. And I would also point out that that WAC applies to whether or not the electric meters are applies to whether or not the field or is taken out of the field and then put back in right after that. That doesn't apply. 14 Where if you look at the evidence, you'll see that a customer's read might say 1,000 - 15.52. And then the life or is taken out of the field and then put back in right after that. That doesn't apply. 12 that 1,000 kilowatt hours were used between those monts. 23 24 that 1,000 kilowatt hours were used between those monts. 24 25 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other 23 26 ocherk's is what violations might have 24 27 And, two, should penalties, or at least should a recommendation be made to consider 3 28 And. the vereff is undealing. | 9 | | 9 | |
| 12 provides to customers. 13 But a key point there is that PSE does not use 13 But a key point there is that PSE does not use 14 interval data for billing. It does not use interval 15 billing. And it is not required to do so. PSE bills 16 customers based off of the beginning read for the month, and how it does that 18 is that the energy used, it works like an odometer. 19 Where if you look at the evidence, you'll see that a 10 customer's read might say 1,000 - 1,552. And then the 12 next morth it will say 2,522. And that would show you 13 than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. 14 than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. 15 So there's no calculation that needs to be doen other 14 than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. 15 One, which is what violations might have 16 occurred? 17 One, which is what violations might have 18 cordition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The key apoint on service and read/sitional instances. And it also 19 One, which is muthe wey finding with the and coromesian instances. And it | 10 | have been estimated reads or estimated bills, that data | 10 | so. And that meter read, it was going up. It wasn't |
| 13 But a key point there is that PSE does not use 13 Another point is that Public Counsel identifies 14 interval data for billing. It does not use interval 13 Another point is that Public Counsel identifies 14 billing. And it is not required to do so. PSE bills 14 WAC 480-100-333. But the issue with that is that is 15 billing. And it is not required to do so. PSE bills 16 registering usage nearly correct as practical. That was 16 customers head might say 1,000 - 1,552. And then the papies to when a meter is initially - is initially put 17 next month it will say 2,552. And that would show you that 1,000 klowatt hours were used between those months. 25 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other accustomer is nead might bat were 26 One, which is what violations might have 20 27 One, which is what violations might have 20 28 breamended - recommended - recomend that with that there w | 11 | doesn't show up in the interval information that it | 11 | going down. It wasn't going backwards. It continued to |
| 14 interval data for billing. It does not use interval 14 WAC 480-100-333. But the issue with that is that is 15 billing. And it is not required to do so. PSE bills 15 specific to whether or not the electric meters are 16 customer's based off of the beginning read for the month. 16 specific to whether or not the electric meters are 17 and the endry used, it works like an odometer. 18 specific to whether or not the electric meters are 18 that the endry used, it works like an odometer. 18 applies to when a meter is initially - is initially put 19 Where if you look at the evidence, you'll see that a 10 into the field or is taken out of the field and then put 20 customer's read might say 1,000 - 1,552. And then the 20 ackin right after that. That doesn't apply. 21 neet rooth it will say 2,552. And then the beginning read. 24 Another WAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 25 So there really are two questions here. 20 Another WAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 26 Coursel one inder of ar mit the beginning read. 24 480-100-148(2)(0). But the issue there, and what that 27 Dne, which is what violations might have 2 a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, a | 12 | provides to customers. | 12 | read. |
| 15 billing. And it is not required to do so. PSE bills 15 specific to whether or not the electric meters are 16 customers based off of the beginning read for the month, and how it does that 16 registering usage nearly correct as practical. That was 17 Where if you look at the evidence, you'll see that a 19 into the field or is taken out of the field and then put 18 customer's read might say 1,000 - 1,552. And that would show you 10 base neater is initially - is initially put 19 that hours' sree darge between those months. 10 base in right atter that. That doesn't apply. 21 the next month it will say 2,552. And that would show you 11 The meters were registering usage as practical. 22 that yook should penalties, or at least should a for the month, that will say 2,552. And that would show you 12 The meters were registering usage as practical. 24 400-100-148(2)(c). But the issue there, and what that 12 Page 149 25 So there's no calculation that weeds to be done other 14 WAC calls for, is that PSE needs to maintain and explain 26 Corcurred? And, two, should penalties, or at least should a 12 a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish afe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no interty intore days courred? | 13 | But a key point there is that PSE does not use | 13 | Another point is that Public Counsel identifies |
| 16 customers based off of the beginning read for the month, and the ending read for the month. And how it does that is that the energy used, it works like an odometer. 16 registering usage nearly correct as practical. That was appending there. And I would also point out that that WAC applies to when a meter is initially - is initialy - is initially - is initially - is initially | 14 | interval data for billing. It does not use interval | 14 | WAC 480-100-333. But the issue with that is that is |
| 17 and the ending read for the month. And how it does that 17 happening here. And I would also point out that that WAC 18 that the energy used, it works like an dometer. 10 19 Where if you look at the evidence, you'll see that a applies to when a meter is initially is initially put 10 next month it will say 2,552. And that would show you ath to field or is taken out of the field and then put 21 next month it will say 2,552. And that would show you ath to four out of the field and then put 22 that 1,000 kilowatt hours were used between those months. And her MAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 24 480 - 100-148(2)(c). But the issue there, and what that 25 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other acondition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, 26 One, which is what violations might have acondition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, 27 And PSE does admit that there were too many acondition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, 36 corcured? Now Public Counsel does identify additional 37 And PSE does admit that there were too many stat the customers were receiving 38 corcured bils in certain instances. And the als nother consel dees identify additional | 15 | billing. And it is not required to do so. PSE bills | 15 | specific to whether or not the electric meters are |
| 18 is that the energy used, it works like an odometer. 18 applies to when a meter is initially is initially put 19 Where if you look at the evidence, you'll see that a 19 into the field of the put 20 customer's read might say 1,00° - 1,552. And that would show you 10 into the field of the put 21 next month it will say 2,552. And that would show you 21 The meters were registering energy usage as 22 that 1,000 kilowatt hours were used between those monts. 26 Another VAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 24 than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. 25 WAC calls for, is that PSE needs to maintain and explain 25 One, which is what violations might have 26 a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The key 26 So let's start with the very first question. 7 And two, should penalties, or at least should a 4 recommended recommendation be made to consider 9 pine there, aqain, is that the customers were receiving 36 So let's start with the very first question. 7 Now Public Counsel does identify additional 4 recommended recommendation be made to consider 9 pine there, which hat muliple estimated re | 16 | customers based off of the beginning read for the month, | 16 | registering usage nearly correct as practical. That was |
| 19 Where if you look at the evidence, you'll see that a customer's read might say 1,000 - 1,552. And then the customer's read might say 1,000 - 1,552. And then the the did or is taken out of the field and then put back in right rater that. That doesn't apply. 11 next month it will say 2,552. And that would show you that 1,000 kilowatt hours were used between those months. 10 25 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. 20 Another VAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 26 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. 21 Another VAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 27 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. 23 Another VAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 28 So there really are two questions might have coccurred? 24 480-100-148(2)(c). But the issue there, and what that tat counters were receiving safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no inintain tank ever to consider penalties in another proceeding? 2 a condition that will enable it to quote, time kay that that WAC applies to. 26 So let's start with the very first question. 7 Now Public Counsel does identify additional violations for the Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns them. 7 Now Public Counsel does identify additional violations | | - | 1 | |
| 20 customer's read might say 1,0001,552. And then the next month it will say 2,552. And that would show you that 1,000 kilowath hours were used between those months. 20 back in right after that. That doesn't apply. 21 that 1,000 kilowath hours were used between those months. 20 The meters were registering energy usage as nearly correct as practical. 24 that 1,000 kilowath hours were used between those months. 20 The meters were registering energy usage as nearly correct as practical. 25 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. So there really are two questions here. 20 Another WAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 480-100-148(2)(c). But the issue there, and what that WAC calls for, is that PSE needs to maintain and explain Page 147 Page 147 Page 147 Page 147 Page 147 Page 147 a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service. Hore was no interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC applies to. Now Public Counsel does admit that three were too many setimated bills in certain instances. And it also corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the Groesbecks, received a couple of bills that were corrected bills. And Commission staff found violations for the groesbecks received a couple of bills that were corrected bills. And Commi | | | 1 | |
| 21 next month it will say 2,552. And that would show you 21 The meters were registering energy usage as 22 that 1,000 kilowatt hours were used between those months. 20 Another WAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 23 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other 40 40 100 148(2)(0). But the issue there, and what that 25 So there really are two questions here. 24 480-100-148(2)(0). But the issue there, and what that 26 One, which is what violations might have 2 a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The key 3 And, two, should penalties, or at least should a a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no 4 recommended - recommendation be made to consider penalties in another proceeding? 5 5 safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC 6 so less start with the very first question. 7 Now Public Counsel does identify additional 10 Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting 1 the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>•</td> | | | | • |
| 22 that 1,000 kilowatt hours were used between those months. 22 nearly correct as practical. 23 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other 23 24 than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. 23 25 So there really are two questions here. 24 26 One, which is what violations might have 25 27 One, which is what violations might have 26 28 And, two, should penalties, or at least should a 7 4 recommended recommendation be made to consider 29 4 recommended recommendation be made to consider 20 5 penalties in another proceeding? 3 6 So let's start with the very first question. 7 7 And PSE does admit that there were too many 6 9 corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the 9 10 Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting 1 11 there was a violation there. But a key finding with the 1 12 Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting 1 13 theter. Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it | | | | |
| 23 So there's no calculation that needs to be done other 23 Another WAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 24 Another WAC that Public Counsel cites is WAC 480-100-148(2)(c). But the issue there, and what that 25 So there really are two questions here. 23 26 Doe, which is what violations might have 24 27 One, which is what violations might have 25 28 And, two, should penalties, or at least should a recommended - recommendation be made to consider 29 Page 147 a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, 30 Now, should penalties, or at least should a a condition that will enable it to quote. The key 4 recommended - recommendation be made to consider penalties in another proceeding? a condition that will enable it to quote. The key 6 So let's start with the very first question. And the 's what that WAC applies to. 7 And PSE does admit that there were too many estimated reads. and, again, PSE does achnowledge that estimated reads. And, again, 10 Groesbecks. PSE acknowledge that at it not contesting that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns 11 therm. Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it is unclear wh | | | | |
| 24 than subtracting the end read from the beginning read. 24 480-100-148(2)(c). But the issue there, and what that 25 So there really are two questions here. 24 480-100-148(2)(c). But the issue there, and what that 26 Dne, which is what violations might have 25 a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The key adequate, and efficient service. There was no interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC applies to. 7 And PSE does admit that there were too many 3 safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC applies to. 7 And PSE does admit that there were too many 8 violations that it claims to have with the Argunovs' AMR 8 corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the 9 meter, which had multiple estimated reads. And, again, 10 Groesbecks: PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting 11 the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal complaint is that there 18 Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there 12 was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill. 19 was good cause FSE went out and tested the meter because there 10 Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and where 11 bills. Ind releasing it tot the customer to make sur | | - | 1 | |
| 25 So there really are two questions here. 25 WAC calls for, is that PSE needs to maintain and explain Page 147 1 One, which is what violations might have occurred? a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The key point here, again, is that the customers were receiving safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC applies to. 7 And PSE does admit that there were too many estimated bills in certain instances. And it also corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns them. Now Yot the Johnsons, I do want to note that it is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming there was a violation there. But a key finding with the yas good cause for the wight between issuing a bill. Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming there was a volation there. But a key finding with the were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending that bill and releasing that bill and releasing to the twest meas using a bill. Was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill. Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming there was a violation there. But a key finding with the ere was not end there from a credit of \$1,600 to make sure | | | 1 | |
| Page 147 Page 149 1 One, which is what violations might have 1 a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The key point here, again, is that the customers were receiving safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC applies to. 7 And PSE does admit that there were too many 5 8 estimated bills in certain instances. And it also 6 9 corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the 9 9 corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the 9 11 bills. And Commission staff found violations for the 10 12 Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting 10 13 that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns 11 14 is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming 13 16 is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming 14 17 there was a violation there. But a key finding with the 17 18 was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill. 19 19 was reading correctly, which is why then that bill 19 20 that that meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | |
| 1One, which is what violations might have occurred?1a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The key point here, again, is that the customers were receiving safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC applies to.7And PSE does admit that there were too many setimated bills in certain instances. And it also3Now Public Counsel does identify additional violations that it claims to have with the Argunovs' AMR meter, which had multiple estimated reads. And, again, PSE does acknowledge that and is not contesting that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns7Now Public Counsel for the functional violations that it claims to have with the Argunovs' AMR meter, which had multiple estimated reads occurred with the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in testimony.13that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns them.1a condition that will enable it of quote, furnish safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was an impact on the violations that it claims to have with the Argunovs' AMR meter, which had multiple estimated reads occurred with the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in testimator16Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it sunclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming that that meter was a violation there. But a key finding with the going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond what gets to whether or not there was an impact on the customer is that for the Argunovs for that AMR meter, they were not negatively impacted because they were given ta credit | 25 | So there really are two questions here. | 25 | WAC calls for, is that PSE needs to maintain and explain |
| 2occurred?2adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The key3And, two, should penalties, or at least should a3point here, again, is that the customers were receiving4recommended recommendation be made to considerasafe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no5penalties in another proceeding?interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC6So let's start with the very first question.n7And PSE does admit that there were too manynow Public Counsel does identify additional8estimated bills in certain instances. And it alsonow Public Counsel does identify additional9corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and theneter, which had multiple estimated reads. And, again,10Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contestingPSE does acknowledge that estimated reads occurred with11bills. And Commission staff found violations for theneter, which had multiple estimated reads occurred with13that. Those were mistakes that were made and it ownsthem.14them.neter was reading cornectly customer is that for the Argunovs. I do want to note that it16is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming17there was a violation there. But a key finding with the18Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there21what they re allowed to do.22that that meter was reading co | | Page 147 | | Page 149 |
| 2occurred?2adequate, and efficient service, end quote. The key3And, two, should penalties, or at least should a3point here, again, is that the customers were receiving4recommended recommendation be made to considerasafe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no5penalties in another proceeding?interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC6So let's start with the very first question.n7And PSE does admit that there were too manynow Public Counsel does identify additional8estimated bills in certain instances. And it alsonow Public Counsel does identify additional9corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and theneter, which had multiple estimated reads. And, again,10Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contestingPSE does acknowledge that estimated reads occurred with11bills. And Commission staff found violations for theneter, which had multiple estimated reads occurred with13that. Those were mistakes that were made and it ownsthem.14them.neter was reading cornectly customer is that for the Argunovs. I do want to note that it16is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming17there was a violation there. But a key finding with the18Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there21what they re allowed to do.22that that meter was reading co | 1 | One, which is what violations might have | 1 | a condition that will enable it to quote, furnish safe. |
| 3And, two, should penalties, or at least should a3point here, again, is that the customers were receiving4recommended recommendation be made to considersafe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no5penalties in another proceeding?interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC6So let's start with the very first question.67And PSE does admit that there were too many78estimated bills in certain instances. And it also89corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the99Groesbecks received a couple of bills that were corrected1011bills. And Commission staff found violations for the1112Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting1213that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns1314them.1415Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it1516is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming1616Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there1818Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there1919was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.1920Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there2021were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending2122that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that2324meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that2424meter was reading correctly | 2 | | 2 | - |
| 4recommended recommendation be made to consider penalties in another proceeding?4safe, adequate, and efficient service. There was no interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC applies to.6So let's start with the very first question.6applies to.7And PSE does admit that there were too many estimated bills in certain instances. And it also7Now Public Counsel does identify additional8estimated bills in certain instances. And it also8violations that it claims to have with the Argunovs' AMR9corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the9meter, which had multiple estimated reads. And, again,10Groesbecks received a couple of bills that were corrected10PSE does acknowledge that estimated reads occurred with11bills. And Commission staff found violations for the11the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal12Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting12complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in13that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns14Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and14them.14Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and15Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it1516is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming1617there was a violation there. But a key finding with the1718Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there1819was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.1919 <t< td=""><td>3</td><td></td><td>3</td><td></td></t<> | 3 | | 3 | |
| 6So let's start with the very first question.6applies to.7And PSE does admit that there were too manyapplies to.8estimated bills in certain instances. And it also89corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the910Groesbecks received a couple of bills that were corrected1011bills. And Commission staff found violations for the1112Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting1213that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns1314them.1415Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it1516is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming1617there was a violation there. But a key finding with the1718Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there1819was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.1920Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there2021were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending2122that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that2323that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that2324meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24 | 4 | | 4 | |
| 7And PSE does admit that there were too many7Now Public Counsel does identify additional8estimated bills in certain instances. And it also99corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the910Groesbecks received a couple of bills that were corrected1011bills. And Commission staff found violations for the1112Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting1213that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns1314them.1415Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it1516is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming1617there was a violation there. But a key finding with the1718Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there1819was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.1910Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there2022that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that2123that that meter was reading correctly. which is why then that bill24 | 5 | penalties in another proceeding? | 5 | interruption of service here. And that's what that WAC |
| estimated bills in certain instances. And it also corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the Groesbecks received a couple of bills that were corrected bills. And Commission staff found violations for the Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns them. Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill. Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill | 6 | So let's start with the very first question. | 6 | applies to. |
| 9corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the Groesbecks received a couple of bills that were corrected bills. And Commission staff found violations for the Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns them.9meter, which had multiple estimated reads. And, again, PSE does acknowledge that estimated reads occurred with the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in testimony.13that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns them.10PSE does acknowledge that estimated reads. And, again, PSE does acknowledge that estimated reads occurred with the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in testimony.14them.11Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and what gets to whether or not there was an impact on the customer is that for the Argunovs and their AMR meter, they were not negatively impacted because they were given a credit of \$1,600 to make sure because PSE was not going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond what they're allowed to do.20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill2424meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24 | 7 | And PSE does admit that there were too many | 7 | Now Public Counsel does identify additional |
| 10Groesbecks received a couple of bills that were corrected bills. And Commission staff found violations for the Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns them.10PSE does acknowledge that estimated reads occurred with the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in testimony.14them.1112Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and what gets to whether or not there was an impact on the customer is that for the Argunovs and their AMR meter, there was a violation there. But a key finding with the Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.10PSE does acknowledge that estimated reads occurred with the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in testimony.16succear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming there was a violation there. But a key finding with the Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.10Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and what gets to whether or not there was not poing to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond what they're allowed to do.20were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill10So the Argunovs for that AMR meter.23that that meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | 8 | estimated bills in certain instances. And it also | 8 | violations that it claims to have with the Argunovs' AMR |
| 11bills. And Commission staff found violations for the11the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal12Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting11the Argunovs. That was not part of the informal13that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns12complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in14them.13testimony.15Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it15what gets to whether or not there was an impact on the16is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming16customer is that for the Argunovs and their AMR meter,17there was a violation there. But a key finding with the17they were not negatively impacted because they were given18Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there18a credit of \$1,600 to make sure because PSE was not19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.19going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond20because PSE went out and tested the meter because there20So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | 9 | corrected the errors for the Groesbecks, and the | 9 | meter, which had multiple estimated reads. And, again, |
| 12Groesbecks. PSE acknowledges that and is not contesting that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns them.12complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in testimony.13that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns them.12complaint. And nor did the customers pursue that in testimony.14them.13Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and15Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming15Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and16is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming16customer is that for the Argunovs and their AMR meter,17there was a violation there. But a key finding with the Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there18a credit of \$1,600 to make sure because PSE was not19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.19going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | 10 | Groesbecks received a couple of bills that were corrected | 10 | - |
| 13that. Those were mistakes that were made and it owns13testimony.14them.14Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and15Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it15Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and16is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming16what gets to whether or not there was an impact on the17there was a violation there. But a key finding with the17they were not negatively impacted because they were given18Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there18a credit of \$1,600 to make sure because PSE was not19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.19going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there20what they're allowed to do.21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | - |
| 14them.14Nevertheless, a key point to consider here and15Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it15what gets to whether or not there was an impact on the16is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming16customer is that for the Argunovs and their AMR meter,17there was a violation there. But a key finding with the17they were not negatively impacted because they were given18Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there18a credit of \$1,600 to make sure because PSE was not19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.19going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there20what they're allowed to do.21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | |
| 15Now for the Johnsons, I do want to note that it15what gets to whether or not there was an impact on the16is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming16customer is that for the Argunovs and their AMR meter,17there was a violation there. But a key finding with the16customer is that for the Argunovs and their AMR meter,18Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there18a credit of \$1,600 to make sure because PSE was not19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.19going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there20what they're allowed to do.21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | | |
| 16is unclear whether or not Public Counsel is claiming16customer is that for the Argunovs and their AMR meter,17there was a violation there. But a key finding with the17they were not negatively impacted because they were given18Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there18a credit of \$1,600 to make sure because PSE was not19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.19going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there20what they're allowed to do.21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | |
| 17there was a violation there. But a key finding with the17they were not negatively impacted because they were given18Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there18a credit of \$1,600 to make sure because PSE was not19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.19going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there20what they're allowed to do.21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | 5 |
| 18Johnsons' case in the informal complaint is that there18a credit of \$1,600 to make sure because PSE was not19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.19going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there20what they're allowed to do.21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | • | 1 | |
| 19was good cause for the weight between issuing a bill.19going to bill them for any sort of estimated read beyond20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there20what they're allowed to do.21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | |
| 20Because PSE went out and tested the meter because there20what they're allowed to do.21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | |
| 21were high initial bills. So PSE waited before sending21So the Argunovs for that AMR meter and where22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | |
| 22that bill and releasing it to the customer to make sure22there was multiple estimated reads, they were not charged23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | - |
| 23that that meter was reading correctly. Ultimately that23in the end for the full amount of electricity that they24meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill24used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | • |
| 24 meter was reading correctly, which is why then that bill 24 used with that AMR meter. | | | 1 | |
| | | | 1 | |
| | | | 1 | |
| | | | | |

33 (Pages 146 to 149)

| | Page 150 | | Page 152 |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | | 1 | |
| 1 2 | is whether or not fines should be imposed or whether or not there should be a recommendation to consider | 1 2 | Another factor is whether or not the Company promptly corrected the violations and remedied the |
| 2 3 | penalties. | 3 | impacts. And their solution here to avoid future issues |
| 4 | I would like to highlight the testimony of | 4 | was to install an AMI meter. And that is what PSE did. |
| 5 | Ms. Hoyt here at the very end which was that her | 5 | And PSE did that ahead of schedule. And a key point is |
| 6 | recommendation, based off of their investigation, was | 6 | that typically the AMI meters are installed by a |
| 7 | that that was not necessary. That there that imposing | 7 | contractor. And they have a schedule that they'll go |
| 8 | | 8 | through for that area and eventually they'll do it |
| 9 | penalties was not necessary here. And what the Commission should consider is the | 9 | neighborhood by neighborhood. |
| 10 | totality of factors and that weighs against the | 10 | What happened here is that PSE realized that |
| 11 | , | 11 | that was not going to be happening quick enough so they |
| 12 | imposition of penalties and whether or not a proceeding should be opened. | 12 | sent out their own technicians to then install an AMI |
| 13 | - | 13 | meter. And if you look at when the AMI meters were |
| | Typically the Commission will consider the | 14 | installed, the estimated bills did not happen as |
| 14 | policy statement in Docket A-120061. And that outlines different factors that would be considered of whether or | 15 | frequently. And there was no other violation of the WAC |
| 15 16 | not there's an imposition of funds. Or what we would | 16 | after the AMI meters were installed. |
| | P C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C | 17 | One of the final two considerations here is the |
| 17 | argue, opening another proceeding. | 18 | number of violations. Commission staff found nine |
| 18 | So let's go through a couple of those factors. | 19 | violations and we and PSE wants to highlight that |
| 19 | One is how serious or harmful the violation is | 20 | those violations occurred over the course of a few |
| 20 | to the public. The key here is that the violations were | 21 | months. |
| 21 | isolated. They're not part of a larger issue. They | 22 | During COVID and while PSE was transitioning |
| 22 | don't threaten public safety. And, importantly, the | 23 | customers to AMI meters. So those violations are |
| 23 | customers were receiving electricity, their service was | 24 | unlikely to happen again. |
| 24 | not interrupted. And the meters themselves were | 25 | And then, finally, the other consideration is to |
| 25 | recording the actual energy use. And the customers were | | And then, many, the other consideration is to |
| | | | |
| | Page 151 | | Page 153 |
| 1 | Page 151 billed based off of actual energy used. | 1 | Page 153 the number of customers affected. And here again, the |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| | billed based off of actual energy used. | | the number of customers affected. And here again, the |
| 2 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an | 2 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the |
| 2 3 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when | 2 3 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are |
| 2 3 4 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate | 2 3 4 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the |
| 2 3 4 5 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over | 2 3 4 5 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. | 2 3 4 5 6 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. And eventually PSE installed AMI meters which resolved | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying for the energy that they use. And the Commission should |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. And eventually PSE installed AMI meters which resolved the problem. And Ms. McClenahan, if you look at her | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying for the energy that they use. And the Commission should consider that totality of circumstances here when |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. And eventually PSE installed AMI meters which resolved the problem. And Ms. McClenahan, if you look at her testimony, she shows that PSE has a system in place to | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying for the energy that they use. And the Commission should consider that totality of circumstances here when considering whether or not to either issue penalties or |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. And eventually PSE installed AMI meters which resolved the problem. And Ms. McClenahan, if you look at her testimony, she shows that PSE has a system in place to try and prevent these type of issues from happening | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying for the energy that they use. And the Commission should consider that totality of circumstances here when considering whether or not to either issue penalties or open a new proceeding. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. And eventually PSE installed AMI meters which resolved the problem. And Ms. McClenahan, if you look at her testimony, she shows that PSE has a system in place to try and prevent these type of issues from happening again. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying for the energy that they use. And the Commission should consider that totality of circumstances here when considering whether or not to either issue penalties or open a new proceeding. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. And eventually PSE installed AMI meters which resolved the problem. And Ms. McClenahan, if you look at her testimony, she shows that PSE has a system in place to try and prevent these type of issues from happening again. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying for the energy that they use. And the Commission should consider that totality of circumstances here when considering whether or not to either issue penalties or open a new proceeding. The circumstances here show that PSE remedied the situation, that the AMI meters are working as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. And eventually PSE installed AMI meters which resolved the problem. And Ms. McClenahan, if you look at her testimony, she shows that PSE has a system in place to try and prevent these type of issues from happening again. Another factor is whether or not the company was cooperative and responsive. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Muget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying for the energy that they use. And the Commission should consider that totality of circumstances here when considering whether or not to either issue penalties or open a new proceeding. The circumstances here show that PSE remedied the situation, that the AMI meters are working as designed for these customers, and that this is not a part |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. And eventually PSE installed AMI meters which resolved the problem. And Ms. McClenahan, if you look at her testimony, she shows that PSE has a system in place to try and prevent these type of issues from happening again. Another factor is whether or not the company was cooperative and responsive. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. Puget Sound Energy takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying for the energy that they use. And the Commission should consider that totality of circumstances here when considering whether or not to either issue penalties or open a new proceeding. The circumstances here show that PSE remedied the situation, that the AMI meters are working as designed for these customers, and that this is not a part of a larger issue. And on that basis, PSE requests that you will find violations only where appropriate and decline to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | billed based off of actual energy used. Additionally, customers that were offered an installment plan were able to opt into one. So that when there were true-up bills issued, it was not one immediate payment that they had to make. It was extended over 18 months to lessen that initial shock. Another consideration is whether or not the violations are intentional. And there should be very clear, here based off of the testimony of Mr. Hagan, of Ms. Sains, Ms. McClenahan, and Ms. Halsen, that there was no intent to violate the WAC. The violation has happened due to a wide variety of circumstances, primarily the AMR meter network was not working as it should in that the meters were not able to communicate with the AMR network. And eventually PSE installed AMI meters which resolved the problem. And Ms. McClenahan, if you look at her testimony, she shows that PSE has a system in place to try and prevent these type of issues from happening again. Another factor is whether or not the company was cooperative and responsive. Again, this factor would weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening another proceeding. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | the number of customers affected. And here again, the factors weigh against the imposition of fines or the opening of a new proceeding. The violations here are specific to two customers; the Argunovs and the Groesbecks. And they are tied to the AMR network that has now been replaced. There's no evidence that there's a widespread issue with estimated bills. There's no evidence that there's an issue with the meters in general. And the issues specific to these three customers have been resolved. They takes this obligation to serve customers with reliable electric service seriously, and makes sure that customers not only receive electric service, but also will make sure that they're only paying for the energy that they use. And the Commission should consider that totality of circumstances here when considering whether or not to either issue penalties or open a new proceeding. The circumstances here show that PSE remedied the situation, that the AMI meters are working as designed for these customers, and that this is not a part of a larger issue. |

34 (Pages 150 to 153)

| | Page 154 | | Page 156 |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Thank you. | 1 | he he was off the meeting around 12:30 because he said |
| 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I would now turn to | 2 | his wife was in the hospital with her brother and he had |
| 3 | Public Counsel. | 3 | to go to the meeting. |
| 4 | MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. | 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Okay. I just wanted to |
| 5 | CLOSING ARGUMENTS | 5 | raise that one more time. |
| 6 | MS. GAFKEN: Aaron Tam testified in Exhibit | 6 | Is there anything else that we should address |
| 7 | AT-1T, page 10, compounding effects of the estimated | 7 | before we adjourn today? |
| 8 | bills, the numerous bill corrections, and unknown high | 8 | All right. Hearing nothing, I would like to |
| 9 | energy bill ratings, resulted in the Groesbeck household | 9 | thank all the parties, their witnesses. |
| 10 | being nearly disconnected and the Argunov household | 10 | MS. ARGUNOV: Does anyone else have problem |
| 11 | applying for energy assistance. | 11 | with network? |
| 12 | While PSE has paid very little consequence, | 12 | MS. GAFKEN: I believe Judge Howard has |
| 13 | these customers were surprised with sudden and large | 13 | frozen. |
| 14 | arrearage payments and put them at risk for | 14 | MR. STARKEY: We're having the same issues |
| 15 | disconnection. | 15 | over here. |
| 16 | The impact of this case has been tremendous on | 16 | JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry. Was someone trying to |
| 17 | customers. Yes, we are only talking about three | 17 | raise something? |
| 18 | households among Puget's millions over a million | 18 | MR. STARKEY: Your Honor, you just froze for a |
| 19 | customers. But this case is very important to those | 19 | while there. |
| 20 | individual customers. So I caution against saying this | 20 | MS. ARGUNOV: We couldn't hear you. |
| 21 | is a small case or an inconsequential case. | 21 | MR. STARKEY: For a few seconds. |
| 22 | Public Counsel continues to request that the | 22 | JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I'll start from the top |
| 23 | Commission consider bringing a separate complaint for | 23 | here. |
| 24 | rule violations. Ms. Hoyt for Staff provided a good | 24 | So I was thanking all the parties for their |
| 25 | explanation today about the valuation I'm sorry, the | 25 | participation in this proceeding. And I was letting |
| | Page 155 | | Page 157 |
| 1 | violations Public Counsel noted with respect to the | 1 | parties know that under Commission rule, I need to issue |
| 2 | Argunov account relating to WAC 480-100-178(5)(a). | 2 | my decision within 60 days of the close of the record, |
| 3 | The other violations identified by Public | 3 | which would be today. We don't have any further briefing |
| 4 | Counsel of WAC 480-100-178(1)(i)(ii), WAC | 4 | on the schedule for this case. So my decision is going |
| 5 | 480-100-148(2)(c), and WAC 480-100-133 pertaining to | 5 | to be based on everything submitted up through the close |
| 6 | meters not being in good working order and estimating | 6 | of the hearing today. And I do hope to get a decision |
| 7 | bills for over a year deserve consideration along with | 7 | |
| | | 1 ' | out in a timely manner. I do have some other pending, |
| 8 | | 8 | out in a timely manner. I do have some other pending, pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case |
| 8 9 | the violations found by Commission staff. | | |
| | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does | 8 9 10 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. |
| 9 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are | 8 9 10 11 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we |
| 9 10 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does | 8 9 10 11 12 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. |
| 9 10 11 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The | 8 9 10 11 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable | 8 9 10 11 12 13 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. |
| 9 10 11 12 13 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified requirements. Public Counsel believes that the | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified requirements. Public Counsel believes that the Commission has probable cause to proceed with the | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified requirements. Public Counsel believes that the Commission has probable cause to proceed with the complaint in this matter. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission. And I will conclude my remarks. | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified requirements. Public Counsel believes that the Commission has probable cause to proceed with the complaint in this matter. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission. And I will conclude my remarks. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified requirements. Public Counsel believes that the Commission has probable cause to proceed with the complaint in this matter. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission. And I will conclude my remarks. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. That would conclude our closing statements. I | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified requirements. Public Counsel believes that the Commission has probable cause to proceed with the complaint in this matter. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission. And I will conclude my remarks. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. That would conclude our closing statements. I would offer as does Mr. Johnson want to make any | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified requirements. Public Counsel believes that the Commission has probable cause to proceed with the complaint in this matter. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission. And I will conclude my remarks. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. That would conclude our closing statements. I would offer as does Mr. Johnson want to make any closing remarks? I raised that earlier. I did not hear | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified requirements. Public Counsel believes that the Commission has probable cause to proceed with the complaint in this matter. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission. And I will conclude my remarks. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. That would conclude our closing statements. I would offer as does Mr. Johnson want to make any closing remarks? I raised that earlier. I did not hear anything. | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | the violations found by Commission staff. Asking the Commission to issue a complaint does not decide liability or culpability, only that there are issues to pursue and potential penalties to impose. The Commission issues complaints on what's akin to probable cause that there is probable cause to believe that the regulated company has violated the identified requirements. Public Counsel believes that the Commission has probable cause to proceed with the complaint in this matter. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission. And I will conclude my remarks. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. That would conclude our closing statements. I would offer as does Mr. Johnson want to make any closing remarks? I raised that earlier. I did not hear | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | pressing cases as well. But I also consider this case important and I do want to get a decision out in a timely manner. So unless the parties have anything further, we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at |

35 (Pages 154 to 157)

Docket No. UE-220701 - Vol. II - 3/14/2023

| | Page 158 | |
|----------|---|--|
| 1 | CERTIFICATE | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | STATE OF WASHINGTON | |
| 4 | COUNTY OF KITSAP | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | I, Carisa Kitselman, a Certified Court Reporter | |
| 7 | in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify | |
| 8 | that the foregoing transcript of the videoconference | |
| 9 | hearing is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, | |
| 10 | skill and ability. | |
| 11 | IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand | |
| 12 | and seal this 28th day of March, 2023. | |
| 13 | ADTC. | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | _ (alliget selman | |
| 16 | CARISA KITSELMAN, RPR, CCR #2018 | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 24 | | |
| 24 25 | | |
| 20 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| _ | | |

| Α | acts 70:23 | 27:8 29:12 33:3 | 139:3 | 57:20,21,24 58:3 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| A-120061 150:14 | actual 37:3 45:23 | admitting 23:23 | allowed 46:8 53:11 | 58:5,8,10 62:22 |
| a.m 18:14 22:2,5 | 46:11,18,18,23,24 | adopted 49:3 | 53:12,21,22 | 63:16,23 65:12,16 |
| 66:3,10,10 88:24 | 47:15 57:10,11 | advance 34:25 | 149:20 | 86:8 99:19,23 |
| 88:24 98:8 | 68:1 72:14 78:10 | advanced 35:4 52:8 | allowing 82:24 | 115:25 116:4 |
| Aaron 20:16 30:25 | 85:21 95:18 100:5 | adversely 30:18 | allows 71:5 | 119:1,1,2,18 |
| 53:18 120:10,17 | 100:6,19,24 107:5 | advisor 107:7 | alluded 50:24 | 122:5 123:15,18 |
| 131:15,22 132:12 | 109:21 110:16,17 | advisors 144:17 | alternative 141:24 | 125:3 127:10,10 |
| 154:6 | 116:18,19 117:21 | advocacy 121:10 | ambient 42:16 | 127:13 140:13,19 |
| ability 34:3 63:19 | 118:12,13 134:18 | advocating 122:3 | AMI 35:11,11,22 | 145:17 148:7 |
| 158:10 | 137:17,22 141:22 | affect 105:8 | 36:6 45:14 47:9 | 149:8,16,21,24 |
| able 26:7 47:13 | 145:11,15 150:25 | affirmatively 45:10 | 47:17 50:12,20 | 151:12,14 153:5 |
| 69:10,11 76:1 | 151:1 | afford 143:10 | 51:2,4,7,10 52:9 | analysis 36:3 91:10 |
| 78:13,17 80:7 | add 43:20 44:2 | afraid 127:24 | 53:1 56:14,20,22 | analytics 140:9 |
| 95:18 116:18 | 62:22 80:21 | afternoon 24:21 | 57:7,15 58:11 | analyzing 37:3 |
| 143:6,10 148:9 | additional 40:4 | 98:25 99:1 112:24 | 59:8 61:4 65:12 | answer 26:17 28:18 |
| 151:3,14 | 53:16 132:21 | 121:1 126:5 | 65:13,15 75:15 | 35:5 44:11 51:23 |
| account 50:1 58:13 | 133:25 138:18 | agents 107:3 | 77:21 90:16 91:2 | 59:19 76:1 85:13 |
| 76:18 79:8 80:16 | 148:2 149:7 | ago 62:15 75:5 | 91:4,18 92:18,20 | 104:17 108:24 |
| 80:18 84:1 95:19 | additionally 29:3 | agree 26:24 27:7 | 94:11 104:2 | 111:7 126:12 |
| 95:19,23 96:12,15 | 135:11 144:13 | 31:18 32:22 83:16 | 113:12,14 119:3 | 127:25 128:13 |
| 99:18 106:22 | 151:2 | 136:19 | 119:17,18,20,22 | answering 35:6 |
| 107:20 109:24 | address 22:16,22 | agreed 129:19 | 120:3 121:7,13 | 113:4 114:14 |
| 111:15,16 117:10 | 23:1 45:20 76:8 | 130:15 | 122:5 123:6,12,13 | answers 128:17 |
| 127:9 128:3 155:2 | 78:23 101:20 | Ah 136:2 | 124:16,22,24 | anyone's 85:12 |
| accounting 128:11 | 113:1 123:24 | ahead 51:11 119:20 | 125:3 126:22 | anyways 80:3 |
| accounts 60:23 | 124:25 155:18 | 122:9,12 124:7 | 127:5,9 140:6,6 | apart 79:23 |
| 61:7,13 62:16 | 156:6 | 152:5 | 140:13 141:14 | apologies 134:7 |
| 76:15 79:9 95:2 | addressed 26:22 | air 144:14 | 142:10 143:17 | apologize 33:15 |
| 96:6 102:21 103:5 | 54:1 84:4 97:10 | air-conditioning | 151:15 152:4,6,12 | 63:22 87:21 106:3 |
| 103:11 117:20 | 106:20 | 41:24 | 152:13,16,23 | 143:2 |
| | addresses 26:13 | akin 155:12 | 153:20 | app 132:8 |
| accuracy 44:22 59:24 61:15 | addressing 23:24 | Alexander 18:2 | amount 38:17,20 | appear 69:20 |
| accurate 46:5 47:4 | adds 26:21 | 22:8 | 39:14 40:1,15 | appearance 22:19 |
| 47:25 48:25 70:2 | adequate 149:2,4 | aligned 87:15 | 49:6 81:9 83:5 | 22:24 23:4,9,16 |
| 109:18 110:21 | adjourn 156:7 | allegation 35:7 | 84:8 144:18 | appearances 22:11 |
| 158:9 | adjourned 157:12 | 45:20 51:1 145:12 | 149:23 | appearing 23:13,18 |
| accurately 44:23 | adjusting 144:17 | allegations 42:7 | amounts 47:14 | 138:23,24 |
| 46:25 51:23 | administrative | 104:2 | 76:18 103:5 | appears 32:21 |
| 110:20 | 18:11 19:2 22:6 | Allison 20:6 49:19 | 135:14 137:13 | 41:16 80:5 |
| acknowledge | admission 25:13,16 | 59:16,21 63:6 | AMR 31:24 32:1 | apples 76:20,20 |
| 149:10 | 26:25 27:1 31:18 | 65:25 66:14,21 | 36:6 45:25 46:2,3 | appliance 44:2 |
| acknowledges | 32:22 | 96:18 145:19 | 46:24 47:2,8,13 | appliances 42:24 |
| 47:11 147:12 | admit 32:24 34:1 | allow 24:2,9 33:7,8 | 47:14 50:13,16,20 | 44:1,4 144:9 |
| active 40:8,9,9 | 142:12 147:7 | 60:4 82:19 110:6 | 51:3,8 53:1 56:14 | applicable 36:5 |
| 42:12 | admitted 21:3 27:7 | 122:21 135:4 | 56:15,15 57:7,7,8 | 37:16 |
| 42.12 | | | | 2 |

| | - | - | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| application 26:3 | 55:13,21,23 56:1 | asking 60:18 63:4 | average 80:2 82:6 | 127:5 |
| 71:5,11 72:24 | 56:4,10,12 58:17 | 65:11 68:5 83:25 | 82:25 83:3,12,15 | basically 39:17 |
| 73:3 | 58:19,20,24 59:5 | 84:25 103:7 | 101:24 102:25 | 57:9 71:17 72:15 |
| applied 78:5 134:4 | 59:6 60:3,11,17 | 105:22 108:14 | 103:21,22 104:6,8 | 134:14 142:25 |
| applies 102:11 | 60:20 61:24 62:5 | 110:4,6 112:6 | 104:12,22,25 | 143:1 |
| 148:18 149:6 | 62:7,10,14,21 | 122:13,16 134:10 | 105:1,8,14 111:25 | basis 32:3 49:21 |
| apply 32:18 73:6 | 63:10,13,15 64:23 | 155:9 | 111:25 | 50:25 136:19 |
| 148:4,20 | 65:2,11 66:25 | asks 31:14 | averages 79:15,16 | 153:23 |
| applying 154:11 | 67:4 69:2,5,23 | ASP 93:15 | 85:22 105:10 | battle 48:18,18 |
| appreciate 139:1 | 70:9,11 74:14 | asserting 93:23,25 | avoid 105:24 152:3 | began 114:12 123:9 |
| appropriate 51:20 | 75:1,9,10 82:12 | 132:13,13 | aware 32:1 103:25 | beginning 22:11 |
| 69:13 128:23 | 82:22 84:8,10,15 | assertion 136:9 | 109:22 110:5,6 | 35:18,18 99:4 |
| 153:24 | 84:21 85:25 86:11 | asserts 134:1,16 | 119:16 | 110:17 132:16,20 |
| approved 144:6 | 86:18,20,22 88:17 | assigned 95:25 | AX 39:8 67:12 68:1 | 134:18 142:23 |
| approximately | 88:20 89:12,14 | assist 42:14,21 | | 144:6 146:16,24 |
| 24:18 104:4 | 92:5,10,14,15 | assistance 154:11 | B | behalf 23:6,12,19 |
| 125:15 139:5 | 93:22 94:3 97:7 | assistant 19:10,14 | b 21:1 115:23 | beliefs 34:1 |
| April 41:15 42:2 | 97:16 98:21,23 | 23:11,18 112:25 | back 35:5 36:3 | believe 25:20 28:6 |
| area 45:15 52:6 | 101:7,13,18 | assume 49:10 | 42:22 59:8 60:1 | 28:24 30:13 55:4 |
| 67:6 77:7 83:13 | 102:13,19 103:16 | assumed 81:12 | 63:8,16 67:9 | 64:17 69:18 82:1 |
| 101:11 113:14 | 103:18 105:16 | assumes 49:7 | 72:12 73:21 77:21 | 101:12 103:10 |
| 119:21 144:20 | 106:3,4,12,15,16 | 108:21 | 79:17 80:14 88:22 | 111:18 120:21 |
| 152:8 | 108:22,25 109:6,7 | assuming 93:20 | 89:1,17 90:14 | 122:23 124:18 |
| areas 29:3 40:12 | 110:4,9,10,12 | AT-1T 131:23 | 91:11 98:10 | 125:8,15 131:12 |
| 43:23 48:19 | 111:12,14 112:12 | 154:7 | 100:13 111:16 | 132:4 133:17,21 |
| argue 121:17 | 125:15 126:2,4 | AT-6X 31:1,2,15 | 114:13 115:22 | 134:7,23 143:17 |
| 150:17 | 130:3,12,15,16 | 32:8,10 33:2 | 137:13 139:18 | 155:13 156:12 |
| arguing 32:4 | 131:5 139:12,22 | AT6X 31:1 | 140:4,21 148:20 | believed 123:23 |
| argument 21:11,12 | 139:23,25 146:1,8 | attached 128:2 | background | believes 53:25 |
| 21:13,14 106:7 | 154:10 155:2,25 | attempt 60:12 | 107:18 108:15 | 155:15 |
| argumentative | 156:10,20 | 95:17 | 128:11,14,15 | Bellevue 19:6 |
| 62:4 93:18 106:8 | Argunov's 69:25 | attend 55:12 | backlog 100:13 | benefits 77:21 |
| 108:20 | 115:18 | attention 39:16 | backwards 148:11 | best 33:24 34:24 |
| arguments 41:7 | Argunovs 45:19 | attorney 19:10,14 | balance 46:16 | 37:1 158:9 |
| 52:17 139:24 | 49:1,5 52:22 54:2 | 23:11,18 112:25 | based 31:6 45:23 | better 76:8 107:8 |
| 144:2 145:7 154:5 | 113:12 134:24 | audio 124:9 | 46:18,24 47:15,19 | 142:8 |
| Argunov 18:2 | 136:22,23 149:11 | August 41:24 79:22 | 49:2 77:17 79:10 | bevy 48:22 |
| 19:19 20:4,7,10 | 149:16,21 153:4 | 111:16 113:13 | 79:11,25 99:9 | beyond 53:12,22 |
| 20:13,20 21:6,11 | Argunovs' 115:6 | 118:5 | 105:1 110:15 | 149:19 |
| 22:8,13,14,15 | 135:12 149:8 | automatically | 122:4 123:18 | big 60:25 61:2 |
| 24:9,13 25:22,25 | arranged 143:11 | 100:15 | 126:21 134:18 | bill 40:2,18 41:25 |
| 26:1,11 27:5,8,24 | arrearage 154:14 | available 62:1 71:8 | 135:24 140:11 | 46:14,15,17 47:5 |
| 28:4 29:6 33:12 | asked 42:15 44:10 | 72:18,19 90:11 | 145:10 146:16 | 49:16,21,24 50:14 |
| 33:14 40:21,24 | 84:22,23 85:5 | 141:14 | 150:6 151:1,9 | 78:20 90:22 91:20 |
| 45:21 49:9 54:19 | 101:19 108:23 | availed 53:2 | 157:5 | 93:3,6,8 94:19 |
| 54:20,25 55:8,10 | 115:5 | Avenue 19:15 | basic 116:12 127:4 | 99:24 100:1,23 |
| | | | l | |

| Page | 161 |
|-------|-----|
| ' ago | |

| F | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 116:19 118:12 | 138:4 140:5,11 | 86:17 120:22 | 71:23 84:18 95:3 | catch 69:9 95:3 |
| 134:9 135:12 | 141:16 146:14,15 | 123:11 124:8 | 95:17 141:16 | 99:25 100:13 |
| 137:4,10,19,25 | billings 67:14 | 139:4 | Callaghan 19:9 | catch-up 99:17,24 |
| 138:8 147:19,22 | 76:17 126:9 | briefer 42:7 | 23:10,11 24:12 | 100:1 |
| 147:24 149:19 | bills 28:11 38:9 | briefing 157:3 | 30:18 129:21,23 | category 134:14 |
| 154:8,9 | 43:15,16,17,20 | briefly 31:21 | 131:9 132:18 | cause 144:14 |
| billed 44:23 45:23 | 44:3,14 46:8,10 | bring 54:13 55:6 | 133:4,8 135:24 | 147:19 148:1 |
| 48:25 51:23 78:11 | 46:20,24 47:4,12 | 79:4 143:4,4 | 136:4 138:19,21 | 155:13,13,16 |
| 81:9 84:1 87:16 | 47:20 49:1 50:18 | bringing 154:23 | called 46:16 49:9 | caused 100:1 |
| 87:19 109:20 | 53:10,21 95:3 | broad 45:4 | 52:9 56:16 59:11 | 142:24 |
| 110:20 111:2,17 | 99:17 100:22 | broader 32:6 | 68:23 71:25 72:7 | causes 74:9 |
| 134:8 135:14 | 101:24 102:24 | brochure 141:9 | 95:23 99:8 108:12 | causing 38:24 |
| 138:2,9 145:10,23 | 103:21 106:20 | brother 156:2 | 137:6 141:25 | caution 154:20 |
| 151:1 | 137:12,15,21 | brought 22:12 54:9 | calls 95:6 117:14 | CCR 18:25 158:16 |
| billing 35:14,17 | 138:1 142:14 | 54:11 145:3 | 148:25 | Cedars 22:17,22 |
| 36:4,11,17,23 | 143:9 144:19,19 | browser 69:10 | camera 54:20 89:5 | 23:1 |
| 37:1 38:2,8,11,11 | 146:10,15 147:8 | 132:8 | 125:18 | center 26:4,16,21 |
| 38:12,24 39:16,16 | 147:10,11,21 | build 72:24 | capability 35:11 | central 100:4 |
| 39:19,23,23,24 | 151:4 152:14 | building 52:23 | captioned 22:8 | certain 42:17 100:7 |
| 41:13 45:5 46:4 | 153:7 154:8 155:7 | 144:4 | capture 71:22 | 117:17 147:8 |
| 49:7,12 52:12 | bimonthly 49:21 | built 45:1 71:8,10 | car 57:13 88:2 | certainly 60:12 |
| 53:9,11,21 59:13 | 93:3,9 | 73:1 | careful 58:21,22 | 85:14 88:19 103:9 |
| 60:24 61:3,12 | bit 33:16 57:19 | burden 45:9 50:7 | Carisa 18:25 158:6 | 103:9 |
| 62:17,25 65:19 | 85:1,24 90:24 | business 38:19 | 158:16 | certificate 144:7 |
| 67:16,21,24 68:6 | 126:6 127:19 | Byron 23:5 | carries 68:12 | Certified 158:6 |
| 68:7,12,22 70:15 | blower 43:24 | byronstarkey@p | Carson 23:7 | certify 158:7 |
| 71:17,24,25 72:3 | 144:13 | 19:7 | case 22:8 24:13 | cetera 58:14 59:25 |
| 72:6,8,11 73:4,5,6 | blowers 42:12 | | 28:3,16 30:17 | 85:7 130:23 140:9 |
| 73:22 74:6,16 | boat 43:13 | $\frac{\mathbf{C}}{\mathbf{C}}$ | 31:4,9,11 32:3 | Chad 18:3 19:20 |
| 75:14 76:4,5,15 | bottom 135:25 | C 19:1 21:5 158:1,1 | 34:14 41:9 44:21 | 22:9,25 |
| 76:19,23 77:2,6 | 142:15 | calculate 39:25 | 45:6 48:2 52:6,20 | challenge 34:3 |
| 77:17,18,19,19,20 | Box 19:10 | 40:1,17 142:3 | 53:15,17 55:10 | challenging 85:3 |
| 78:14,16 79:7 | brand-new 43:23 | calculated 38:7 | 79:19 106:14 | 142:21 |
| 80:5 84:4 87:6,12 | 140:8 | 39:14 | 117:9,14,14,15,16 | chance 109:24 |
| 87:13,13,20 89:24 | breach 59:12 | calculates 141:21 | 117:18 118:2,5,8 | 139:3 |
| 90:5,16,21,23 | break 24:16,17,22 | calculating 41:10 calculation 35:13 | 121:10,11,12 | change 43:1 |
| 91:11 92:22,24,24 | 66:1,2,10,13 | 107:13 146:23 | 123:7 124:20,20 | channel 37:13 |
| 94:5,9,19 97:20 | 88:18,24 89:3 | calculations 38:3 | 124:23 126:22 | chapter 73:10 |
| 97:22 100:20 | 98:6,7,8 139:7,8 | 38:19 40:3,14 | 140:16 142:17 | charge 39:22 41:15 |
| 101:3,4 105:14 | 139:10,16 | 43:11 63:3 72:11 | 147:18 154:16,19 | 59:24 61:15 143:7 |
| 107:12 110:16,17 | breaks 25:9 | 102:2,8 103:3,4 | 154:21,21 157:4,8 | charged 42:3 47:15 |
| 110:18,22 111:3 | BRIAN 19:5 | 102.2,8 105.3,4 103:24 140:18 | cases 26:3,21 30:9 | 76:18,18 79:22 |
| 117:18 118:24 | bridge 36:22 70:23 71:12 | calculator 140:19 | 45:22 117:18 | 95:20 107:19 149:22 |
| 126:9,22 128:12 134:17 135:6,11 | brief 24:3,16 25:24 | call 25:6 38:14,14 | 118:13 121:12 128:24 132:8,9 | charges 38:25 40:3 |
| 136:9 137:18,25 | 31:3,23 42:6 | 44:9 61:2 71:23 | 128:24 152:8,9 | 79:21 111:16 |
| 150.7 157.10,25 | 51.5,25 42.0 | , 01.2 / 1.20 | 155.2 157.0 | 17.21 111.10 |
| | | | 1 | |

| Page 1 | 62 |
|--------|----|
|--------|----|

| | • | • | • | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 137:5 138:9 | closely 87:15 | 57:9 58:7 127:11 | 126:12,13,14,19 | conducted 84:4 |
| charging 44:11 | closer 61:20 | 151:14 | 127:16,17 128:2,6 | confidential 26:6,8 |
| 53:9 | closing 21:11,12,13 | communicated | 128:8,19,22 129:1 | 26:10,12,14,18 |
| chat 25:7,7,7 | 21:14 24:20 41:7 | 145:16 | 129:3,5,11,15,18 | configuration |
| check 81:4 96:4 | 129:17 139:4,21 | communicates | 129:24 130:6,10 | 67:20 68:4 |
| 97:4 110:20 | 139:24 143:22,24 | 57:16,16 | 130:18,23 136:13 | configurations |
| checks 97:6 | 144:2 145:7 154:5 | communicating | 137:25 147:18,25 | 39:13 |
| chime 82:13 | 155:21,23 | 73:21 116:7,14,17 | 149:12 151:25 | confirm 28:21 |
| choice 74:7 | closure 143:4 | 118:23 134:5 | 154:23 155:9,17 | 69:11 71:14 86:6 |
| chooses 91:20 | code 114:11 | communication | complaints 31:12 | 110:23 116:10 |
| chose 72:13 | Coie 19:5 | 47:9 51:14 56:17 | 50:2,20 51:20 | confirmed 144:21 |
| circle 128:20 | cold 48:19 104:16 | 56:21 57:8,15 | 126:15,18 128:24 | confirming 70:1 |
| circulated 24:8 | coldest 48:19 | 58:4 91:9,10 | 129:2,4 137:1 | confuse 67:5 |
| 25:18,22 | collection 64:5,7 | 107:23 118:15,22 | 155:12 | confused 57:19 |
| circumstances 30:2 | combination 100:2 | 119:2 127:6 | complete 142:23 | 67:22 85:1 |
| 30:3 51:16 134:22 | combined 45:3 | companies 94:8 | completed 79:3 | confusion 39:20 |
| 151:12 153:16,19 | 60:21,22 62:15 | 129:7 | 118:5 | 142:24 |
| cite 41:1 | come 79:15,16 80:4 | company 44:18 | completely 121:11 | connected 108:9 |
| cited 148:4 | 96:3 | 52:20 61:4 99:8 | compliance 54:6 | 133:11 |
| cites 148:23 | comes 57:20 59:20 | 100:10,17 122:14 | 99:11 110:19 | consecutive 95:22 |
| claim 49:1,5 134:20 | 64:7 65:14 105:11 | 125:5 127:7,11,14 | 116:15 | 96:2,11 109:23 |
| 136:11 | 140:5 | 130:19,25 131:1,4 | complicated | consequence |
| claiming 29:4 | comfortable 85:13 | 134:8 137:16 | 128:24 | 154:12 |
| 147:16 148:4 | coming 33:22 | 140:7 142:7 | comply 93:25 | consider 24:19 |
| claims 48:4 52:13 | 39:20 43:16 60:7 | 151:20 152:1 | component 52:10 | 34:1 51:15 54:5 |
| 109:25 149:8 | 78:6 112:1 140:12 | 155:14 | components 92:18 | 84:13 109:2 147:4 |
| clarification 57:4,4 | commands 56:23 | compare 76:20 | 141:16 | 149:14 150:2,9,13 |
| clarify 25:24 26:5 | 56:24 | comparing 85:21 | compound 74:22 | 153:16 154:23 |
| 26:20 29:3 74:15 | commented 84:13 | complainant 22:15 | 92:1 | 157:8 |
| 87:3,22 138:17 | comments 143:24 | 52:14 | compounding | consideration |
| clarifying 24:15 | Commission 18:1 | complainants 18:4 | 154:7 | 151:7 152:25 |
| 138:20 | 19:8 22:6 31:8 | 45:8,18 50:7,17 | concern 32:11 | 155:7 |
| Cle 22:16,22 23:1 | 35:9 50:19 51:19 | 52:16 145:10 | 60:25 85:11 | considerations |
| 45:1 52:6 83:13 | 52:5,17,18 53:2,6 | complained 52:7 | concerned 84:16 | 38:4 152:17 |
| 83:18 114:10 | 53:7,13,20 54:4,5 | complaining 107:1 | 123:15,21 | considered 27:21 |
| clear 40:13 92:8 | 54:12,13 121:16 | complains 137:3 | concerns 30:21 | 39:21 122:20 |
| 105:19 118:9,18 | 122:13,16,18 | complaint 22:12 | 31:24,25 32:18 | 137:17 144:23 |
| 122:3 123:4 143:2 | 127:4,24 129:23 | 35:6,7,8 45:2,21 | conclude 119:7 | 150:15 |
| 145:9 151:9 | 131:3 136:21 | 47:19 49:4 53:3,5 | 139:2 155:19,21 | considering 32:6 |
| clearly 37:10 40:7 | 147:11 150:9,13 | 53:7,14,17 54:9 | concluded 40:23 | 34:7 50:22 58:4 |
| 73:11,25 96:5 | 151:24 152:18 | 54:11,14 106:18 | 157:13 | 96:11 153:17 |
| 144:24 | 153:15 154:23 | 106:18,18 107:11 | concludes 44:16 | consistent 35:10 |
| close 56:25 58:7 | 155:8,9,12,16,19 | 107:16 108:10,13 | condition 149:1 | consolidated 78:8 |
| 79:16 83:22 157:2 | 157:1 | 109:17,20 110:15 | conditions 83:14 | construction 41:20 |
| 157:5 | communicate 36:2 | 110:15,19 121:18 | 83:16 | 46:22 |
| closed 129:11,19 | 44:8 51:4 56:16 | 122:15,17 126:7,9 | conduct 53:8 | consumer 126:16 |
| | l | | - | I |

| | | | | <u> </u> |
|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| consumers 105:7 | 90:10 93:16 94:13 | Counsel's 31:3,4,6 | 120:22 121:9 | 91:11 93:1,8 |
| consumption 35:24 | 96:25 97:1 100:22 | 50:5 51:6 114:6 | cross-examination | 94:17 97:23 |
| 37:4 38:21 61:6,6 | 102:5 110:25 | 115:1 117:5 | 24:6,10,19 25:19 | 100:11 102:11,12 |
| 73:20 79:11,12,13 | 113:15,16 114:7 | 122:20 131:14,16 | 28:14,19 29:13,17 | 102:15,17 105:3 |
| 82:5 83:3 91:6 | 114:10,19,20 | 136:19 | 54:16 56:11 67:3 | 105:10 118:13 |
| 101:25 102:25 | 115:2,3,7,8,12,13 | counters 146:1 | 89:13 98:22 | 119:19 124:24 |
| 103:21 107:9 | 115:15,16,20,21 | County 144:5 | 112:22 119:7 | 127:6,8 134:22 |
| 141:22 | 115:25 116:1,10 | 158:4 | 120:24 125:16 | 142:14 145:22 |
| contacted 53:2 | 116:15,25 117:6,7 | couple 24:15 28:4 | 126:3 141:5,11 | 146:12,16 149:3 |
| 107:2 | 117:11,12 118:3,4 | 61:19 62:14 76:17 | cross-examine 28:3 | 149:12 150:23,25 |
| contend 29:16 62:4 | 118:6,7,10,19 | 90:7 99:15 131:12 | 142:21 | 151:2 152:23 |
| contention 50:6 | 123:17 148:16,22 | 147:10 150:18 | crossing 32:11 | 153:1,4,10,12,13 |
| contesting 147:12 | corrected 47:13 | course 59:1 109:1 | crucial 25:3 | 153:21 154:13,17 |
| context 32:6 51:15 | 134:9 137:4,10,12 | 152:20 | culpability 155:10 | 154:19,20 |
| 123:8 | 137:19,23 138:4,7 | court 32:9 33:5 | cumulative 37:20 | customers' 107:5 |
| continue 25:13 | 147:9,10 152:2 | 75:7 158:6 | 38:7,18 77:10,18 | cycle 87:13,16,19 |
| 116:11 139:9 | correction 138:4 | courtesy 92:25 | 78:15,18 80:24 | cycles 87:14 |
| continued 47:1 | corrections 53:12 | 94:17 | 86:2 87:10 88:1 | |
| 70:5 148:11 | 53:22 100:21 | cover 26:8 | current 90:9 143:8 | D |
| 151:25 | 135:12 136:10 | COVID 95:4,8 99:2 | customer 31:12 | D 21:5 64:24,25 |
| continues 154:22 | 137:18 154:8 | 99:5,8,17,22 | 35:16,23 40:2 | daily 57:24 61:6 |
| contractor 48:6,15 | correctly 53:13 | 100:2,3,4,14,15 | 44:9 45:2 46:13 | 63:20 64:14 76:9 |
| 51:12 107:24 | 66:15 71:15 99:21 | 115:5 152:22 | 46:17 49:6,16 | 76:22,25 77:1,10 |
| 119:17,22 152:7 | 103:10 116:9 | CP 95:25 | 60:18 61:16 77:22 | 77:23 78:18 79:15 |
| contractors 108:5 | 135:16 137:21 | cracked 48:22 | 78:13 87:12 91:6 | 80:12,20,25 81:2 |
| contradicts 34:1 | 147:23,24 | create 140:17 | 96:1 101:24 | 81:2 86:2,4,8 |
| 36:8 | Cory 128:6,10,11 | 143:14 | 103:21 104:4,8,11 | 87:10,15 127:8 |
| contrary 48:3 50:5 | Cory's 128:13 | created 74:9 99:8 | 104:22 105:2 | data 28:9 36:12 |
| control 106:14 | cost 31:11 44:2 | 117:10 118:11,19 | 106:19 107:2,7,10 | 37:3,21,23,25 |
| conversation 58:10 | 99:24 121:13 | creativity 142:20 | 107:15 108:12 | 38:4,4,15,16,18 |
| 59:8 140:5 | costing 44:4 | credit 46:15 149:18 | 124:17 125:4 | 38:24 41:10 46:21 |
| conversion 146:5 | costs 43:1,4 | credited 134:8 | 126:8,8 130:25 | 49:11,12,20 57:10 |
| convert 49:11 | Counsel 19:13 | 137:5 138:11 | 134:21 137:8 | 57:14,23 58:5,11 |
| convince 30:2 | 23:16,19 30:20,21 | crediting 137:14 | 138:11 147:22 | 60:5,18,21,22 |
| Cook 128:6 | 30:24 31:14,17,25 | credits 144:5,16 | 149:16 | 61:15 62:15 63:18 |
| cooperated 151:24 | 32:4 50:24 51:7 | crisis 99:8 | customer's 50:1 | 64:5,7,12,14,17 |
| cooperative 151:21 | 52:1,4,14,21 | critical 52:10 | 52:11,25 87:20 | 67:8 70:15 71:3,5 |
| copies 28:10,15,20 | 53:16,25 54:4,8 | cross 20:4,7,10,13 | 105:13 125:7,8 | 71:6,13,18 72:3,7 |
| 29:1 132:2 | 112:19,25 120:11 | 20:14,17,20 24:14 | 146:20 | 72:22 73:3,4,14 |
| copy 33:5 114:5,25 | 121:7 122:3 123:5 | 27:21 30:24,25 | customers 35:9,14 | 74:1 75:12 76:9 |
| cords 42:14 | 123:9,11,15,17,21 | 31:1,2,14 55:5,11 | 36:3 39:22 40:18 | 76:14 77:15 78:6 |
| core 35:22 91:4 | 132:12 134:1,16 | 66:25 69:3 82:16 | 44:23,25 45:5 | 78:13,16,16 79:8 80:10 85:7,19 |
| correct 57:18 59:25 | 137:9 147:16 | 112:20 113:3,17 | 46:14 49:21 50:4 | 86:9 89:24 90:16 |
| 61:17 68:25 69:21 | 148:2,13,23 149:7 | 114:5,13,21,22,25 | 50:15 51:10,22 | 90:22 91:13,14,18 |
| 71:19 78:2 81:1,4 | 154:3,22 155:1,4 | 115:22 116:21 | 52:6,19 61:5 | 90.22 91.13,14,18 |
| 81:25 86:3 89:25 | 155:15 | 117:4 119:5,11 | 73:21 87:3,4,5,8,9 | 71.17 72.17,21,24 |
| | I | I | I | I |

| 92:25 93:1,12 | delays 99:16 | 77:20 78:15 116:7 | displayed 137:21 | E |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 94:6,12,12,15,16 | delivered 39:11 | 117:19,21 118:14 | displaying 70:5 | E 19:1,1 20:1 21:1 |
| 94:19 95:17 97:20 | demand 37:11 | developed 70:22 | disregarding 72:14 | 21:5,5 158:1,1 |
| 102:1,3 103:23 | 38:12 39:19,21,22 | 71:16 | 140:18 | E-M-M-A 117:14 |
| 109:16 111:19,24 | 39:23 40:2,3 | difference 36:23 | dissipate 50:21 | e-mail 25:17 133:8 |
| 114:6 115:1,4 | 67:16,18,21 68:7 | 56:14,20 57:7 | distinction 102:14 | e-mailed 26:16 |
| 117:5 127:20 | 68:9 71:25 87:2,6 | 61:18,21 62:23 | divide 126:17 | 62:14 |
| 128:8,12 140:12 | demonstrate 49:14 | 65:12 87:19,25 | division 126:11 | EA-37 70:19 |
| 140:13,15 141:7 | demonstrated 54:3 | 88:5 93:5 | divisions 126:10 | EACCH 111:6 |
| 141:20 142:3 | denies 35:7 | differences 60:6 | docket 18:4 22:7 | EACCH-1T 26:2 |
| 146:5,10,14 | department 73:19 | 61:2 63:2 | 26:21 31:5 54:11 | EACCH-2.1 71:21 |
| data-related 72:10 | 91:1 107:3,11 | different 40:3 | 54:13 122:14 | EACCH-30 39:7 |
| date 18:24 28:5 | 117:17 | 44:25 49:2 75:4 | 131:15 150:14 | 67:10 |
| 87:16 114:9 132:1 | depend 32:19 | 78:7 87:14 90:10 | document 31:1,2 | EACCH-37 70:20 |
| 135:15 141:9 | depending 32:16 | 93:11 94:8 96:25 | 68:11 70:2,6 72:4 | 141:9 |
| dates 78:15 95:8 | 117:16 | 103:5 104:11,18 | 73:5 103:2,24 | EACCH-479:5 |
| day 34:9 39:25 | depends 104:10,11 | 105:3 106:6 | 131:21 133:15 | 111:12 |
| 87:13,17 100:9,12 | deploying 119:22 | 109:23 121:11 | 135:25 136:6 | EACCH-41 60:22 |
| 111:22 143:7 | deployment 114:11 | 123:20 124:19 | documentation | 127:18 |
| 158:12 | 119:20,23 120:4 | 127:10 134:22 | 28:24 34:16,17 | EACCH-42 29:22 |
| days 62:15 77:11 | 123:12 124:21 | 142:10 150:15 | 58:3 73:23 90:15 | 30:10 33:1 |
| 77:13 100:16,17 | describe 33:24 | direct 26:2 27:22 | 129:12,16,17 | EACCH-7 35:3 |
| 132:10 157:2 | described 108:24 | 34:23 48:5 | documents 31:18 | 75:6 92:9 |
| deadline 29:14,20 | describes 34:17 | disagree 30:18 | doing 81:14 94:2,2 | EACCH-9C 82:10 |
| 29:23,25 136:10 | 39:7 67:13 75:15 | 136:19 137:8 | 121:1 | earlier 24:8 87:1 |
| deadlines 30:8 | 117:24 118:2 | disconnect 57:1 | door 43:24 48:10 | 100:22 115:17 |
| December 47:18 | describing 35:20 | 64:4 74:11 90:25 | 48:11 144:13 | 121:15 155:23 |
| 48:8 76:24 | 59:3 67:6 90:5 | 127:12 | double-check | early 47:20 48:10 |
| decide 29:6 130:13 | description 68:7 | disconnected 64:4 | 26:15 | easier 140:1 |
| 142:16 155:10 | 71:24 | 96:1 154:10 | doubt 82:1 | easy 143:20 144:25 |
| decided 140:17 | deserve 52:19 | disconnection | download 57:1 | editing 80:10 81:16 |
| 143:14 | 155:7 | 154:15 | 58:13 64:11,12 | 81:16 101:2 |
| decision 157:2,4,6 | deserves 106:10 | discovered 34:6 | downloaded 57:11 | 141:19 |
| 157:9 | 122:22 | 76:4 | 58:5 | educated 116:6 |
| decisions 99:10 | designed 58:11 | discovery 48:1 | drop 133:1 | effect 95:6 99:22 |
| decline 153:24,25 | 71:1 144:10 | 52:21 107:23 | dropped 25:6 | effective 99:6,12 |
| defer 75:20 95:7 | 153:21 | discrepancies 60:5 | drying 42:19,21 | effects 154:7 |
| define 75:18 | desire 33:11 | 63:3 75:23 77:5 | drywall 42:14 | efficient 43:25 |
| definite 104:18 | detail 108:15 | discrepancy 76:3,7 | drywallers 42:16 | 144:9,11 149:2,4 |
| definitely 38:1 | detailed 53:17 | discrete 73:13 75:3 | due 42:11 83:14 | eight 79:23 111:17 |
| degrees 48:17 | 126:23 | 140:14 | 99:17 100:8 143:8 | either 28:6,21 |
| 108:5 | details 53:20 | discussed 32:23 | 145:2 151:12 | 34:12 46:17 58:6 |
| delay 100:7 138:7 | 107:14 | discussing 95:1 | duly 54:25 56:6 | 59:21 63:5 67:20 |
| 148:1 | determination | discussions 48:6,7 | 66:21 89:8 98:17 | 74:8 125:6 130:24 |
| delayed 53:9 137:5 | 73:11,12 | display 39:9 64:10 | 120:17 125:23 | 137:1 142:1,2 |
| 138:6,9 | determine 35:15 | 67:13 68:11,15 | duties 100:4 | 153:17 |
| | I | I | I | I |

| | | | | 5 |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| electric 36:1 91:8 | 102:24 103:21 | 147:8 149:9,10,19 | exceptional 30:2 | 127:23 140:10 |
| 100:11 105:6 | 106:20 107:7 | 149:22 152:14 | excerpt 31:3 | 143:3 |
| 107:9 115:16 | 115:4,10 142:14 | 153:7 154:7 | excerpted 31:23 | exist 141:12 |
| 148:15 153:12,13 | 144:5,9,16,17,18 | estimates 100:22 | exchange 71:5,12 | existed 45:13 |
| electrical 41:20 | 144:25 145:11,23 | 117:20 | 71:18 73:3 129:17 | expect 24:20 83:13 |
| 42:24 43:1 48:9 | 146:3,18 148:21 | estimating 50:14 | exchanging 72:22 | expected 47:23 |
| 49:17 107:22 | 150:25 151:1 | 53:10,21 81:16 | exclude 105:4 | experience 52:25 |
| 108:2,8 | 153:11,15 154:9 | 118:22 155:6 | excluded 31:15 | experienced 46:1 |
| electrically 42:4 | 154:11 | estimation 78:4 | excuse 24:25 29:24 | 53:1 54:2 145:2 |
| electricity 35:24 | Energy's 114:6 | 79:10,17,18 80:9 | 35:17 64:1,19 | experiences 124:17 |
| 42:10,10 91:6 | 115:1 117:5 | 81:17 95:24 101:2 | 105:16 108:18 | experiencing |
| 107:25 135:12 | engaged 52:21 | 111:20,22 112:5 | 127:16 | 124:24 125:4,6 |
| 149:23 150:23 | engineer 49:17 | 141:19 | excused 66:5 88:13 | expert 67:19 83:12 |
| electronic 83:19 | enhanced 117:9,13 | estimations 78:22 | excuses 44:13 | 94:14 96:17 |
| element 35:22 91:4 | enrolled 47:6 | 79:2,14 111:16 | exhibit 25:18,23 | expertise 41:10,11 |
| elements 48:21 | ensure 26:20 | et 58:14 59:24 85:7 | 26:5,10 29:16 | 43:12 67:7,23 |
| Elena 18:2 19:19 | 145:22 | 130:23 140:9 | 30:24,25 31:1,2 | experts 43:22 |
| 22:8,15 41:9 44:7 | entire 44:5 106:14 | eventually 46:23 | 31:15 33:5 35:3 | explain 30:5 56:13 |
| 54:25 | environment 33:21 | 47:8 145:22 | 36:13 39:7 41:8 | 59:10 60:6 61:1 |
| Elena's 43:11 | equipped 64:3 | 151:15 152:8 | 41:14,22 57:6 | 76:7 77:4 87:11 |
| Elum 22:16,22 23:1 | ERP 72:1 75:11 | evidence 23:24 | 59:12 60:10,22 | 116:2 117:13 |
| 45:2 52:6 83:13 | 91:22 92:19 93:15 | 25:14 31:7 32:15 | 61:24 62:13,15 | 130:18 148:25 |
| 83:18 114:10 | 105:22 142:10,16 | 32:16 34:1 45:6 | 63:9,17 67:10 | explained 49:13 |
| embedded 141:22 | erred 138:10 | 50:11 93:21 | 69:3,3,6 70:19,20 | 146:7 |
| EMMA 117:14,15 | error 95:22,24 96:5 | 106:10 108:21 | 71:21 75:4 76:14 | explaining 64:2 |
| 117:18,24 118:2,8 | 135:15 | 142:19 146:19 | 79:5 82:10 89:18 | 99:16 |
| employee 96:3,13 | errors 47:13 96:11 | 153:6,8 | 92:9,20 94:24 | explains 49:17 |
| employer 95:16 | 96:13,16,17,19,25 | evidentiary 18:9 | 95:13 96:21 | 145:24 |
| employment 123:8 | 109:23 110:22 | 22:7 | 101:22 102:7 | explanation 48:2 |
| 123:9 | 147:9 | exact 28:5 95:8 | 103:19 108:3,4 | 111:20 154:25 |
| enable 149:1 | escalated 130:6 | 109:23 | 111:6,10 113:4,17 | explore 122:21 |
| enables 93:3 94:7 | especially 43:15 | exactly 130:9 | 113:19,25 114:5 | export 57:13 |
| encourage 54:6 | essential 115:15 | examination 20:2 | 114:14,22,22,25 | expressed 96:21 |
| 75:2 | essentially 49:6 | 65:9 86:24 97:17 | 115:14,22 116:21 | extended 151:5 |
| ended 99:13 | 93:20 109:3 | 119:14 124:12 | 117:4,23 118:1 | extending 30:3 |
| energy 18:6 19:4 | established 93:24 | 139:2 | 121:9 128:1,1 | extends 49:10 |
| 22:10,16 23:6 | establishing 136:10 | examined 56:6 | 141:8 154:6 | extension 42:14 |
| 39:10 40:8,9 | estimate 24:17 | 66:21 89:8 98:17 | exhibits 21:3 25:16 | extremely 43:16 |
| 41:19 43:25 44:22 | 49:23 135:4 | 120:17 125:23 | 25:19,20,21,21 | 106:20 144:21 |
| 44:23 45:23 46:13 | estimated 46:8,14 | example 56:24 85:4 | 26:25 27:2,6 28:1 | eyes 44:15 |
| 46:18,22,25 47:15 | 46:15,20 47:4,12 | 128:21 129:20 | 28:2,7,8 29:12 | F |
| 48:17,25 49:2,6,8 | 50:18 107:4 | 140:20 144:12 | 30:10,22 31:16 | |
| 49:15,18 56:17 | 110:21 111:25 | 146:7 | 32:12,22,25 33:3 | F 158:1 |
| 57:22 65:17,18 | 116:16 135:5 | exceeded 41:25 | 37:7,9 41:1 53:18 | face 50:15 51:7 |
| 73:19,22 82:5 | 137:16,16,20,22 | Excel 103:24 128:3 | 60:14 62:1 73:24 | faced 50:4 145:2 |
| 85:21 91:1 101:24 | 138:5 146:10,10 | excellent 142:5 | 113:7 114:1 119:5 | fact 42:2,11,25 |
| | l | | | |

| 48:24 91:13 | field 148:19,19 | 139:22 147:6 | 96:8 101:6,8 | 154:4,6 156:12 |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 105:25 142:9 | fieldwork 114:18 | firsthand 32:13 | 110:3 | Gafney 20:18 |
| factor 151:20,22 | Fifth 19:15 | five 55:4 88:22 | four 25:21 38:25 | 124:13 |
| 152:1 | fighting 48:18 | 126:14 139:12 | 39:1 60:22 61:7 | gallons 144:10 |
| factors 100:2 | figure 78:3 116:12 | five-minute 88:18 | 61:13 62:16 76:15 | gap 146:8 |
| 104:11,19 128:25 | file 126:12 127:17 | 89:3 | 103:5 104:25 | gaps 81:15 |
| 150:10,15,18 | 127:22 128:3 | flexible 90:12 94:7 | 138:4 | garage 48:10,11 |
| 153:2 | 129:14 | flies 51:6 | Fourth 19:6 | gas 105:5 |
| facts 34:12,16 45:3 | filed 25:21 30:4 | flows 140:18 | frame 77:8 95:5 | general 19:10,14 |
| 51:16 93:20 | 53:5 108:10,12 | FOCUS 39:8 67:12 | 128:18 | 23:11,18 28:16,25 |
| 108:21 127:18 | 126:19 127:1 | 68:1 | free 102:16 103:13 | 31:4 38:16 39:7 |
| failed 93:25 | 128:21 132:1,5 | focused 85:17,18 | frequently 152:15 | 40:5 50:2 60:18 |
| failure 53:8,23,23 | files 129:15 | follow 34:18,22 | fresh 130:7 | 81:7 85:4 87:4 |
| 95:16 123:15,18 | filling 81:14 | 51:18 53:19 92:6 | front 24:1 44:21 | 90:5 102:12,15,17 |
| 123:21,25 124:16 | filters 80:15 | 93:14 99:11,20 | froze 156:18 | 102:21 112:5,25 |
| 124:17 125:4,6 | final 31:8 144:3 | 129:9 139:5 | frozen 133:13 | 123:7 124:20 |
| fair 84:8 139:14 | 152:17 | 142:16,18 | 156:13 | 140:6 143:19 |
| fairly 57:21 | finally 49:25 | followed 68:21 | full 149:23 | 153:9 |
| familiar 60:14,16 | 152:25 | 69:7 89:21 | full-time 41:24 | generally 50:4 |
| 84:19 101:9,11 | financial 145:2 | following 24:7 | functional 46:6 | generated 118:3 |
| 108:3 127:23 | find 28:20 51:21 | 119:11 132:2 | functionality 35:13 | genuinely 143:12 |
| 133:20,22 | 58:2 63:24 79:25 | 138:20 139:6 | 75:16,19,21 | getting 47:1 100:9 |
| families 52:23 | 80:2 82:23 83:1,1 | 144:23 | 118:14 122:6 | 100:14 106:5 |
| family 54:3 143:18 | 107:9,12 113:6 | follows 50:14 55:1 | functioning 125:2 | 127:20 |
| fans 42:18 | 131:25 137:7 | 56:7 66:22 89:9 | functions 35:23 | give 30:6 41:3 |
| far 33:24 41:12 | 148:1 153:24 | 98:18 120:18 | 91:5 | 55:19 58:25 63:13 |
| 85:3 100:7 109:15 | finding 147:17 | 125:24 | funds 150:16 | 63:24 73:16 95:11 |
| fashion 42:8 125:1 | fine 29:7 55:9 | force 143:14 | furnace 42:11 | 106:9 122:22 |
| fathom 42:9 | 62:12 113:2 | foregoing 158:8 | 108:7,8 | 131:24 133:7 |
| faucets 144:9 | 131:19 | formal 35:6 49:4 | furnish 149:1 | 136:12 143:24 |
| favor 131:4 | fines 32:4 45:16 | 53:5,17 127:1,16 | further 65:21 | given 51:16,16,17 |
| feature 40:4 | 50:22 51:21 150:1 | 129:24 130:6 | 70:15 88:10 | 111:20 149:17 |
| features 127:7 | 151:23 153:2 | formalities 92:6 | 100:18 157:3,11 | giving 23:21 43:7 |
| 140:8 | finish 128:20 | formally 138:24 | future 46:10 54:6 | 46:5 |
| February 30:1 | finished 41:19 | format 103:24 | 152:3 | glitched 124:9 |
| 76:24 132:5 | 42:24 | formula 79:10,11 | | go 25:12 34:10 35:5 |
| feed 89:5 98:13 | first 22:13 24:9 | 111:20 | G | 38:8,8 47:7 51:12 |
| 125:18 | 27:4 33:12 34:6 | formulas 141:22 | G 21:5 | 63:16 64:9 65:3 |
| feedback 73:22 | 34:22,25 44:10 | Fortunately 42:19 | Gafken 19:14 | 73:10 77:21 81:23 |
| 128:9 | 54:18,25 56:6 | forward 41:23 | 20:14 21:10,14 | 87:14,21 88:21,22 |
| feeds 89:24 | 66:21 67:9 68:21 | found 43:2 109:18 | 23:17,18 30:23 | 89:17 90:13 97:7 |
| feel 30:19 85:23 | 79:13 89:8 98:17 | 131:4 142:21 | 52:2,4 112:21,23 | 98:7 107:8 113:4 |
| 101:17 102:16 | 98:24 99:2 101:11 | 147:11 148:3 | 112:24 119:4 | 118:12 122:9,12 |
| | 100 10 107 0 | 152:18 155:8 | 121:8 122:8,10,13 | 124:7 128:25 |
| 103:13 | 106:18 107:2 | | | |
| | 106:18 107:2 117:9 120:3,17 125:23 126:6 | foundation 49:4 70:8 74:21 84:18 | 124:5,7,8 125:10 132:11,14 133:10 | 133:16 137:13 140:4 141:18 |

| | | | | 0 |
|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 145:21 150:18 | 74:25 92:3 93:19 | 109:15 | heard 70:13 | 124:11 |
| 152:7 156:3 | 102:13 109:5 | Halsen 20:12 49:25 | hearing 22:7 24:21 | home 26:13 42:23 |
| goes 32:16 36:16 | granted 139:13 | 80:7 94:22 95:7 | 24:24 25:2,15 | 43:17,25 44:12 |
| 38:18 40:16 49:7 | grasping 102:14 | 97:10 98:4,12,14 | 30:1 32:20,21 | 104:12 107:8,22 |
| 49:20,25 56:19 | great 22:23 23:20 | 98:17,24 101:10 | 33:4 66:6 88:13 | 108:1,2 115:11,19 |
| 90:18,19,19 101:4 | 26:19 30:8 31:20 | 101:20,22 102:22 | 98:6 133:14 | 144:4,8 |
| 117:16,16 121:25 | 54:21 55:3,18 | 106:17 109:8 | 139:20 143:23 | homeowners 22:12 |
| 146:5 | 56:9 66:17 69:22 | 111:23 113:2,3 | 156:8 157:6,13 | 27:3 |
| going 26:22 27:3 | 86:7 87:7 97:24 | 119:8,16 145:21 | 158:9 | homes 45:1 52:23 |
| 29:7,21 30:10,20 | 113:3 120:14 | 151:10 | HEARING-VOL | 83:13 144:20,21 |
| 32:9 36:18 37:15 | 139:13 | hand 49:16 54:22 | 18:9 | honest 41:23 |
| 39:18 40:21 41:11 | Groesbeck 18:3 | 66:18 89:6 98:15 | heat 41:25 42:15 | 136:24 |
| 52:24 57:25 58:16 | 19:20 21:8,12 | 120:15 125:21 | 104:14 105:6 | honestly 43:2 52:15 |
| 58:25 59:8 60:13 | 22:9,25,25 23:1 | 158:11 | 108:2 144:12,22 | Honor 23:10 27:9 |
| 63:8 67:9 69:1 | 27:15 43:10 52:23 | handing 72:3 | heater 105:6,7 | 27:12,15,19 29:10 |
| 72:12 74:18,20 | 54:2 143:25 144:3 | 113:25 | heaters 42:12 | 30:14,23 31:22 |
| 75:4 79:17 80:14 | 154:9 | handled 130:10 | 83:19 108:8 | 33:14 41:6 44:19 |
| 80:21 84:5 85:23 | Groesbecks 22:24 | hands 132:17 | heating 43:18 48:9 | 55:2,6,16 56:8 |
| 87:21 90:14 91:23 | 27:14,16 43:7 | handy 131:22 | 48:16,17 83:8,21 | 58:16 60:3 61:22 |
| 93:18 96:7 99:10 | 45:19,24,25 46:20 | 132:12 | 105:6 144:15 | 65:7,22 66:7,23 |
| 101:5,8 102:9 | 47:3,6,11 50:19 | happen 51:9,18 | heavily 41:9 43:11 | 69:1,15,24 74:13 |
| 110:2,5,5 112:8 | 113:12 143:23 | 83:10 96:14 | 44:7 | 74:18 82:12 84:5 |
| 114:21 116:9 | 147:9,10,12 153:5 | 132:11 152:14,24 | Heidi 18:3 22:9 | 86:16 88:10,17 |
| 121:8,9 122:11 | Groesbecks' 79:8 | happened 79:6 | 43:13 | 89:10 91:23 93:17 |
| 123:3 129:22 | 111:15 115:6 | 108:23 151:11 | held 130:25 | 96:7 97:14 98:19 |
| 130:9 132:8 | 117:10 118:9 | 152:10 | Hello 89:15 98:24 | 101:6 102:9 |
| 135:10 139:20 | grounds 74:20 | happening 38:19 | help 42:19 107:9 | 105:16 110:3 |
| 141:2,3 143:5 | 129:22 | 38:23 39:4 40:14 | 126:12 143:1,3 | 112:17 119:13 |
| 148:10,11,11 | group 38:5,5 52:25 | 113:23 140:16 | helpful 131:21 | 120:23 121:20,23 |
| 149:19 152:11 | guess 65:2 94:20 | 148:17 151:18 | 132:15 | 123:1 125:11 |
| 157:4 | 142:25 | 152:11 | helps 56:23 132:6 | 129:21 131:9 |
| good 22:4,14 23:17 | guides 43:25 | happens 46:7 96:22 | hereunto 158:11 | 132:18 138:21 |
| 52:2 53:24 55:20 | guys 73:8 74:9 | happy 139:8 | hesitant 82:19 | 139:12,23 145:8 |
| 55:21 65:24 67:5 | 129:17 | hard 129:5 | Hi 55:22 | 155:25 156:18 |
| 81:13,20,21,22,24 | | hardship 145:2 | high 43:16 44:14 | hope 24:4 32:9 |
| 89:15,16 98:25 | H | harmful 150:19 | 46:14 47:20 48:3 | 40:18 142:7 143:2 |
| 99:1 112:24 121:1 | H 21:1 | he'll 55:17 | 106:20 125:6 | 157:6 |
| 126:5 140:20 | habits 104:13,14 | headphones 124:10 | 126:23 137:25 | hoped 52:15 |
| 147:19 148:1 | Hagan 20:3 49:17 | health 143:18 | 144:19 147:21 | hopefully 124:10 |
| 154:24 155:6 | 55:15,16 56:2,3,6 | Healthy 115:11,20 | 154:8 | 139:4 |
| Google 57:6 | 56:13 58:23 60:6 | hear 23:25 25:25 | higher 47:23 83:14 | horse 88:15 |
| Gotcha 131:5 | 60:10,14 61:1 | 27:11,14 52:1 | 143:7 144:20 | hospital 156:2 |
| Governor 115:11 | 63:1 65:11 66:4 | 105:18 120:12 | highlight 148:3 | hot 104:15,16 |
| governor's 99:6,9 | 68:3 84:23 85:4 | 121:4 125:18 | 150:4 152:19 | 144:11 |
| grab 94:24 | 145:19,24 151:9 | 133:13 155:23 | historical 46:21 | hour 38:6 39:1 |
| grant 29:21 58:21 | Hagan's 85:16 | 156:20 | hold 30:8 95:14 | 56:22 104:3,4 |
| | | | | |

| | | | | <u> </u> |
|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 105:8 | 74:24 82:15,19 | 109:15 145:19,24 | 81:3 | initially 45:25 |
| hours 24:18 37:12 | 84:7,11,16 85:14 | identified 53:6,13 | including 25:19 | 46:21 148:18,18 |
| 37:19,20 38:9,15 | 86:14,18,21 88:11 | 53:16,19 54:3 | 35:23 60:23 81:3 | input 52:19 |
| 38:21 39:11,25 | 88:19,21 89:1,11 | 95:25 115:15 | 91:5 114:18 128:4 | inside 104:12 |
| 40:1,7,8 41:15 | 92:3,11 93:19 | 122:18 155:3,14 | incomplete 143:8 | 107:22 108:2,5 |
| 47:21,22 49:12,15 | 97:12 98:1,10,20 | identifies 148:13 | inconsequential | Inslee's 115:11 |
| 49:18,22 56:18 | 101:7 102:13 | identify 149:7 | 154:21 | install 51:11 152:4 |
| 61:10,13,19 62:20 | 103:9,17 106:2,4 | ignore 51:1 | incorrect 45:11 | 152:12 |
| 62:24,25 65:20 | 106:13 108:22 | II 18:9 | 49:3,14 148:6 | installations 114:9 |
| 80:3,22,24 82:7 | 109:1 110:4 | illogical 41:18 43:1 | incorrectly 45:5 | installed 42:12 |
| 82:25 83:4,6,9 | 111:10,13 112:15 | imagine 55:11 | 53:9 | 48:14 99:19,23 |
| 84:1 87:24 88:8 | 112:19 119:10 | immediate 151:4 | increase 82:24 | 119:25 120:3 |
| 93:6,9 95:20 | 120:8,14,20 | impact 149:15 | indicate 82:16 | 140:21 151:15 |
| 96:24 102:6,25 | 121:19,21 122:7,9 | 154:16 | indicated 24:14 | 152:6,14,16 |
| 103:6,22 104:5,24 | 122:12,19 124:2,6 | impacted 149:17 | 33:8 55:4 66:25 | installing 119:17 |
| 104:25 105:2,15 | 125:12,20 126:1 | impacts 152:3 | 112:20 120:22 | 120:1,2 |
| 107:19 111:2,22 | 130:3,13 131:8,12 | implement 143:6 | 125:15 133:21 | installment 151:3 |
| 143:7 145:11,25 | 131:19 132:4,7,22 | implementation | individual 50:10 | instances 147:8 |
| 146:4,22 | 133:7,10,12,17,20 | 143:8 | 104:13 124:17 | instruct 54:13 |
| hours' 61:20 | 133:24 134:11,16 | implemented 71:7 | 154:20 | insulation 144:11 |
| house 41:18,19 | 134:23 135:1,7,19 | implements 140:7 | industries 129:3 | integrity 59:23 |
| 42:9,17 43:23 | 135:22 136:2,8,14 | implies 131:3 | industry 115:16 | 60:18 61:15 85:7 |
| 48:8,12,16,20 | 136:18,23 138:13 | importance 129:2 | informal 45:2 50:2 | Intelligent 34:2 |
| 83:11 108:6 | 138:16,22 139:1 | important 46:12 | 50:19 51:19 53:3 | intelligible 32:9 |
| 143:11 | 139:14,18 143:21 | 50:22 154:19 | 53:7,14 106:18 | intend 26:5 27:25 |
| household 82:6 | 144:1 145:5 154:2 | 157:9 | 107:11,15 108:13 | 27:25 28:1 |
| 83:3 154:9,10 | 155:20 156:4,12 | importantly 150:22 | 109:17,20 110:14 | intending 62:9,13 |
| households 154:18 | 156:16,22 | impose 50:22 | 110:15,19 126:7 | intent 142:25 |
| housekeeping | Hoyt 20:19 23:14 | 153:25 155:11 | 126:19 127:2,3,16 | 151:11 |
| 25:12 | 24:12,15 125:15 | imposed 32:5,7 | 127:16 128:2,19 | intentional 151:8 |
| houses 102:6 | 125:16,17,23 | 150:1 | 128:21,24 129:1 | interfaces 71:9,10 |
| Howard 22:3,5,18 | 126:5 130:17 | imposing 54:8 | 129:11,15,18 | 73:1 |
| 22:23 23:3,8,15 | 131:11,14 132:24 | 150:7 | 130:9,18,23 | interrupted 150:24 |
| 23:20 26:19 27:10 | 133:4 135:24 | imposition 45:16 | 147:18,25 149:11 | interruption 149:5 |
| 27:13,17,23 29:5 | 138:22 150:5 | 150:11,16 151:23 | 151:25 | interval 36:11 37:3 |
| 29:8,21 30:16 | 154:24 | 153:2 | information 26:15 | 38:5,15 39:23 |
| 31:20 32:8 33:4 | huge 63:3 77:5 | impractical 104:5 | 35:8 46:3 57:20 | 58:12,13 59:24 |
| 40:20,25 43:6 | humidity 42:20 | improper 106:7 | 77:11 80:6 81:5 | 60:5,23 61:8 |
| 44:17 51:25 54:15 | hundred 61:19 | improperly 49:11 | 81:13,19 82:8,13 | 64:17 71:1,23 |
| 55:3,9,14,18,20 | hurt 111:7 | in-house 71:9,10 | 92:19 128:1,3 | 72:3,10 73:4,6,25 |
| 55:25 56:2,9 | HVAC 48:9 | 72:25 73:2 | 129:25 146:5,8,11 | 75:14,24 76:5,9 |
| 58:20,25 60:9,12 | hybrid 137:11 | inaccurate 41:13 | informative 130:10 | 76:15 77:1,12 |
| 62:7,12 63:10 | | 45:4 | infrastructure 35:1 | 78:6 80:13 85:7 |
| 65:5,23 66:8,12 | $\frac{\mathbf{I}}{\mathbf{I} + 20 + 240 + 17}$ | include 105:4 | 35:4 52:8,11 | 87:8 90:22 91:14 |
| 66:17,24 69:8,18 | Ian 20:3 49:17 | 144:8 | initial 86:1 92:8 | 92:19,21,23,24,25 |
| 69:22 70:4,10 | 55:14 56:6 68:3 | included 25:18 | 147:21 151:6 | 94:12,16,19 97:20 |
| | | | | l |

| | | - | - | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 141:17 142:3 | 130:5 145:3 148:6 | 27:10,13,17,23 | justifying 44:14,15 | KM-1CT 36:13 |
| 146:11,14,14 | 148:14,24 150:21 | 29:5,8,21 30:16 | | 69:6,19 89:18 |
| interval-data 93:12 | 153:7,8,17,22 | 31:20 32:8 33:4 | K | 95:13 96:21 |
| interval-related | 155:9 157:1 | 40:20,25 43:6 | keep 24:24 25:4 | knew 108:10 |
| 72:7 74:1 75:12 | issued 31:8 135:11 | 44:17 51:25 54:15 | 42:16 77:22 | 127:19 |
| 90:16 91:13,18 | 137:3 151:4 | 55:3,9,14,18,20 | 104:14 121:4 | know 23:13 33:20 |
| 93:12 94:5 | issues 25:5,8 28:7 | 55:25 56:2,9 | 129:6 | 34:4,8 37:12 41:2 |
| intervals 35:12,25 | 31:9,10 32:1 34:5 | 58:20,25 60:9,12 | keeps 142:3 | 56:24 60:8 61:5,5 |
| 39:1 61:3 62:19 | 45:13 46:1 47:10 | 62:7,12 63:10 | kept 40:14 | 61:23 69:16 73:15 |
| 73:20 77:5,14 | 50:3,9,14,21 | 65:5,23 66:8,12 | key 45:22 48:24 | 78:1 81:12,15,22 |
| 91:19 94:13,13 | 51:14,17 52:7,16 | 66:17,24 69:8,18 | 51:22 56:20 | 81:24 85:3,15 |
| 140:14 | 52:18 53:1 54:1 | 69:22 70:4,10 | 145:25 146:13 | 91:12 92:5 98:7 |
| introduction 92:12 | 84:4,19 107:16 | 74:24 82:15,19 | 147:17 149:2,14 | 104:23 108:16 |
| invent 142:12 | 118:15 121:11,12 | 84:7,11,16 85:14 | 150:20 152:5 | 111:6 113:8 126:6 |
| investigate 106:25 | 121:13,16 124:24 | 86:14,18,21 88:11 | kilowatt 37:12,12 | 127:25,25 129:6 |
| 126:10,15 129:9 | 124:25 126:17 | 88:19,21 89:1,11 | 37:14,19,20 38:9 | 140:24 145:14,14 |
| investigated 109:25 | 133:13 151:18 | 92:3,11 93:19 | 38:13,15,15,21 | 145:18 148:7 |
| investigating | 152:3 153:9 | 97:12 98:1,10,20 | 39:11,11 40:1,7,8 | 157:1 |
| 126:20 127:3 | 155:11,12 156:14 | 101:7 102:13 | 41:15 47:21,22 | knowing 34:2 |
| 128:23 137:24 | issuing 136:9 | 103:9,17 106:2,4 | 49:12,15,18,22 | 43:24,24 83:7 |
| investigation 84:3 | 147:19 | 106:13 108:22 | 56:18,22 61:9,13 | knowledge 32:13 |
| 106:22 110:24 | | 109:1 110:4 | 61:19,20 62:17,18 | 126:21 127:4,5 |
| 116:3 126:12 | J | 111:10,13 112:15 | 62:18,20,24,24 | 142:22 158:9 |
| 127:15,22 128:5 | January 48:10 72:4 | 112:19 119:10 | 65:20 80:3,22,24 | knowledgeable |
| 129:1 150:6 | job 43:14 143:18 | 120:8,14,20 | 82:7,25 83:4,6,9 | 101:17 |
| investigations | Johnson 18:3,11 | 121:19,21 122:7,9 | 84:1 87:24 88:8 | known 38:12 39:19 |
| 115:24 | 19:3,19 21:7 22:9 | 122:10,12,19 | 93:6,9 95:20 | 51:7 |
| investigator 126:14 | 22:21,21 27:12 | 124:2,6 125:12,20 | 96:24 102:6,25 | Kristina 20:9 49:19 |
| 128:7 136:17 | 41:5,8 52:22 54:2 | 126:1 130:3,13 | 103:6,22 104:3,4 | 59:21 63:6 75:20 |
| 137:1 | 69:24 82:12,15,18 | 131:8,12,19 132:4 | 104:5,24,25 105:2 | 80:7 88:15 89:4,8 |
| invoice 41:22 | 82:21 143:22 | 132:7,22 133:7,10 | 105:8,14 107:19 | 112:2 145:20 |
| involve 31:12 54:10 | 155:22 | 133:12,17,20,24 | 111:2,21 145:11 | |
| involved 31:11 | Johnsons 22:20 | 134:11,16,23 | 145:24 146:4,22 | L |
| 34:18 44:25 53:8 | 27:11 41:3 43:11 | 135:1,7,19,22 | kilowatts 40:9,10 | L+G 36:20 59:9 |
| 106:21 | 45:19 47:16,17 | 136:2,8,14,18,23 | 49:8 101:25 | 68:19 70:17 74:8 |
| irregularities 54:1 | 48:6 106:19,25 | 138:13,16,22 | kind 33:21 34:23 | 141:6 142:11 |
| irrelevant 121:17 | 107:2,15,24 108:7 | 139:1,14,18 | 41:11,18 75:6 | labeled 26:2 |
| IS-U-EDM 141:25 | 109:20 147:15 | 143:21 144:1 | 100:2 102:4 | laid 129:24 |
| IS-USAP 90:19 | Johnsons' 48:3,24 | 145:5 154:2 | 128:19 129:16 | Landis+Gyr 70:21 |
| isolated 50:4,15 | 95:19 96:14 | 155:20 156:4,12 | 130:5 137:10,19 | 71:4,8,18 77:7 |
| 51:17 150:21 | 108:15 109:9 | 156:16,22 | 138:10 | laptop 82:11 |
| issue 25:3,24 26:4 | 147:18 | July 31:9 99:18 | KITSAP 158:4 | large 48:20 61:18 |
| 26:22 31:11 32:2 | joining 125:17 | 113:13 135:11 | Kitselman 18:25 | 76:18 100:10 |
| 32:18 45:9 50:25 | judge 18:11 19:2 | 140:21 | 158:6,16 | 154:13 |
| 51:20 77:7 84:18 | 22:3,6,18,23 23:3 | June 114:10 140:21 | Kittitas 144:5 | large-scale 123:12 |
| 85:16 122:16,22 | 23:8,15,20 26:19 | justice 143:4 | KM 95:13 | 124:21 |
| | l | | | l |

| | | | | 1 490 110 |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| largely 32:22 | 68:21 69:5,6,7,12 | 78:10 79:9 80:18 | 22:1,4 25:22 28:6 | 74:3 89:24 90:7 |
| larger 45:20 50:25 | 73:7 89:18,21 | 82:13 89:22 | 30:4 41:15 42:2 | 110:7,8 141:4,6 |
| 150:21 153:22 | 133:1 | 109:24 111:24 | 48:14 99:7,12 | mean 63:19 85:15 |
| largest 72:1 105:7 | linked 95:17 | 115:22 118:17 | 117:10 141:10 | 86:4 96:19 102:3 |
| lasted 100:8 | Lisa 19:14 23:18 | 127:8 132:18 | 158:12 | 104:3 105:13 |
| laundry 104:15 | 112:24 | 136:6 | mark 26:5 | 107:17 116:5 |
| law 18:11 19:2 22:6 | Lisa.gafken@atg | looks 41:16 59:22 | mash-up 137:20 | 130:20 131:2 |
| lawyer 105:17 | 19:17 | 67:15 89:23 | mass 119:23 120:4 | meaning 38:4 |
| leak 144:14 | list 25:18,23 33:5 | 132:19 133:12 | match 91:15 112:8 | 39:24 40:17 59:23 |
| leaning 41:9 | litigation 31:10 | losing 48:18,18 | match 91:15 112:0 math 112:7 | 64:14,14 100:3 |
| learned 34:11 58:2 | little 33:16 57:19 | lot 32:12 37:6,9 | matter 38:16 42:3 | 104:20 118:22 |
| learning 34:7,10 | 60:15 69:11 84:16 | 44:13 92:6 100:12 | 75:2 125:5 142:9 | 127:11 141:1 |
| 143:16 | 85:1,24 90:24 | 128:25 142:24 | 144:4 155:17 | 143:6 |
| leeway 30:6 | 121:2 123:20 | lots 94:8 | matters 25:12 | means 24:8 37:20 |
| lessen 151:6 | 126:6 127:19 | low 46:15,21 64:21 | maximum 144:11 | 116:2,4 |
| let's 22:3,11 25:15 | 154:12 | 124:10 125:6 | McClenahan 20:9 | measure 36:24 |
| 28:20 58:15 66:1 | live 22:16 42:19,21 | 124:10 125:0 | 36:13 49:19 59:21 | 40:9,16 49:8,9,15 |
| 66:1,2,12 76:12 | 104:12 142:10 | low-profile 64:12 | 63:6 65:4 67:25 | 49:18 109:13 |
| 88:21 89:1 98:7,7 | lived 83:7,20 | luckily 121:2 | 68:18 69:17,19 | measurement |
| 98:10 130:24 | lives 145:4 | lump 86:2 | 75:20,25 76:8 | 73:14 88:6 104:3 |
| 133:17 134:13 | living 43:17 83:11 | lunch 24:16 98:5,7 | 79:1 88:16 89:4,8 | measurements |
| 139:15,18 147:6 | LLP 19:5 | 98:11 | 89:15 94:22 97:19 | 36:22 37:2,11 |
| 149:25 150:18 | load 57:1,12,23 | 70.11 | 99:16 101:19 | 38:17 |
| letter 26:8 | 63:18,19 64:16,21 | M | 112:9 145:20 | measures 40:10,15 |
| letting 156:25 | 64:22,23 132:9 | M 20:1 | 151:10,16 | 123:24 145:24 |
| level 42:17 126:23 | logic 41:12 | main 22:15 83:8,21 | McClenahan's | 146:3 |
| 126:24 130:7 | logical 42:22 | maintain 53:24 | 112:2,11 | measuring 35:23 |
| levels 35:25 91:7 | logically 42:4 | 148:25 | MDMS 36:19,19 | 35:25 46:25 65:17 |
| leveraging 122:4 | long 74:17 99:25 | major 75:11 | 37:24 49:10 56:19 | 65:18 91:5,7 |
| liability 155:10 | 109:8,10,16 | majority 30:9 | 60:2,23 61:2 | meet 50:7 53:23 |
| life 143:19 | longer 53:11,21 | 91:25 | 67:23 68:8,13 | meeting 33:19 |
| lifestyle 144:17 | 143:10 | making 70:2 | 70:17 71:1,7,18 | 105:23 144:16 |
| light 106:11 | look 37:5,14,18 | malfunctioning | 72:23 76:10,15 | 156:1,3 |
| lights 143:11 | 38:10,12 39:13 | 114:19 | 77:8 79:3 80:13 | members 35:10 |
| limit 58:22 129:7,7 | 40:5 61:7,11 | management 36:19 | 80:14,20,23 81:5 | memorized 114:2 |
| limited 24:3 57:22 | 68:10 80:1,15,16 | 49:20 67:8 71:6 | 85:7 86:2,8 88:1 | mention 25:7 |
| 57:22 100:4 139:4 | 80:23 109:24 | 99:9 117:9,14 | 93:4 96:16,17,23 | 104:22 141:3,8 |
| 144:8 | 114:15 115:9 | 127:20 128:12 | 97:5 109:25 | mentioned 33:1 |
| line 58:17 62:3 63:5 | 116:6 122:17 | mandatory 80:10 | 110:10,11,14,24 | 67:15 72:9 87:1 |
| 74:19 81:13 84:6 | 127:19 130:7,22 | 81:8 101:3 | 111:1 140:22 | 89:23 90:7 95:4 |
| 91:24 108:19,19 | 133:22 135:9 | manner 157:7,10 | 146:6,6,9 | 102:8 143:5 |
| 135:9,10,10 | 136:12 140:22 | manual 125:1 | MDS 110:8 | message 117:9,13 |
| 142:15 | 146:19 151:16 | manually 57:12 | MDUS 36:18,18,20 | met 45:8 144:5 |
| lines 113:5,11 | 152:13 | 58:5,6 64:4 | 59:11 68:23,25 | meter 31:24 32:2 |
| 114:15 135:20,22 | looking 34:5 61:16 | 117:17 | 70:14,18 71:2,3,8 | 34:25 35:16,22 |
| link 36:14,15 68:20 | 76:25 77:2,10 | March 18:13,24 | 72:16,22 73:18 | 37:5,8,8,9,9,16,16 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | J |
|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 39:13 45:25 46:2 | 50:21 51:2,3,4,11 | 139:5,12 | 102:5 | 138:12 150:7,8 |
| 46:3,5,11,19,25 | 52:9,10 53:2,24 | mirror 74:5 | months 43:20 47:7 | need 26:18 28:17 |
| 47:8,9,13,17,23 | 56:14,15,16,22,23 | miscalculation | 79:20,23,25 80:1 | 28:20 30:19 38:3 |
| 47:24,24 48:25 | 57:7,8 58:8 59:13 | 42:8 | 80:2 99:25 100:9 | 57:13 59:2,3 71:9 |
| 49:15,20 50:12,16 | 63:17,24 64:3,6,8 | missed 77:12 | 100:9,12 111:18 | 73:2 95:7 113:6 |
| 52:7,8 53:8 56:17 | 65:12,14,17,18 | missing 77:15 | 135:15 137:5,13 | 118:25 146:4 |
| 56:25 57:10,16,16 | 67:12 77:9 81:11 | misspeak 128:14 | 138:1,3,4,5,9 | 157:1 |
| 58:7 59:24 60:1,5 | 82:2 85:17 90:16 | misstating 102:10 | 146:22 151:6 | needed 29:18 49:24 |
| 60:23 61:2,11 | 91:4,8,18 92:18 | mistaken 101:21 | 152:21 | 117:21 118:18 |
| 62:16,24 63:20,21 | 94:11,14 99:19 | mistakes 147:13 | morning 22:4,14 | 119:3 144:5 |
| 64:8,12,12 67:8 | 100:20 104:2 | Mm-hmm 80:14 | 23:17 52:2 55:21 | needs 58:5 129:5 |
| 67:14,19 68:1,2,4 | 114:19 115:6,25 | model 68:1 70:14 | 67:5 89:15,16,16 | 146:23 148:25 |
| 68:11,15 71:3,6 | 116:17,18 117:22 | 141:5 | move 32:15 125:14 | negatively 149:17 |
| 71:24 75:15,24 | 118:12 119:1,3,17 | module 36:20 | 144:7 | neighborhood 45:1 |
| 76:5,15,19,22,22 | 119:18,18,23,24 | 38:18 40:16 59:11 | moving 41:23 | 51:13 152:9,9 |
| 77:5 78:6,7,17 | 121:7 122:5 123:6 | 59:15 67:23 68:25 | multibillion 142:7 | neither 80:19 |
| 80:19,20 81:19 | 123:12,13 124:22 | 70:14 74:2,16 | multifaceted 85:15 | nervous 33:16 |
| 82:1 86:9 88:3 | 124:25 125:3 | 75:12 89:24 90:6 | multiple 47:4,7,12 | network 45:14 46:2 |
| 91:2,14 92:18 | 140:6,12,13 148:5 | 90:9,17,19 94:6 | 50:18 60:17 70:16 | 46:2,6 47:2,9,14 |
| 94:12 95:17,17,25 | 148:6,7,15,21 | 141:4,12,14,15,21 | 109:22 142:19 | 50:12,13,16 51:5 |
| 96:4,4,23 97:5 | 150:24 151:14,15 | 141:24 | 149:9,22 | 51:8,14 56:17,18 |
| 99:23 100:5,6,19 | 152:6,13,16,23 | modules 36:11 | multiplied 100:12 | 56:20,21 57:21,24 |
| 107:6,16 108:1 | 153:8,20 155:6 | 37:22 39:3 72:2 | multiply 104:24 | 58:3 65:13,15,16 |
| 109:9,10,10,18,21 | metric 37:11 39:10 | 91:18 141:5,23 | muted 24:24 | 77:7 116:7,18 |
| 113:12 115:19 | metrics 39:8 | 142:2 | mystery 52:15 | 118:23 123:15 |
| 116:4,6,12,13,16 | Michael 22:5 | moment 29:24 | | 134:5 145:17 |
| 118:9,14,15,18,21 | microphones 24:24 | 55:25 69:8,11 | N | 148:7 151:13,14 |
| 118:21,25 120:1,2 | midafternoon | 75:5 79:5 113:6 | N 19:1 20:1,1 21:5 | 153:5 156:11 |
| 120:3 122:6 125:1 | 24:22 | 113:20 117:1 | name 22:5,14 23:17 | never 33:15 |
| 125:4 127:5,12,13 | midmorning 24:16 | 124:11 131:25 | 66:15 112:24 | Nevertheless |
| 127:13 134:4 | 66:2,13 | 133:7 134:25 | 131:17 | 149:14 |
| 137:23 140:15,21 | million 100:11 | 136:12 | Nash 19:9 23:11 | new 28:10,11,23 |
| 140:23,25 141:6 | 154:18 | monitoring 35:25 | 129:22 | 45:1 46:22 51:2,4 |
| 141:16 145:15,24 | millions 154:18 | 91:7 | nash.callaghan@ | 52:23 54:11 144:4 |
| 146:3,6 147:20,23 | mind 25:4 67:6 | month 35:17,19,19 | 19:12 | 153:3,18,25 |
| 147:24 148:8,9,10 | mindful 32:14 | 41:16 43:18 44:3 | nature 51:17 57:2 | nine 152:18 |
| 148:18 149:9,16 | mine 112:3 132:25 | 47:21 79:13,19 | navigate 86:23 | noncommunicati |
| 149:21,24 151:13 | 132:25 | 82:7,25 83:7,10 | NCR 63:17,20,24 | 63:20 64:3,6,8 |
| 152:4,13 | minimal 92:12 | 87:14 88:4 95:21 | 63:24 | 115:25 116:4 |
| metering 35:4 54:1 | minus 77:19 88:4 | 101:25 103:22 | near 45:1 | 140:20,25 |
| 70:21,23 | minute 23:23 | 105:2,11,15 134:8 | nearly 148:16,22 | noncommunicati |
| meters 31:13 35:9 | 144:10 | 137:6 138:11 | 154:10 | 116:3 |
| 35:10,11,11 36:1 | minutes 24:3,18 | 146:16,17,21 | necessarily 106:6,7 | noncritical 114:18 |
| 36:5,6,6 37:2,25 | 33:10 34:20 38:6 | month's 79:11,12 | necessary 24:22 | nonfunctioning |
| 39:8 40:7,13,15 | 40:22 55:4 88:23 | monthly 35:14,17 | 45:12,17 64:13 | 114:19 |
| 49:8,18 50:10,20 | 91:7 98:4 125:16 | 49:21 61:6 93:3,8 | 111:1 122:1 | noon 98:4 |
| | | | | |

| normal 129:14 | 24:1 27:1,5,9,12 | 82:18 84:10,15,21 | 155:18 | P 19:1,1 21:5 |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| normally 30:16 | 27:15,19,20 29:17 | 86:1,11 90:13 | oppose 123:13 | p.m 98:8 139:16,16 |
| 98:6 | 30:12,15,21 31:17 | 92:14,16 94:4,11 | opposed 121:7 | 157:13 |
| Northeast 19:6 | 32:21 70:7 74:25 | 94:22 95:10 99:14 | 123:5,11 | P.O 19:10 |
| notate 59:17 | obligation 145:13 | 101:21 103:16 | opposite 50:12 | page 20:2 21:2 |
| note 53:14 58:1 | 153:11 | 104:20 106:12,15 | opt 151:3 | 35:21 36:14,17 |
| 62:2 75:7 79:24 | obligations 54:7 | 109:6 110:11,14 | option 63:18 64:11 | 63:8,22 64:1 |
| 111:11 147:15 | observe 25:6 | 111:4,6 112:12 | 142:1 | 68:21 69:6,19 |
| noted 24:13 27:20 | obsolete 119:2 | 113:10 114:13,17 | optional 140:8 | 80:17 95:13,15 |
| 50:19 155:1 | obtain 78:13 | 114:21,24,25 | options 39:9,16,17 | 96:21 101:22 |
| notes 41:14 120:21 | 116:18 117:21 | 115:9,22 116:8,20 | 67:13,16 68:6,11 | 103:19 113:5,18 |
| notice 68:22,22 | 118:12 | 117:3 118:16 | 90:10 94:8 | 114:15 115:14,22 |
| 69:14 | obtained 35:16 | 119:4,24 120:6 | Oracle 28:24,25 | 117:23 118:1,16 |
| noticed 84:11 | 118:21 | 123:14 127:15 | 29:3 36:9,25 | 132:11,20,23 |
| notification 118:19 | obtaining 125:1 | 128:10,16 130:12 | 37:22 71:23 91:17 | 133:16,17,18 |
| November 123:10 | obviously 42:8 | 130:15 131:5 | 142:11 | 135:2,9,18,19,21 |
| number 35:23 | 142:13 | 132:6 133:19 | oral 24:20 139:4,20 | 135:22,25 154:7 |
| 38:21 55:23 63:23 | occupancy 144:7 | 134:15,25 135:7 | order 24:7 31:8 | pages 18:10 29:1 |
| 80:1 88:3,4,6 91:5 | occupation 41:23 | 136:5,7 138:13,16 | 34:23 36:17 42:16 | 95:1 |
| 96:11 104:18 | occur 50:5,18 | 156:4,4,22 | 53:24 54:12,18 | paid 41:22 154:12 |
| 111:10 117:20 | occurred 48:3 | old 22:16,22 23:1 | 68:22 116:15 | paragraph 35:7 |
| 122:2 129:2 | 130:1,8,14 135:15 | 81:2 | 117:15 129:1 | parenthesis 40:8 |
| 152:18 153:1 | 147:2 149:10 | older 50:15 | 134:15 139:6 | part 25:9 28:3,24 |
| numbers 26:14 | 152:20 | Olympia 19:11 | 144:6,7,18 148:5 | 33:6 35:8 44:13 |
| 61:16 80:4,8 | odometer 88:2 | on/off 36:1 91:8 | 155:6 | 53:15 67:24 82:23 |
| 104:21 135:25 | 146:18 | once 46:10 96:22 | orders 118:11 | 109:15 110:14 |
| 136:1 | offer 32:15 107:5 | 97:4 137:16 | original 35:5 | 111:2 112:2,10 |
| numerous 154:8 | 127:8 155:22 | one-way 36:5 56:15 | 103:12 106:19 | 140:9 144:24 |
| | offered 47:5 107:6 | 56:16 58:4 | 137:21 | 149:11 150:21 |
| $\frac{0}{0}$ | 151:2 | ones 71:16 145:1 | outlets 107:22 | 153:21 |
| O 20:1 21:5 | offers 143:12 | open 28:25 36:15 | outlines 150:14 | partial 77:12 |
| object 30:24 58:17 | office 126:16 | 56:25 131:20 | output 36:18 90:6 | participation |
| 69:1,4 70:2,8 | official 25:9 69:13 | 133:16 153:18,25 | outset 47:18 | 156:25 |
| 74:18,20,22 84:5 | oh 55:25 56:1 62:10 | opened 42:18 | outside 31:7 104:13 | particular 29:2 |
| 91:23 92:1 93:18 | 64:22 90:3 111:5 | 132:23 150:12 | overbilled 137:12 | 35:15 38:2,3,18 |
| 96:7 102:9 105:17 | 113:2 124:4 | opening 21:6,7,8,9 | 137:14 | 39:25 40:10 52:13 |
| 108:19 110:2 | 131:10,19 | 21:10 24:3,19 | overestimated | 70:14 73:18 76:4 |
| 129:22 | okay 26:19 29:5,8 | 33:8,9,13,17 41:4 | 100:23 | 76:23 77:24 79:19 |
| objection 29:19,22 | 34:11,11 55:9,18 | 43:7,9 44:20 52:3 | overnight 51:9 | 106:22 111:21 |
| 31:6 58:21 61:23 | 56:4 58:19,24 | 150:17 151:23 | overtime 144:15 | 126:10,11,22 |
| 62:3 69:25 70:5 | 59:5,17,22 63:7,7 | 153:3 | overview 23:21 | 135:8 136:20 |
| 92:4 93:17,20 | 63:16 64:18 65:2 | opinion 34:13 | 34:25 35:3 59:9 | 140:23 |
| 101:5,8 102:14 109:5 113:24 | 65:5 66:17 67:9 | 133:25 134:20 | 72:9 92:21 | particularities 50:1 |
| 109:5 113:24 121:8,15 122:20 | 68:14,16 70:20 | 136:11,20 138:15 | owns 147:13 | particularly 47:20 |
| objections 23:24,25 | 75:9,22 76:6,12 | opportunity 24:2 | P | parties 24:2,8,17 |
| 00jections 25.24,25 | 78:23 79:4 80:9 | 33:9 52:20 82:16 | | 24:23 25:17,25 |
| | I | I | I | I |

| Page | 173 |
|------|-----|
| | |

| | 111 0 104 17 | 105 00 100 10 | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 26:23 27:6 30:6 | 111:3 134:17 | 125:20 130:18 | preface 59:2 | problem 50:9 74:9 |
| 31:10 32:20,22 | periodic 93:2,7 | 144:1 | prefiled 21:3 25:16 | 78:8 151:16 |
| 82:15 139:3,6,21 | periods 135:6 | plus 39:11 60:23 | 25:18 26:25 27:2 | 156:10 |
| 156:9,24 157:1,11 | Perkins 19:5 | 126:15 | 27:21 32:24 33:3 | problems 45:13 |
| parties' 24:1 32:21 | permanent 47:17 | plywood 48:12 | 90:25 | 134:5 |
| party 23:13 24:13 | 48:7 108:1,11 | point 29:18 34:10 | premier 70:21 | procedure 46:7 |
| 30:7,17 33:9 52:5 | 109:21 | 42:7,22 43:16 | prepare 33:21 | proceed 24:11 55:5 |
| 52:5 127:24 | person 61:14 63:4 | 82:2 83:17 84:17 | present 19:18 | 56:3,10 67:2 |
| 138:24 139:10 | 106:13 126:20 | 85:2 92:8 122:2 | 52:17,20 60:4 | 69:23 89:12 94:20 |
| pattern 53:19 | personally 60:14 | 129:21 145:25 | 73:16 76:3 82:10 | 98:21 112:20 |
| pay 46:17 47:7 | perspective 38:16 | 146:13 148:13,17 | 102:8 | 122:25 126:2 |
| 143:13,14 | 83:9 125:7,8 | 149:3,14 152:5 | presentation 24:7 | 144:1 155:16 |
| paying 153:14 | pertaining 103:4 | point-in-time 77:18 | 54:18 106:1 | proceeding 31:8 |
| payment 47:6 | 134:24 140:23 | 78:19 87:11 | presented 103:2 | 147:5 150:11,17 |
| 143:11 151:5 | 155:5 | pointing 146:9 | 107:23 140:10 | 151:23 153:3,18 |
| payments 154:14 | phonetic 128:6 | points 41:10 61:22 | presenting 79:5 | 153:25 156:25 |
| pays 46:13 | phrase 35:21 | 109:3 121:23 | 105:20,21 | proceedings 52:5 |
| PC 72:15 | 103:11 | 146:1 | pressing 157:8 | process 34:17 |
| PDF 29:1 135:25 | phrasing 103:12 | pole 41:21,21 | pretty 121:3,4 | 36:11,11,22 37:23 |
| 136:6 | physical 148:9 | poles 42:13 | 122:3 | 42:19 46:12 50:13 |
| peak 143:7 | picture 33:10 | policy 150:14 | prevent 151:18 | 53:3,5,7 59:18 |
| penalize 122:14 | pictures 38:13 | portions 25:1 | prevented 115:5 | 72:11 78:5 79:3 |
| penalizing 54:5 | ping 56:25 | pose 75:2 92:13 | previous 50:13 | 80:10 81:7,9,12 |
| penalties 32:4,7 | place 95:9 134:1 | 93:22 102:16 | 79:11,12,13,19,20 | 81:24 84:2 86:5 |
| 54:9 122:4 134:6 | 151:17 | 103:13 | 79:25,25 80:1 | 90:6,18 94:15 |
| 137:10 138:14 | plan 47:6 82:16 | posing 58:22 | 111:17 | 101:2 112:5 |
| 147:3,5 150:3,8 | 151:3 | position 29:11,11 | previously 118:20 | 119:23 126:23 |
| 150:11 153:17,25 | planning 28:18 | 32:5 52:14 138:18 | price 74:16 94:5 | 140:17,20 141:2 |
| 155:11 | plans 23:22 25:11 | positive 100:15 | 105:8 143:7 | 141:19 142:23 |
| pending 157:7 | 144:6 | possible 34:21 60:7 | pricing 71:23 72:8 | 145:21 |
| people 100:14,16 | plastic 48:13 | 104:17 144:18 | 74:16 75:15,17,18 | processed 85:19 |
| 115:19 116:11,12 | platform 36:21 | possibly 79:15 80:4 | 87:7,8 90:14,21 | 93:13 95:5 100:21 |
| percent 83:18 | 59:12 68:19 73:18 | post-hearing 31:3 | 90:23 94:9 97:22 | processes 59:13 |
| 123:19 | 141:6 142:11 | 123:10 | primarily 43:18 | 73:13 80:12 85:19 |
| perception 34:14 | platforms 34:18 | potential 32:7 | 46:1 64:9 81:14 | 89:25 93:2,7 |
| Perfect 86:11 97:15 | 74:8 | 50:23 155:11 | 85:17 151:12 | 143:15 |
| 117:4 | plausible 48:2 | potentially 89:24 | primary 145:12 | processing 36:2 |
| perfectly 139:14 | please 25:6 54:22 | 122:4 125:2 | printed 72:4 114:2 | 70:15 71:1 72:2 |
| performance | 56:13 59:10 66:18 | power 40:9 41:21 | prior 28:6 77:19 | 91:10,10 |
| 117:19 | 88:18 89:6 95:11 | 41:21 42:13 48:8 | 87:18,18 88:4 | proclamation 99:6 |
| performed 109:8 | 98:14 102:16 | 108:9,11 127:14 | pro 30:6 | 99:10,11,12 100:8 |
| period 35:17 47:20 | 113:6,17,20 | practical 148:16,22 | probable 155:12,13 | 115:12,20 |
| 52:24 53:12,22 | 114:13,22 115:23 | practically 104:6 | 155:16 | produced 43:3 |
| 61:8 73:12 76:4 | 116:21 117:1 | preceding 84:9,12 | probably 26:11 | profile 38:4,4 57:1 |
| 76:23 77:2,9 95:6 | 120:15 121:21 | 84:14 | 34:22,24 98:5 | 57:10,12,14,23 |
| 99:3 110:17,18 | 122:25 124:7 | predated 123:8 | 133:2 | 63:18 64:14,16 |
| , | 122.23 124.7 | predated 125.8 | 155.2 | 05.10 04.14,10 |

| | | | | . «ge |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 80:10 94:12 | 55:4,7 57:9,16,17 | 120:10 121:6 | qualified 138:7 | 119:4,12 131:6,10 |
| profiles 72:7,10 | 58:11,13 59:9,10 | 122:3,20 123:5,9 | quantity 36:24 | 131:13 138:17,20 |
| 74:1 | 62:1 63:3,19 | 123:11,14,17,21 | 40:18,18 73:10,12 | 146:25 |
| program 120:5 | 67:17,21 68:5,12 | 130:22 131:14,16 | quarantined | quick 58:1 59:18 |
| project 33:19 | 68:24 70:25 71:7 | 132:12 133:25 | 100:16 | 82:13 89:20 94:23 |
| promptly 152:2 | 71:16 72:13 74:4 | 134:16 136:19 | question 26:17 | 94:25 97:8 122:5 |
| proof 45:9 50:8 | 74:7 75:11,13 | 137:9 147:16 | 27:24 28:14,18 | 129:10 152:11 |
| propane 83:8,20,20 | 78:3,12 79:8 81:8 | 148:2,13,23 149:7 | 51:22 57:5 58:15 | quicker 133:2 |
| 105:5 | 84:4 87:7 89:23 | 150:20,22 154:3 | 58:18 59:2,4,7,18 | quickly 122:11 |
| proper 59:14 63:4 | 90:8,20,22 91:20 | 154:22 155:1,3,15 | 62:6,22 63:1 65:3 | 134:7 |
| 84:2 140:19 | 92:23,25 93:2,14 | Puget 18:6 19:4 | 67:9 68:16 70:9 | quite 74:6 |
| properly 48:21 | 93:25 94:4,8 96:3 | 22:10,15 23:6 | 70:12,25 71:20 | quote 149:1,2 |
| 49:14 91:15 | 97:1,20,22 101:23 | 44:22 114:5,25 | 72:6,12,16,17 | · · · |
| 142:13 148:6,8 | 102:11 103:20 | 115:4,10,23 | 74:23 75:8,11,23 | R |
| proposed 30:25 | 104:2 105:22 | 116:11 117:4 | 75:25 76:2,6 77:4 | R 19:1 21:5 158:1 |
| protection 126:16 | 111:19 114:17 | 122:17 144:25 | 78:22,25 79:17 | raise 54:22 66:18 |
| protocol 100:4 | 115:18 117:8 | 153:11 | 82:14 83:5 84:9 | 89:6 98:14 120:15 |
| protocols 95:4,8 | 119:17,20,24 | Puget's 154:18 | 84:14 85:20 86:1 | 121:8 125:20 |
| 99:3,5,17,22 | 120:21 127:22 | pull 28:15 41:2 | 86:3,13 90:20 | 156:5,17 |
| 115:5 | 128:5 129:12,20 | 61:12 | 91:20 92:2,12,13 | raised 27:24 31:10 |
| proven 51:1 145:12 | 134:17 135:11 | pump 144:12 | 92:16,23 93:10,14 | 32:2 155:23 |
| provide 24:3 33:5 | 137:3,22 138:10 | purchase 72:24 | 93:23,24 94:21,23 | raising 113:23 |
| 35:23 91:5 109:16 | 140:16,17,25 | 73:2 | 95:11,19 96:2 | 146:2 |
| 127:13 | 141:13 142:3,7,12 | purpose 35:10 | 97:2,8,9,11 99:2 | range 76:19 |
| provided 35:8,21 | 142:16,22 143:5,9 | 137:18 | 101:1,12,15 102:1 | ranging 47:21 |
| 36:9,9,14 51:10 | 143:12 145:6,21 | purposes 49:12 | 102:16 103:12,13 | rate 31:4,9,11 |
| 69:6 73:7 89:18 | 146:13,15 147:7 | 52:12 65:18 90:23 | 104:17 106:17,21 | 35:18,19 82:24 |
| 104:21 107:15 | 147:12,20,21 | 94:19 | 107:17 108:23 | 121:10,12 123:7 |
| 109:17 126:21 | 148:8,25 149:10 | pursue 149:12 | 110:6 112:4,9,13 | 124:20 125:6 |
| 127:18 129:12 | 149:18 151:15,17 | 155:11 | 123:20 124:14 | rates 35:1 73:22 |
| 142:18 154:24 | 151:24 152:4,5,10 | pushes 141:20,20 | 126:6 127:25 | 105:9 121:12 |
| provides 39:8 | 152:19,22 153:19 | put 28:8 39:15 | 128:4,18 129:10 | 123:16,18,22,25 |
| 92:25 146:12 | 153:23 154:12 | 43:21 70:20 92:16 | 129:25 130:17 | 124:16,17 |
| providing 23:14 | PSE's 28:21 29:11 | 100:19 105:25 | 136:15 147:6 | ratings 154:9 |
| PSE 23:4 27:18,24 | 29:22 49:5,8 51:7 | 137:6 140:1 | 149:25 | raw 37:21 38:24 |
| 28:10 30:12,25 | 54:7 55:14 66:14 | 148:18,19 154:14 | questioning 62:4 | RCW 54:9,10 |
| 31:21 32:11,14,15 | 67:8 107:12 121:7 | puts 100:17 | 63:5 74:19 84:6 | read 26:12 34:24 |
| 34:13,15 35:6,7,8 | 123:6,18 | putting 81:17 | 91:24 108:19 | 35:16 36:25 40:7 |
| 36:8 37:12 38:9 | public 19:13 23:16 | | 115:18 | 46:11,18 49:19,24 |
| 38:23 39:21 42:7 | 23:19 30:20,21,24 | $\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\mathbf{Q}^{2}}$ | questions 24:15 | 56:18 62:16 64:9 |
| 42:25 43:3 44:8 | 31:3,4,6,14,17,25 | Q2 114:12 | 25:11 32:17,19 | 68:10 76:22,22 |
| 45:4,10,12 46:7 | 32:3 50:5,24 51:6 | quadruples 101:24 | 44:10 55:7,23 | 77:19,19 78:6,19 |
| 46:12,23 47:5,8 | 51:7 52:1,4,14,21 | 103:20 | 58:23 65:8 68:2 | 80:19,20 87:11,15 |
| 47:11,23 48:19 | 53:16,25 54:4,8 | quadrupling 49:6 | 75:3 84:12,22,23 | 87:15,17,18,23 |
| 49:13,14 51:10 | 112:19,25 114:6 | 102:24 104:3 | 84:25 85:2,6,8,10 | 88:1 91:2,3,3,19 |
| 52:7,7,16 54:1,5 | 115:1 117:5 | 105:12 | 85:13 86:17 97:15 | 93:4,4,5 94:11,14 |
| | | I | | I |

| | | | | 5 |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 95:18 96:23 108:4 | 94:9,9 97:22 | 36:3 | refers 115:11 | 153:19 |
| 108:16 110:16,17 | realized 152:10 | reconcile 46:10 | refile 26:7 | remember 28:5 |
| 133:23 135:16 | really 26:13 28:11 | 77:16 78:9,12 | reflecting 42:3 | 100:13 107:14 |
| 137:23 139:25 | 28:20,23 34:6,14 | reconciliation | reflection 33:20,23 | 128:10 131:10 |
| 140:13,24,25 | 58:2,9 65:7 77:24 | 46:12 | refuses 142:12 | remind 24:23 |
| 141:17 146:16,17 | 81:24 89:20 94:25 | reconnect 127:12 | regards 59:15 | 40:21 |
| 146:20,24,24 | 97:8 102:20 | record 22:3 25:10 | register 57:22 | remote 45:1 57:1 |
| 148:9,10,12 | 104:17,23 105:8 | 25:13 26:3 31:19 | 141:17 | 64:3 127:12 |
| 149:19 | 105:17,24 129:6 | 33:6 49:8,18 | registered 116:19 | remove 103:16 |
| readers 64:8 100:5 | 136:15 142:6 | 53:15 60:15 66:9 | registering 148:16 | repeat 45:14 76:2 |
| 116:16 145:15 | 146:25 | 66:12 88:21,22 | 148:21 | 116:22 123:3 |
| 148:8 | reason 29:23 39:21 | 89:2 98:7,10 | regulate 129:4 | 126:25 |
| reading 104:1 | 40:5 82:1 136:24 | 106:11 111:11 | regulated 126:17 | rephrase 75:9 |
| 123:10 137:17 | 137:10 138:8 | 119:6 123:4 | 155:14 | 92:17 96:10 |
| 147:23,24 | reasoning 95:2 | 139:15,19 157:2 | regulatory 54:7 | 101:16 102:19 |
| readings 35:12 | reasons 92:7 | recorded 81:19 | reject 30:10 | 107:17 130:21 |
| 36:2,16 58:13 | rebuttal 29:25 | 135:5 136:16 | rejected 33:2 | replace 47:8 51:3 |
| 76:5 80:23 85:7 | recall 107:21 | recording 150:25 | related 32:1 36:12 | 71:10 |
| 91:9,14 109:25 | 108:14 131:17 | records 26:4,16,21 | 53:20 73:25 92:21 | replaced 50:17,17 |
| 110:7,24 111:1 | recalling 103:10 | 53:14 80:25 81:10 | 93:12 114:18 | 50:20 118:18 |
| reads 46:2,5,23 | receive 37:25 46:15 | 130:22 | relates 87:12 | 119:19,22 122:5 |
| 47:1,14 52:11 | 46:23 56:22 81:5 | recovery 31:11 | relating 31:12 | 153:6 |
| 56:22 57:2,22,24 | 86:8,10 95:18 | 121:13 124:21 | 155:2 | replacement 115:6 |
| 59:24 60:5,23 | 96:23,23 97:4,5 | recreate 72:13 | relatively 92:12 | 118:10 119:1 |
| 61:11 62:24 75:24 | 153:13 | redacted 26:8 28:8 | released 138:1 | replacing 119:1,18 |
| 76:6,15,19 77:5,9 | received 37:14,19 | redirect 20:5,8,11 | 147:25 | 125:2 |
| 77:12,18 78:15 | 41:13 49:24 56:18 | 20:15,18 65:6,9 | releasing 147:22 | REPORTED 18:25 |
| 80:13,14 81:2,11 | 78:17 81:11,15 | 86:15,24 97:13,17 | relevance 31:6 | reporter 32:9 33:5 |
| 81:12,15 86:8 | 113:12 132:2 | 112:16 119:11,14 | 32:19 122:1,2,23 | 64:19,20,24 65:1 |
| 87:6,10 92:18 | 145:15 147:10 | 124:7,8,12,14 | 122:24 129:22 | 75:7 158:6 |
| 94:12 97:5 100:6 | receives 46:2,11 | 131:8 138:20 | relevant 32:5 52:24 | reporting 140:9 |
| 100:19,20 107:4,5 | 126:16 | reduce 107:9 | 73:13 130:2 | reports 78:3,4 |
| 110:14,16 115:19 | receiving 46:6 77:8 | reestimating 137:4 | reliability 31:24 | 102:4 |
| 116:12,13,18 | 77:12 93:3 144:19 | refer 59:2,15 63:5 | 32:2 51:2 | representing 55:12 |
| 118:12,21,21,23 | 149:3 150:23 | 64:16 78:19 95:12 | reliable 50:12 51:5 | 112:25 |
| 125:1 134:18 | recognize 75:1 | 96:18 114:21 | 51:8 65:14,15 | request 36:18,19 |
| 140:15,19,22 | recognizes 54:8 | 115:23 | 153:12 | 80:20 114:6 115:1 |
| 145:15,16 146:10 | recommendation | reference 28:16 | religiously 132:3 | 115:4 117:5 139:7 |
| 149:9,10,22 | 51:6,19 135:4 | 41:8 70:13,16,18 | rely 41:11 63:2 | 139:10 154:22 |
| real 34:16 38:10 | 136:16 147:4 | references 73:23 | 109:2 | requested 79:8 |
| 39:19 73:24 75:17 | 150:2,6 | referencing 37:13 | relying 43:11 44:7 | 111:19 |
| 75:18 | recommendations | 68:19 70:25 | 48:12 | requesting 148:2 |
| real-time 38:11,11 | 134:6 | referred 61:24 | remaining 31:16 | requests 25:8 28:9 |
| 39:23 71:23 72:7 | recommended | 64:17 100:21 | remarks 155:19,23 | 138:19 153:23 |
| 74:15 75:15 87:7 | 147:4 | 135:1 | remediate 45:13 | require 30:3 74:4 |
| 90:14,21,23 94:4 | recommunication | referring 73:9 92:9 | remedied 152:2 | required 72:8 74:8 |
| | Ι | l | l | Ι |

| 75:12 108:5 118:9 | 85:6 | 90:9 94:13 95:3 | <u> </u> | SBH-11X 119:5 |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 140:18 142:2 | responsive 151:21 | 97:12 98:1,5,14 | S 19:1 21:1,5 | SBH-1CT 101:23 |
| 144:13,16 146:15 | rest 65:2 66:5 | 98:20 99:17 | s 19:1 21:1,5 safe 149:1,4 | SBH-4 48:5 |
| requirement 72:21 | 88:13 | 101:23 102:23,24 | safety 150:22 | SBH-7T 113:4 |
| 72:22 73:18 75:14 | result 31:14 38:20 | 103:20 104:23 | Salety 130:22 Sains 20:6 49:19 | 114:14 |
| 97:19 | 47:3 53:4 96:13 | 108:16 111:13 | | SBH-8X 113:17 |
| requirements | 130:24 142:13 | 112:15,19 113:21 | 59:16,21 63:6 | 114:5 |
| 53:23 72:14 74:5 | resulted 154:9 | 114:4 119:10 | 65:3,25 66:14,21 67:5 69:16 75:3 | SBH-9X 114:23,25 |
| 91:21 93:15 | results 43:24 | 120:8,12,14,15 | 75:23 76:17 80:9 | 115:23 |
| 109:19 140:5,11 | resume 66:2 | 124:2 125:12,18 | 84:24,25 85:9,18 | scale 38:6 124:21 |
| 142:4,10,17,18 | 139:20 | 125:21 126:1 | 85:20 87:1 88:12 | scenario 33:22 |
| 155:15 | return 114:14 | 127:19,20 132:22 | 89:22 90:8 145:19 | 40:11 77:24 |
| research 123:18 | returning 66:13 | 133:14,15,24 | 146:7 151:10 | 111:21 |
| reserve 23:24 | 89:3 98:11 | 136:8,18 138:22 | Sains' 96:18 | schedule 51:11 |
| 32:10 | review 52:19 96:13 | 139:18 141:19 | SAP 36:10,14 | 53:9 119:20 152:5 |
| reserved 25:8 | 96:14 106:10 | 143:23 145:5 | 37:22 38:10 49:10 | 152:7 157:4 |
| reserving 33:2 | 107:10 111:1 | 148:20 155:20 | 49:20 60:2 68:13 | scheduled 113:14 |
| reshare 73:16 | 117:20 120:21 | 156:8 | 70:22,24 71:6,19 | scope 31:7 |
| 89:20 | 137:2 | risk 154:14 | 71:22 72:6,19,23 | scratch 34:7 |
| residential 53:10 | reviewed 97:1,1 | Road 22:17,22 23:1 | 73:23 74:4,5,8,16 | screen 35:2 60:19 |
| 87:5,8 97:23 | 107:3 110:24 | role 25:2 | 75:16,19,20 76:11 | 61:25 62:8 63:12 |
| 105:10 | 127:22 128:5,8 | rolling 52:8 | 80:5 90:11,15 | 67:10 75:5 76:13 |
| residents 83:18 | 131:14,16 133:21 | rollout 51:7 113:14 | 91:17 92:19 93:8 | 86:19 89:20,22 |
| resolved 51:14 | reviewing 37:2 | room 55:17 142:19 | 93:11 94:6,7,18 | 90:1 111:9 |
| 151:15 153:10 | 126:20 | 144:14 | 94:18 96:17,20,22 | screens 86:22 |
| resolving 31:9 | revised 25:22 | row 64:2 135:6 | 97:3,6 141:24 | script 124:6 |
| resources 128:4 | right 23:8 25:15 | rows 63:25 95:13 | 142:11 146:6 | scroll 133:3 |
| respect 31:16 52:13 | 26:1 27:10 29:4 | 95:15 | SAP's 93:2 | scrolling 134:7 |
| 155:1 | 29:21 30:16 31:20 | RPR 18:25 158:16 | saw 70:17 107:4 | se 30:6 |
| respectively 113:13 | 32:20 34:19 36:16 | RTP 73:5 | 137:19 138:4 | seal 48:13 158:12 |
| respects 30:7 | 36:21 37:6,8,10 | rule 53:11 95:24 | saying 36:7 40:6 | sealed 48:21 |
| respond 31:21 | 37:24 38:13 39:8 | 116:16 129:24 | 64:21 66:15 | sealing 48:11 |
| 121:21 122:11 | 39:11 40:25 41:3 | 136:10,21 138:8 | 105:24 106:13 | Seattle 19:16 |
| 129:8 130:4 | 43:6 44:17 51:25 | 154:24 157:1 | 107:21 129:19 | sec 35:2 73:16 |
| responded 117:8 | 54:15,22 55:3 | ruled 121:16 | 141:25,25 142:3 | second 43:14 59:7 |
| Respondent 18:7 | 56:9 57:9 62:8,19 | rules 38:19 79:17 | 154:20 | 63:14,24 95:11 |
| responds 115:24 | 62:23 64:15 65:23 | 79:18 111:24 | says 36:17 61:3 | 101:1 117:24 |
| response 28:9 29:9 | 66:8,18,24 69:8 | 135:4 | 70:21 77:22 79:10 | 118:2,5,8 149:25 |
| 36:8 96:22 114:6 | 69:22 70:10 71:17 | ruling 32:10 33:2 | 79:19 90:8,15 | seconds 55:19 |
| 114:9 115:1,9,17 | 73:7,9,11 76:20 | rulings 23:25 | 94:5 104:2 131:1 | 156:21 |
| 117:5,8,23 118:1 | 76:25 77:22 78:9 | run 42:15,18 48:16 | 135:11 | section 118:17 |
| 118:16 | 79:9,20,22 80:15 | 80:12 81:6 86:9 | SBH 116:22 | sector 114:11 |
| responses 37:13 | 80:16 81:23 85:2 | running 41:24 | SBH-1 103:19 | security 26:14 |
| responsibility | 85:4 86:14,18,21 | 42:13,24 45:15 | SBH-10X 116:21 | see 28:2 29:1 30:20 |
| 134:3 | 88:11 89:1,6,11 | 48:8,9 | 116:23 117:4,23 | 32:16 34:13,13 |
| responsible 59:23 | 89:16,21,23 90:6 | | 118:1 | 37:3,6 38:14 39:6 |
| | l | | l | l |

| | | | | <u>0</u> |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 39:18 60:16 61:7 | 107:3,11,15 | shown 48:2 50:8,9 | 56:1,4 62:11 | 148:15 153:4,9 |
| 61:11,25 62:8 | 107.3,11,13 | shows 37:20 39:12 | 69:24 82:11 83:1 | specifically 28:19 |
| 63:7 69:6 70:16 | 130:23 134:2 | 44:24 45:7 48:17 | 86:20 88:14 90:3 | 29:13 32:23 41:14 |
| 70:17 72:4 73:17 | 137:5 149:2,4,5 | 96:5 151:17 | 94:22 95:14 110:1 | 97:3 107:25 144:4 |
| 77:11 79:14 80:18 | 150:23 153:12,14 | sick 100:14 121:2 | 116:3,22 117:24 | specification 67:12 |
| 80:21,23 85:14 | set 45:3 48:16 | side 28:21,22 42:20 | 120:11 121:4 | specifications |
| 86:2,2 89:5,5 93:1 | 108:1 114:9 129:7 | 60:1 108:15 | 122:10 124:4,4 | 28:25 36:9,10,25 |
| 95:18,23 96:6 | 129:8 158:11 | 138:10 141:17 | 126:25 128:13 | 37:6,8,10 40:5 |
| 98:12 101:16 | setting 62:5 | 142:24 | 131:17 135:17 | 105:21 |
| 103:2 106:2,4 | settled 121:16 | sides 28:15 34:12 | 136:4,5,14 137:7 | specifics 52:24 |
| 125:17 129:14 | seven 79:23 129:3 | 78:5 | 142:22 154:25 | specify 95:6 111:23 |
| 132:14 134:12 | 138:3 | similar 22:19 32:18 | 156:16 | spend 128:23 |
| 138:3 146:19 | seventh 137:6 | 43:10 53:19 91:17 | sort 94:1 146:4 | spent 42:25 |
| seeing 63:2 76:21 | 138:11 | 127:17 144:20,21 | 149:19 | spit 87:23 |
| 83:5 90:1 129:24 | shaded 26:6 | simply 26:24 | sound 18:6 19:4 | spoke 128:7 |
| 135:17 | share 35:2 60:19 | 144:22 | 22:10,16 23:6 | spot 137:7 |
| seeks 32:15 | 62:9,13 67:10 | single 134:17 | 44:22 103:15 | spread 105:3 |
| seen 134:3 | 75:4 76:13 90:13 | single-story 44:12 | 114:5 115:1,4,10 | square 48:20 |
| seized 115:24 | 111:5,9 | site 64:9 132:11,17 | 117:4 144:25 | Stacey 20:12 49:25 |
| send 46:8,23 47:14 | shared 92:20 103:2 | situation 42:14,21 | 153:11 | 80:7,7 95:7 98:4 |
| 47:23 56:23 | Shari 20:19 | 107:18 153:20 | Sounds 55:20 | 98:12,17 145:21 |
| 116:11,16 133:5 | sharing 61:25 | situations 106:25 | source 61:17 78:7 | staff 19:8 23:9,12 |
| sending 100:5 | 63:12,13 69:2 | six 129:3 135:14 | 83:8,21 102:1,3 | 24:12,13 30:17,17 |
| 115:18 116:5 | 75:5,6 86:19 90:1 | 137:13,14 | 103:23 140:14 | 50:19 51:19 53:6 |
| 147:21 | Sheetrock 48:13 | size 144:22 | 144:22 | 53:13,20 54:4,13 |
| sense 30:3 40:19 | Sheri 23:7,14 24:12 | skill 158:10 | sources 105:22 | 97:1 122:18 |
| 42:4 43:15,21 | 125:14,23 | slightly 127:9 | 127:18 142:6,19 | 126:20 127:4,24 |
| 44:8 98:5 | shift 47:16 | 134:22 | speak 76:9,10 79:2 | 129:9 131:3 |
| sent 57:21,23 76:11 | shock 151:6 | slow 69:11 132:9 | 80:6 97:3 107:7 | 138:24 147:11 |
| 133:8 148:8 | short 33:9 34:21 | small 154:21 | speaker 142:5 | 151:24,24 152:18 |
| 152:12 | 65:8 121:3,5 | smart 35:22 36:1,6 | speaking 24:25,25 | 154:24 155:8 |
| sentence 26:6 | 139:8 143:25 | 37:2 40:6 52:9 | 25:2 124:20 | Staff's 125:14 |
| separate 41:21 | shorter 42:6 92:16 | 70:21,23 78:7 | 144:17 | 138:18 |
| 54:10 72:2,10 | shortly 43:21 | 91:4,8 140:12,13 | speaks 137:11,15 | staffing 129:2 |
| 90:17,18 122:15 | show 37:15 39:6 | social 26:13 | specialize 126:17 | stages 36:16 |
| 136:25 154:23 | 43:3 45:7,10 48:7 | software 34:19 | specific 28:14 29:2 | standard 69:14 |
| September 119:21 | 49:19,23 50:3,11 | 36:21 70:17 | 29:3 31:13 32:17 | 71:4,10,11 93:2,7 |
| serious 150:19 | 140:4 144:14 | 142:11 | 32:19 36:11 37:22 | 93:11 94:1 |
| seriously 153:12 | 146:11,21 153:19 | solution 51:3 70:22 | 39:8 40:16 50:1 | stands 29:19 71:3 |
| serve 153:12 | showed 39:12 | 70:23 152:3 | 51:16 58:6 60:10 | 141:6 Starlar 10:5 20:5 8 |
| served 59:12 | 40:13 71:24 | solve 52:15 | 68:15 74:2 75:3,7 75:12 04:1 6 | Starkey 19:5 20:5,8 |
| service 31:13 36:1 | showers 104:15 | solved 47:9 | 75:12 94:1,6 | 20:11,15,17 21:9 |
| 40:18 44:9 47:17 | showing 41:22 | somebody 133:1 | 96:16 102:12 | 21:13 23:5,5 |
| 48:19 52:7 53:23 | 62:17,18 78:4 95:23 102:1 | soom 55:17 86:23 | 103:7 107:14 111:24 129:23 | 27:19 29:8,10 30:14 31:22 44:19 |
| 91:8 100:11 102:11 106:19 | 103:23 130:19 | sorry 24:4 25:13,21 32:8 37:6 55:6 | 140:11 144:10 | 44:21 55:6,16,19 |
| 102.11 100.19 | 105.25 150.19 | 52.0 57.0 55.0 | 140.11 144.10 | 44.21 33.0,10,19 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| | | | | 1 490 110 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| 58:16 61:22 65:5 | 139:4 140:1 | 74:1 90:17 92:21 | 149:18 153:13,14 | 109:10,12 113:8 |
| 65:7,10,21 69:1 | 150:14 | 94:6 101:11 | surprised 154:13 | 129:4 134:13,14 |
| 69:10,15,20,25 | statements 24:3,20 | 122:15 | swear 24:9 54:23 | 139:8 143:10 |
| 70:4,7 74:13,18 | 24:20 28:21 33:8 | submission 29:14 | 56:2 66:19 89:6 | taken 18:24 45:12 |
| 84:5 86:15,16,25 | 79:7 80:6 139:21 | 54:4 70:3 | 98:15 120:15 | 52:14 66:10 76:14 |
| 88:9 91:23 93:17 | 155:21 | submit 27:25 57:6 | 125:21 | 88:24 98:8 106:24 |
| 96:7,9 97:14,18 | states 37:10 72:6 | submitted 28:7 | switch 57:1 64:4 | 117:21 123:24 |
| 97:24 101:5 102:9 | 73:11,25 95:24 | 29:14,20 69:3 | switched 58:12 | 139:16 148:19 |
| 108:18 110:2 | 102:11 138:8 | 157:5 | sworn 54:25 56:6 | takes 49:11 140:25 |
| 112:17 113:25 | statewide 85:21 | subsection 115:10 | 66:21 89:8 98:17 | 153:11 |
| 119:12,15 120:6 | stating 40:8 42:25 | 115:23 117:8,24 | 120:17 125:23 | talk 73:12 80:7 |
| 120:23,25 121:20 | 79:24 96:12 | 118:2 | synchronization | 132:21 |
| 121:22,23 122:21 | 101:23 | substantiate 43:3 | 71:4 141:7 | talking 59:3 61:19 |
| 122:25 123:1,2 | statistical 82:5 | substantiated 43:2 | synchronize 141:15 | 63:23 64:5 68:8,9 |
| 124:1 145:8 | status 36:1 91:8 | subtract 93:5 | synchronized | 68:12 79:22 82:24 |
| 156:14,18,21 | 130:18,20 | subtracting 35:18 | 140:16 | 84:20 95:2 102:20 |
| start 22:11 23:21 | statutory 52:4 | 146:24 | syncing 82:11 | 102:21 108:17 |
| 33:17,19 34:5,6 | Stay 115:11,11,19 | sudden 154:13 | system 36:20 37:24 | 124:23 126:23 |
| 45:24 93:4 99:4 | 115:19 | sufficient 53:25 | 48:9,16,18 49:5 | 141:4 154:17 |
| 99:18 117:25 | step 101:3 127:21 | Suite 19:15 | 49:20,23 50:16 | talks 107:24 |
| 133:17 141:13 | 142:2 | sum 77:15 78:17 | 59:8,9 61:4 67:8 | Tam 20:16 30:25 |
| 145:9 147:6 | steps 38:2 45:12 | 86:2 | 71:6,7 72:1,14,15 | 53:20 120:10,12 |
| 156:22 | 90:7 106:24 | summaries 79:7 | 72:23 75:11 76:10 | 120:17 121:1,6 |
| started 108:2 | 117:21 | summarize 140:3 | 76:11 77:21 78:9 | 123:3 124:2,15 |
| 143:16 | stipulate 26:24 | summarized | 90:12 91:22 92:20 | 125:13 131:15 |
| starting 41:24 61:9 | stop 63:11,13 86:19 | 140:15 | 93:15 94:7 118:24 | 154:6 |
| 92:8 135:10 | stopped 114:17 | summary 37:18,19 | 121:14 126:22 | Tam's 53:18 |
| starts 132:20 | 137:25 | 60:24 61:12 62:18 | 140:6,8 141:14 | 131:22 132:12 |
| 145:23 | stored 76:10 | 62:25 76:5,16 | 142:10,16 143:8 | 135:9,19 |
| state 42:20 82:5 | stores 37:24 | 77:17 132:15 | 143:17 144:15,24 | tanks 144:11 |
| 95:15 104:7,9 | story 142:8 | support 34:12 67:8 | 151:17 | tape 140:11 |
| 113:11 114:17 | stove 43:19 | 129:12 143:1 | system's 107:13 | tariff 46:9 53:10 |
| 118:17 158:3,7 | stoves 83:19 | supporting 106:1 | system-generated | team 99:8,9 117:19 |
| stated 59:23 61:14 | Street 19:6 | 107:16 129:15,16 | 117:15 | 126:14 |
| 63:17 73:15 90:25 | stress 145:3 | supports 67:14 | systemic 50:8 | technical 25:5,8 |
| 91:1 102:4,22,23 | structure 126:7 | supposed 39:1,3 | systems 44:1 70:24 | 28:7 34:16 59:1 |
| 103:20 108:7 | struggle 47:1 | 40:17 74:5 91:15 | 71:13 72:1 85:8 | 69:14 75:2 105:21 |
| 121:15 123:17 | struggling 142:14 | 129:8 | 105:22 | 127:20 |
| statement 21:6,7,8 | 143:9 | sure 46:13 60:3,7 | systemwide 124:16 | technician 47:24 |
| 21:9,10 33:9,13 | studying 143:17 | 60:13 63:2 69:2 | T | 57:11 58:7 63:19 |
| 33:17 41:4 42:6 | stumbling 117:25 | 70:2 74:7 76:2,19 | $\frac{\mathbf{I}}{\mathbf{T} 20:1 \ 21:1 \ 158:1,1}$ | technicians 152:12 |
| 43:5,8,9 44:16,20 | 136:25 | 102:3,19 111:8 | take 24:16,22 38:3 | tell 106:5,9 127:14 |
| 52:3 57:18 68:25 | subcontractors | 113:8,22 116:8,23 | 39:25 45:19 64:9 | 132:1 142:8 |
| 70:1 78:14 81:1,4 | 48:23 | 117:2 124:9 | 66:1 69:13 98:5,6 | temp 41:21 42:13 |
| 86:4 89:25 102:21 | subject 34:10 55:11 | 130:20 132:7 | 104:15,24 105:9 | temperature 42:16 |
| 103:8 104:20 | 59:1 72:10 73:21 | 133:11 147:22 | 107.13,24 103.7 | temperatures |
| | I | I | I | I |

| [| | | | r age rre |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 104:13 | 104:1,21 108:7,16 | 157:12 | 53:12,22 61:9 | totals 61:3,8 |
| temporary 108:9 | 109:2,14,15 112:3 | thanking 156:24 | 65:24 67:11,16,17 | track 77:22 |
| ten 24:3 33:10 | 112:11 113:4 | theory 45:4,11 49:3 | 67:20 68:7,9 | tracking 88:2 |
| 34:20 40:21 53:6 | 114:14 120:9 | 49:7,10,13 105:12 | 72:18 73:24 74:17 | trailer 83:8,20 |
| 53:13 55:19 | 124:3 125:13 | 105:18,19,20,24 | 75:17 77:3,8,9 | trailers 83:13 |
| 100:16,17 | 131:15,17,22 | 105:25 106:14 | 82:17 85:12 92:13 | transcript 158:8 |
| ten-minute 66:2 | 131:13,17,22 | thing 34:22 39:15 | 94:10 95:5,6 99:3 | transfer 58:11 |
| term 106:8 | 135:10,19 138:23 | 58:3 68:23 141:3 | 99:7 107:10 | 94:11 |
| terms 28:10 56:24 | 145:18,19,20,20 | 143:20 | 109:12 113:8,13 | transfers 46:3 |
| territory 48:20 | 149:13 150:4 | things 28:4 30:8 | 114:15 118:17 | transition 51:9 |
| 100:11 102:12 | 151:9,17 | 34:5 45:7 57:2 | 120:3 122:21 | 121:7 123:6 |
| 100.11 102.12 | testing 82:3 | 108:15 132:9 | 128:18,22 129:7 | transitioning |
| Teslas 44:11,12 | tests 43:24 53:9 | think 26:15 32:5,8 | 134:14 137:24 | 152:22 |
| test 47:24 96:4,4 | thank 22:18,23 | 33:23 34:15 36:25 | 139:11 143:6 | transmit 35:12 |
| 109:8,10,13,16,18 | 23:3,5,8,10,14,15 | 37:1 39:20 57:24 | 156:5 | transmits 56:17 |
| 109.8,10,13,10,18 | 23:20 26:19 27:10 | 65:24 69:15 83:9 | time-based 73:22 | transmitted 94:18 |
| tested 47:24 82:2 | 27:13,17,23 30:23 | 90:24 92:5 94:2 | timeline 129:9 | 94:18 |
| 100:15 107:6,6 | 33:14 40:20,20,25 | 97:9 99:15 101:7 | timely 53:8 115:5 | transparency 61:4 |
| 109:18 147:20 | 41:5 43:5,6 44:17 | 102:14 103:10,14 | 125:1 157:7,9 | transpired 52:22 |
| tester 109:11 | 44:19 51:24,25 | 105:19 106:6 | times 38:25 95:22 | TRANSPORTA |
| testified 56:6 66:21 | 54:14,15,21 55:3 | 108:23 109:14 | 96:3 | 18:1 |
| 89:8 98:17 115:17 | 56:9 57:3 64:18 | 110:4 111:25 | today 22:7 23:22 | treat 30:7 33:18 |
| 120:17 125:23 | 65:1,21,23 66:4,7 | 112:12,12 121:25 | 25:3,12 33:4 | tremendous 154:16 |
| 154:6 | 66:24 70:10 75:22 | 124:14 128:23 | 44:21 55:11 66:5 | tried 41:1 44:7 78:3 |
| testify 75:19 109:4 | 78:21 82:21 86:11 | 130:5 155:25,25 | 88:12 113:1 120:9 | 79:14 |
| testifying 58:18 | 86:13,14,21 88:9 | thinks 34:15,16 | 124:3 128:21 | true 121:6 123:5,14 |
| 62:5 74:19 84:6 | 88:11,20 89:11 | Thomas 18:3,11 | 138:24 139:6 | 158:9 |
| 91:24 102:18 | 90:4 94:20 95:10 | 19:3,19 22:9,21 | 143:2 154:25 | true-up 46:17,24 |
| 108:20 | 97:7,11,15,24 | thought 33:16 34:6 | 156:7 157:3,6 | 47:5,7 100:22 |
| testimonies 68:17 | 98:2,20 100:25 | 40:12 101:19 | toggling 25:4 | 137:15,20 138:5 |
| 68:20 70:13,16 | 106:15 111:4,13 | 107:18 111:7 | told 44:9 85:9 | 157:15,20 150.5 |
| 91:1 99:15 105:20 | 112:13,14,18,21 | thoughts 144:3 | 124:10 141:11 | truly 33:25 |
| 140:4 142:8 143:3 | 113:21,22 114:4 | threaten 150:22 | toll 143:18 | truth 61:17 |
| testimony 25:16,19 | 116:20 117:3 | three 22:12 25:21 | Tom 43:13 | try 34:20 75:2 76:7 |
| 26:2,25 27:2 | 119:8,9,13 120:6 | 44:25 45:7,12,18 | tool 71:4,5,17 | 76:12 92:11,16,17 |
| 29:15,18,25 31:17 | 120:8,20,23 121:3 | 45:22 52:6 86:16 | 128:2 | 151:18 |
| 31:23 32:25 34:23 | 122:19 123:1 | 86:22 134:21 | tools 57:13 58:6 | trying 34:10,13,13 |
| 41:12 43:12 44:24 | 124:1,2 125:10,12 | 136:25 137:4 | 95:17 96:20 | 43:14 74:10 77:25 |
| 45:6 50:11 53:18 | 125:13 126:1 | 138:1,5,9 153:9 | top 156:22 | 82:23 84:22 85:1 |
| 59:22 63:8 66:4 | 128:17 131:5,7,11 | 154:17 | topic 85:23,23 | 86:22 112:7 |
| 68:18 69:12 84:9 | 132:22 133:6,9 | three-month 47:19 | 101:9 | 130:11 132:16 |
| 84:14 85:5,16 | 136:3 138:16,21 | tied 50:15,25 153:5 | total 35:13 76:23 | 133:2 137:7 140:4 |
| 88:12 89:17,19 | 138:22,25 139:23 | time 22:4 24:14 | 76:24 80:22 88:3 | 156:16 |
| 94:24 95:13 96:12 | 143:20,21 145:4,5 | 34:8 38:11 39:5 | 88:3,6 | Tuesday 22:4 |
| 96:18 98:2 102:10 | 145:8 154:1,2,4 | 39:17,19,24,24 | totality 150:10 | turn 22:13 24:6 |
| 102:10,15 103:14 | 155:18,20 156:9 | 40:2 41:2 52:24 | 153:16 | 25:15 26:22 27:3 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 27:18 30:17,20 | 137:12,13 | 104:8,14 105:13 | 141:19 | 147:1,11 148:3 |
| 33:7,12 44:18 | underestimated | 105:13 107:3,12 | validations 97:4 | 149:8 150:20 |
| 45:20 54:16,20 | 100:23 | 107:13 109:21 | valuation 154:25 | 151:8 152:2,18,19 |
| 98:3 109:4 113:3 | underlying 45:9,11 | 110:21,21 111:3 | value 37:21 80:19 | 152:20,23 153:3 |
| 113:17 114:13,22 | understand 26:1 | 116:19 117:22 | 140:23 | 153:24 154:24 |
| 116:21 139:21 | 52:22 53:15 58:9 | 118:13 127:8 | values 36:22 38:7,7 | 155:1,3,8 |
| 145:6 154:2 | 59:171:1474:10 | 137:4,12,16,20,22 | 62:23 75:24 77:13 | voice 24:4 88:15 |
| two 24:18 39:17 | 77:25 84:22 99:21 | 138:5,6,8 144:10 | 78:1,9,18 81:17 | 120:11 |
| 45:10 61:22 62:3 | 99:21 101:14 | 146:3 148:16,21 | 141:2 | voltage 35:25 91:7 |
| 65:7 67:16 68:6 | 113:23 119:6 | use 25:1,3 27:25 | varies 104:10 | |
| 71:13 85:8 87:19 | 136:15 145:1 | 28:1,19 29:2,7 | variety 151:12 | W |
| 87:20 88:5 92:18 | understandable | 38:15 39:2,17 | various 53:1 | WAC 46:8 50:14 |
| 97:14 100:9,9,12 | 24:5 | 47:1 49:2 67:16 | vast 91:25 | 109:19 116:16 |
| 119:12,19,24 | understanding | 67:18,20 68:7,9 | VEE 59:18,20 79:3 | 134:19 135:13 |
| 121:23 122:2 | 68:24 94:16 116:9 | 71:2 72:18 73:18 | 79:6 80:9,12 81:6 | 148:14,17,23,23 |
| 141:5 146:25 | 116:10 123:11 | 74:3,7,15,22 | 81:7,12 84:2 86:9 | 148:25 149:5 |
| 147:3 148:3 | 127:7,10 | 75:13,13 83:18,19 | 141:18 | 151:11 152:15 |
| 152:17 153:4 | understood 85:16 | 87:5,7,10,17 | vendor 120:4 | 155:2,4,4,5 |
| two-way 36:6 56:21 | unfilter 80:15 | 89:23 90:8,20,22 | verbally 75:6 | WACs 148:3 |
| 57:15 127:6 | Unfortunately | 93:4 94:4,9 95:16 | verified 109:19 | wait 97:15 |
| type 67:13 109:23 | 38:23 59:14,20 | 97:20,22 106:6 | verify 61:16 | waited 147:21 |
| 117:16 126:9,11 | unification 71:3 | 108:7,8,11 142:1 | version 26:8 28:8 | waiting 51:12 |
| 126:13 129:2 | 141:7 | 143:6,13 144:18 | versus 22:10 57:15 | walking 55:16 |
| 130:23 140:12 | unique 45:3 | 146:13,14 150:25 | 58:11 | walls 108:6 |
| 144:22 151:18 | unit 36:24 49:9 | 153:15 | Victoria 18:3 19:20 | want 23:21,25 |
| types 96:25 100:7 | 65:18 88:6 123:9 | uses 49:7 93:2 | 22:9,25 | 24:23 35:5 58:21 |
| typical 119:25 | unknown 154:8 | USN 95:24 | video 25:1,3 98:13 | 58:22 63:11 74:22 |
| typically 120:4 | unlikelihood 51:17 | usually 119:25 | 133:12 | 87:22 113:22 |
| 150:13 152:6 | unlimited 142:6 | 120:2 | videoconference | 116:8 128:14 |
| | unnecessary 51:21 | UTC 82:23 83:2 | 18:9 158:8 | 142:16 143:12,13 |
| U | unoccupied 42:23 | utilities 18:1 91:9 | view 52:18 | 145:9 147:15 |
| U.S 73:19 91:1 | unreliable 48:22 | 104:6 121:12 | violate 151:11 | 148:3 155:22 |
| UE-190529 31:5 | unsatisfied 53:4 | utility 36:2 70:24 | violated 155:14 | 157:9 |
| UE-220701 18:4 | upgrade 51:5 | 94:8 115:14 140:7 | violation 50:23 | wanted 25:24 26:20 |
| 22:7 | upheld 130:19,25 | utility's 52:10 | 134:19 135:13 | 29:2 39:5 60:4,25 |
| UG-190530 31:5 | 131:1 | utilize 93:7 144:12 | 136:9,20 147:17 | 62:2 76:3,12 |
| ultimate 86:3 | usage 35:10,14,15 | utilizing 93:1 | 150:19 151:11 | 77:21 80:21 82:10 |
| ultimately 44:23 | 37:21 46:22,24 | | 152:15 | 83:17 89:17 90:13 |
| 45:23 47:15 51:2 | 47:23 48:3,17 | <u> </u> | violations 32:7 | 95:12 99:20 |
| 51:14,23 145:10 | 49:15 52:11 62:25 | v 18:5 | 51:20 53:6,8,14 | 105:17 111:5 |
| 145:22 147:23 | 63:20 64:15 75:24 | validate 81:8 | 53:17,18,19,20 | 138:17 139:25 |
| unbilled 138:6 | 76:25,25 77:11,20 | validation 78:4 | 54:3,6 122:17 | 140:3 141:8 156:4 |
| uncalculated 38:24 | 77:23 78:10,16 | 80:9 81:4,9,16,23 | 129:23 130:1,8,13 | wants 152:19 |
| unclear 97:2 | 82:25 83:12 85:21 | 84:2 86:5 95:16 | 132:13,21 133:25 | warranted 138:15 |
| 147:16 | 86:4 87:20 88:5 | 96:20 97:5 101:1 | 135:5 136:16 | warranting 52:18 |
| underbilled 135:14 | 100:24 102:5 | 101:12 141:2,18 | 137:9 138:18 | washing 104:16 |
| | 1 | | | |

| Washington 18:1 | 124:6 145:16 | 144:19 | zero 37:19 39:12 | 126 20:20 |
|------------------------|--------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 19:6,11,16 22:22 | 147:20 | wondering 69:13 | 44:12 | 120 20:20 12X 119:5 |
| 23:2 82:5,25 | weren't 118:13 | 103:1 | ZIP 114:11 | 13 118:3 135:21 |
| 104:7,9 158:3,7 | west 42:20 | wood 43:18 | Zoom 19:2,4,8,13 | 1340 22:22 |
| wasn't 57:23 72:18 | WHEREOF | wooden 83:19 | 19:18 24:24 25:7 | 139 21:11 |
| 102:20 116:13 | 158:11 | word 103:15 106:6 | 98:6 | 13X 119:5 |
| 124:9 138:8,12 | wide 124:21 151:12 | words 85:8 117:25 | | 14 18:13,24 22:1 |
| 143:2,19 148:10 | widespread 153:7 | work 33:19,19 34:9 | 0 | 64:2 135:10,20,22 |
| 148:11 | wife 156:2 | 65:13 79:18 100:7 | | 144 21:12 |
| waste 85:12 | wild 123:12 | 100:10 114:18 | 1 | 145 21:13 |
| water 104:15 105:6 | willing 33:25 | 117:15 140:18 | 1 35:7 | 14th 22:4 |
| 105:7 144:11 | windows 42:18 | 144:15 | 1,000 104:25 105:1 | 15 38:6 91:6 95:13 |
| watts 40:10 | 48:22 144:10 | worked 117:17,18 | 105:10 146:20,22 | 95:15 96:21 |
| way 33:24 34:24 | winter 41:25 43:19 | workers 115:14 | 1,552 146:20 | 117:10 125:16 |
| 37:1 46:17 49:16 | wired 107:22 | workforce 100:17 | 1,600 149:18 | 139:5 |
| 73:5 96:20 127:11 | withdrawing 69:25 | 115:15 | 1,900 76:25 | 15- 35:24 73:20 |
| 143:19 | withe 151:24 | working 28:13 | 1:51 139:16 | 15-minute 35:12 |
| ways 107:9 124:25 | witness 23:14 | 33:23 53:24 72:15 | 1:56 139:16 | 66:1 91:19 94:13 |
| we'll 23:23 24:6,9 | 24:12,14 32:12 | 115:24 128:22 | 10 76:24 154:7 | 140:13 |
| 24:11,16 32:16 | 54:18 55:2,5,14 | 141:13 142:13 | 10- 66:1 | 15,000 47:21 95:20 |
| 33:7,7,8 47:16 | 55:22 56:8 59:14 | 148:5,6,8 151:13 | 10-15 95:13 | 154 21:14 |
| 88:22 114:15 | 60:16 64:22,25 | 153:20 155:6 | 10:38 66:10 | 1550 22:16 |
| 133:7 134:13 | 65:25 66:7,14,16 | works 111:21 | 10:48 66:3 | 16 95:1 |
| we're 22:6 23:13 | 66:23 67:1 84:17 | 146:18 | 10:50 66:10 | 16th 76:24 |
| 41:9,11 43:11,13 | 84:19 85:11 88:14 | wrong 34:2,11 | 108 80:2 111:21 | 17 95:1 |
| 43:22 44:7 61:19 | 88:15 89:4,10 | 80:16 107:12 | 108,000 61:9 | 172,000 61:11 |
| 66:12 72:16 79:22 | 92:13 98:3,12,19 | 116:13 144:24 | 108.71 79:16 | 174,000 62:17 |
| 81:14,14 88:2 | 101:9,14 103:14 | | 10885 19:6 | 18 118:5 151:6 |
| 89:3,15 98:4,11 | 108:23 110:8,11 | <u> </u> | 10th 25:22 30:4 | 18-158 18:10 |
| 105:14 122:13 | 112:14,20 119:9 | X 20:1 21:1 | 10X 116:24 | 19 76:25 95:22 96:2 |
| 124:23 130:7,11 | 120:10,13,19,22 | Y | 11 113:5,11 135:9 | 115:5 |
| 139:20 143:9 | 125:14,19,25 | | 135:10,20,22 | 1H-1T 63:9 |
| 156:14 | 131:7,16,24 132:6 | yeah 26:17 27:8 | 11:29 88:24 | |
| we've 44:7,9,10 | 132:25 133:6,9,15 | 43:10 60:11 69:15 | 11:36 88:24 | $\frac{2}{2}$ |
| 130:5,5 | 133:19,23 134:2 | 82:8 95:15 97:9 | 11:53 98:8 | 2 101:22 103:19 |
| weather 83:14,16 | 134:15,21,25 | 103:17 109:6,12 109:12 111:5 | 112 20:14 118,000 62:19 | 115:14,22 117:23 |
| website 36:14 | 135:3,17,21,23 | | / | 118:1,16 |
| 71:22 83:2 127:9 | 136:3,5,12,22,24 | 124:5 128:10 year 34:9 43:19 | 119 20:15 12 35:21 53:16 | 2,100 87:24 |
| week 25:17 | 138:14,25 158:11 | v | | 2,552 146:21 |
| weigh 151:22 153:2 | witness's 69:12 | 44:2,5 83:6 134:18 135:13 | 96:22 99:25 12-21 95:15 | 2,700 83:7,9,22 |
| weighs 150:10 | witnesses 24:7,11 | 134:18 135:13 | 12-21 95:15 12:30 156:1 | 2,900 78:10 |
| weight 106:9,10 | 28:3 49:13 50:3 | years 52:10 137:14 | 12:30 136:1 12:45 98:8 | 2:24 157:13 |
| 121:25 122:22 | 54:17 62:1 67:6 | years <i>32</i> .10 137.14 yep 97:15 | 12:45 98:8 12:46 98:11 | 20 109:22 |
| 147:19 | 85:18 106:5 139:3 | ych 21.13 | 12:40 98.11 120 20:17 | 200 43:20 101:25 |
| went 53:12,22 81:3 | 142:22 156:9 | Z | 120 20:17 124 20:18 | 102:6,25 103:22 |
| 82:2 86:4 99:7 | wonder 143:9 | | 147 20.10 | 104:5 105:14 |
| | | | l | l |

| | | | | 1 age 102 |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-----------|
| 2000 19:15 | 360.915.4521 19:11 | 56 20:4 | 9th 132:5 | |
| 2017 141:10,13 | 37 59:12 | 50 20.4 | 7th 152.5 | |
| 2018 18:25 158:16 | 374 29:1 | 6 | | |
| 2019 31:4,9 51:8 | 57427.1 | 6 36:14 63:8,23 | | |
| 121:6,10 123:5,7 | 4 | 64:2 69:6,19 | | |
| 123:14 | 4 41:8,14 108:3 | 113:5 114:15 | | |
| 2020 31:9 61:9 99:7 | 4,000 42:25 48:20 | 6- 43:17 | | |
| 99:12,13,14,18 | 4,403.92 42:3 | 60 91:7 157:2 | | |
| 2021 47:18 48:8 | 40- 61:20 | 60-minute 35:24 | | |
| 111:17 113:13 | 40,000 62:24 | 73:20 | | |
| 114:10,12 117:10 | 400 42:1 | 600 103:6 | | |
| 118:3,6 123:10 | 41 21:7 | 65 20:5 48:17 108:5 | | |
| 135:11 | 41C 62:13,15 76:14 | 67 20:7 | | |
| 2022 47:21 48:14 | 80:14 | 6th 72:4 | | |
| 76:24 79:22 80:2 | 42 27:20 28:1,23 | | | |
| 140:21 | 29:12,16 | 7 | | |
| 2023 18:13,24 22:1 | 425.635.1458 19:7 | 7 114:6,15 | | |
| 61:9 158:12 | 43 21:8 | 700 43:18 | | |
| 2029 76:24 | 44 21:9 | 7th 134:8 | | |
| 2029 76:24 206.464.6595 19:16 | 45 27:20 28:1 29:12 | | | |
| 200.404.0395 19.10 209 62:18 | 29:22 30:11 33:1 | 8 | | |
| 209,000 61:13 | 45-minute 98:6 | 8 31:9 64:1 113:18 | | |
| 62:18 | 47250 19:10 | 113:19 132:20,23 | | |
| 21 87:14 96:22 | 480-100-133 155:5 | 133:17,18 135:2,9 | | |
| 21 87.14 90.22 22 54:3 | 480-100-148 134:3 | 135:18,19,21,22 | | |
| 23 99:7 117:6 | 480-100-148(2)(c) | 8,000 47:22 | | |
| 24 53:10 99:12 | 148:24 155:5 | 8,300 77:3 78:11 | | |
| 240 41:17 | 480-100-178 46:9 | 80.04.110 54:10 | | |
| 24th 30:1 | 480-100-178(1)(i) | 80.04.380 54:9 | | |
| 250 101:25 102:6 | 134:19 155:4 | 800 19:15 | | |
| 102:25 103:22 | 480-100-178(5)(a) | 843 83:4 | | |
| 102:25 105:22 | 135:13 137:11 | 86 20:8 | | |
| 104.3,24 103.11 | 155:2 | 89 20:10 | | |
| 28th 158:12 | 480-100-178(8) | 8th 28:6 | | |
| 29 77:1 135:11 | 137:15 | 8X 113:19 | | |
| 27 77.1 155.11 | 480-100-333 | | | |
| 3 | 148:14 | 9 | | |
| 30 91:6 109:22 | 480-plus 41:15 | 9 113:5,11 114:15 | | |
| 141:10 | | 9:30 18:14 22:2,5 | | |
| 30- 35:24 73:20 | 5 | 90 83:18 | | |
| 31 99:13,14 | 5 91:6 123:19 | 97 20:11 | | |
| 32,000 80:24 81:3 | 137:18 | 971 23:1 | | |
| 83:5,25 | 5- 35:24 73:20 | 98 20:13 | | |
| 33 21:3,6 | 50,000 61:20 | 98004 19:6 | | |
| 36 115:2 | 52 21:10 | 98104 19:16 | | |
| 360 41:17 | 55 24:18 | 98504 19:11 | | |
| • · - • - • | | 9C 82:10 | | |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | |