

Evidentiary Hearing - 11/6/2023

Dee	
Pag	ge 1 Page 3
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	1         A P P E A R A N C E S (continued)           2         FOR THE ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS: (Appearing via Zoom)
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND ) TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, ) ) Complainant, ) DOCKET UG-230393 ) v. ) PUGET SOUND ENERGY, ) ) Respondent. ) EVIDENTIARY HEARING BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES MICHAEL BROWN AND JAMES BROWN, II	<ul> <li>(Appearing Via Zoom)</li> <li>SOMMER J. MOSER</li> <li>Davison Van Cleve, P.C. 1750 South Harbor Way</li> <li>Suite 450 Portland, OR 97201</li> <li>503.241.7242 Sjm@dvclaw.com</li> <li>FOR THE PUYALLUP TRIBE: (Appearing via Zoom)</li> <li>ANDREW FULLER</li> <li>NICHOLAS THOMAS Ogden Murphy Wallace, PLLC</li> <li>NICHOLAS THOMAS Ogden Murphy Wallace, PLLC</li> <li>Seattle, WA 98164 206-447-7000</li> <li>AFuller@omwlaw.com NThomas@omwlaw.com</li> <li>WUTC COMMISSIONERS: Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commissioner Ann Rendahl ******</li> <li>******</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ul>
DATE TAKEN: NOVEMBER 6, 2023 REPORTED BY: LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186	22 23 24 25
Pag	ge 2 Page 4
1       APPEARANCES         2       FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY:         3       SHEREE STROM CARSON PAMELA J. ANDERSON         4       BYRON C. STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP         5       10885 NE 4th Street Suite 700         6       Bellevue, WA 98004-5579 425.635.1422         7       Scarson@perkinscoie.com Pjanderson@perkinscoie.com         8       Byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com         9       FOR COMMISSIONED STAFF:         10       JEFF ROBERSON         11       Senior Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General         12       Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128         13       Olympia, WA 98504 360.664.1186         14       Jeff.roberson@atg.wa.gov         15       FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:         16       (Appearing via Zoom)         17       LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General         18       Washington Attorney General's Office Public Coursel Unit         19       800 5th Avenue Suite 2000         20       Seattle, WA 98104-3188 206.464.6595         21       Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov	1       EXHIBIT INDEX         2       SEF-17       5/25/23       Direct Testimony         3       SEF-2       5/25/23       Revenue Requirement         5       SEF-41       10/6/23       Rebuttal Testimony         6       RJR-1T       5/25/23       Direct Testimony         7       RJR-2       5/25/23       Direct Testimony         7       RJR-2       5/25/23       Excerpt from Presentation to         1       the PSE Board of Directors       1         9       RJR-4       5/25/23       Excerpt from Presentation to         1       RJR-5       5/25/23       Excerpt from 2017 PSE         1       Integrated Resource Plan       1         12       RJR-6       5/25/23       Excerpt from PSE 2019         13       IRP Progress Report       1         14       RJR-7       5/25/23       Excerpt from PSE 2021         11       Integrated Resource Plan       1         15       RJR-8C       5/25/23       Information Presented to         16       the PSE Board of Directors       after September 2016         17       RJR-9       5/25/23       Sorelines Hearings Board         16       Decision 9283 in SHB No. 16-002

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

## Evidentiary Hearing - 11/6/2023

		Derre F		Derie 7
		Page 5		Page 7
1 2	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued) RJR-14 10/6/23 Shorelines Hearings Board,		1 EXHIBIT INDEX (continued) 2 BAE-8 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff DR No. 018	
3	SHB No. 16-002, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order		BAE-9 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff	
4	RJR-15 10/6/23 Pollution Control Hearings Board Decision 11448		4 DR No. 017 5 BAE-10 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff	
5	Duard Decision 11446		DR No. 026	
6	RJR-16 10/6/23Pollution Control Hearings Board Decision 11447		6 BAE-11 9/8/23 Vaporizer and Liquefaction Annual	
7	RJR-17 10/6/23Tacoma LNG Fire and Safety Review,		7 Maximum Capacity 8 BAE-12 9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel	
8	Braemar Technical Services		DR No. 023 Attachment A	
0	RJR-18X 10/31/2023 Excerpt of Testimony of Matthew		RLE-1CT 9/8/23 Response Testimony; CONFIDENTIAL	
9	Stobart, CB&I for PSE, PCHB No. P19-087C		RLE-2 9/8/23 Curriculum Vitae of Robert Earle	
10	RJR-19X 10/31/2023 Excerpt of Opening Statement of		RLE-3 9/8/23 PSE Resp PC DR 5	
11	Joshua Frank, PSE Counsel, PCHB No. P19-087C		RLE-4 9/8/23 PSE Resp PC DR 42	
12	RJR-20X 10/31/2023 Excerpt of Testimony of Steven Van Slyke, PSCAA Director of Compliance,		RLE-5 9/8/23 PSE Resp PC DR 37	
13	PCHB No. P19-087C		RLE-6 9/8/23 PSE Resp PC DR 40 with Attachment A	
14	RJR-21X 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Supplemental Response to WUTC Discovery Request No. 32,		15 RLE-7 9/8/23 Vaporization Day Comparison	
15 16	with Attachments D and E		16 RLE-8 9/8/23 PSE Resp PC DR 24	
	RJR-22X 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Supplemental Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request		17 RLE-9 9/8/23 PSE Resp Staff DR 26	
17 18	No. 46		18 RLE-10 9/8/23 PSE Resp PC DR 23 with Attachment A	
	WFD-1T 5/25/23 Direct Testimony		19 RLE-11 9/8/23 Public Comment Matrix, UG-151663	
19	WFD-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of		20 RLE-12 9/8/23 PSE Resp PC DR 26 with Attachment A	
20	William F. Donahue		21 RLE-13 9/8/23 Legal Fees	
21	WFD-3 5/25/23 Allocation of Cap-Ex for Distribution Upgrade Projects		22 RLE-14 9/8/23 Pipeline Allocation	
22	WFD-4 5/25/23 Application of Rule 6 to Transport		23 RXS-1T 9/8/23 Response Testimony	
23	Service under RS 87T for Puget LNG		24 RXS-2 9/8/23 Resume of Ranajit (Ron) Sahu, Ph.D,	
24 25	WFD-5T 10/06/23Rebuttal Testimony		25 CEM (Nevada)	
		Page 6		Page 8
1	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Page 6	1 EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Page 8
1 2	WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation	Page 6	2 RXS-3 9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of	Page 8
	WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to	Page 6	<ol> <li>RXS-3 9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)</li> <li>3</li> </ol>	Page 8
2	WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG	Page 6	2 RXS-3 9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019) 3 RXS-4 9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information 4 Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG	Page 8
2 3 4	WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5	Page 8
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	Page 8
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-1T 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-1T 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-1T 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-1T 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Schedule 141LNG Tracker Rate Design</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law,	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-1T 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       RXS-8       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Order on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6,	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-1T 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Schedule 141LNG Tracker Rate Design</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         4       Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Order on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-1T 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Schedule 141LNG Tracker Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-4 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Chedule 141N</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-2200067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         12       4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Notice of Construction (NOC)         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-17 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Schedule 141LNG Tracker Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-6       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Order on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Notice of Construction (NOC)         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386         15       RXS-10       9/8/23 Serve Tacoma Letter re	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-1T 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-4 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Schedule 88T Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-6 5/25/23 Calculation of Schedule 141N Supplemental Rates</li> <li>JDT-7 5/25/23 Rebutation Functionality</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         12       4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, 4d, 4e, 4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Notice of Construction (NOC)         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386       FXS-10       9/8/23 Serve Tacoma Letter re Recommendation to initiate a supplemental review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-17 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Schedule 141LNG Tracker Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         12       4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 0rder on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Serve Tacoma Letter re Recommendation to initiate a supplemental review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)         16       review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)       17         17       RXS-11       9/8/23 Serve Tacoma Letter re Central Pierce County	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-1T 5/25/23 Direct Testimony JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Schedule 88T Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-6 5/25/23 Rete Impacts</li> <li>JDT-7 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-7 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-7 9/8/23 Comparison of Tacoma LNG Tracker Revenue Requirement</li> <li>BAE-3 9/8/23 Allocation of four-mile distribution</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Order on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Notice of Construction (NOC) Worksheet for NOC No 11386         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386       Fexe-ormendation to initiate a supplemental review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)         17       RXS-11       9/8/23 SPE Response to Public Counsel Areas Central Pierce County         18       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-17 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Schedule 141LNG Tracker Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-4 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Schedule 88T Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-6 5/25/23 Reputation of Schedule 141N Supplemental Rates</li> <li>JDT-8T 10/06/2023Rebuttal Testimony</li> <li>BAE-2 9/8/23 Comparison of Tacoma LNG Tracker Revenue Requirement</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         4       Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Order on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4t, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Serve Tacoma Letter re Recommendation to initiate a supplemental review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386       FXS-10         15       RXS-11       9/8/23 SPCAA map, Most Impacted Areas Central Pierce County         18       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-2200667	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-17 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Schedule 88T Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-6 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-8T 10/06/2023Rebuttal Testimony</li> <li>BAE-3 9/8/23 Allocation of four-mile distribution pipeline</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Order on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Serve Tacoma Letter re Recommendation to initiate a supplemental review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386       RXS-10       9/8/23 PSCA map, Most Impacted Areas Central Pierce County         18       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-17 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-4 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-8T 10/06/2023Rebuttal Testimony</li> <li>BAE-2 9/8/23 Comparison of Tacoma LNG Tracker Revenue Requirement</li> <li>BAE-3 9/8/23 Allocation of four-mile distribution pipeline AE-4 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Find Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Order on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4t, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Sorice of Construction (NOC)         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386         15       RXS-10       9/8/23 PSCAA map, Most Impacted Areas Central Pierce County         16       review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)         17       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSCA map, Most Impacted Areas Central Pierce County         18       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSC A map, Most Impacted Areas Central Pierce County         18       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSC AA map, Most Impacted Areas Central Pierce County	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-17 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Schedule 141LNG Tracker Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-4 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-6 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-8T 10/06/2023Rebuttal Testimony</li> <li>BAE-3 9/8/23 Allocation of four-mile distribution pipeline</li> <li>AE-4 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff DR No. 020</li> <li>AE-6 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378. Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Order on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Notice of Construction (NOC) Worksheet for NOC No 11386         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386       RXS-10         15       RXS-10       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         17       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         18       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         19       RXS-12       <	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-17 5/25/23 Direct Testimony JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-4 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Schedule 88T Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-6 5/25/23 Proposed Schedule 88T Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-7 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-7 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-7 10/06/2023Rebuttal Testimony</li> <li>BAE-2 9/8/23 Comparison of Tacoma LNG Tracker Revenue Requirement</li> <li>BAE-3 9/8/23 Allocation of four-mile distribution pipeline AE-4 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff DR No. 024</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         4       RXS-5       9/8/23 Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-8       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         12       4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Structe of Construction (NOC)         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386         15       RXS-10       9/8/23 Serve Tacoma Letter re Recommendation to initiate a supplemental review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)         17       RXS-11       9/8/23 PSE Amap, Most Impacted Areas Central Pierce County         18       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         19       RXS-13       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-17 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-3 5/25/23 Schedule 141LNG Tracker Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-4 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Schedule 88T Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-6 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-8T 10/06/2023Rebuttal Testimony</li> <li>BAE-3 9/8/23 Allocation of four-mile distribution pipeline</li> <li>AE-4 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff DR No. 029</li> <li>AE-7 9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Notice</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         11       RXS-9       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         12       4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Serve Tacoma Letter re Recommendation to initiate a supplemental review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)         13       RXS-10       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         14       RxS-12       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220067         17       RXS-13       9/8/23 PSE Notice of Construction Application for Tacoma LNG (excerpts) (5/22/2017)         18       RXS-13       9/8/23 US EPA, Health Effects Notebook for	Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>WFD-6 10/06/23 Comparison of Cost Allocation Methods (after Functionalization) for Four-mile pipeline segment related to providing service to/from Tacoma LNG</li> <li>WFD-7 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 51</li> <li>WFD-8 10/31/2023 Puget Sound Energy's Response to Public Counsel Discovery Request No. 39</li> <li>JDT-17 5/25/23 Direct Testimony</li> <li>JDT-2 5/25/23 Professional Qualifications of John D. Taylor</li> <li>JDT-4 5/25/23 Proposed Changes to Schedule 141D</li> <li>JDT-5 5/25/23 Proposed Schedule 88T Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-6 5/25/23 Proposed Schedule 88T Rate Design</li> <li>JDT-7 5/25/23 Ret Impacts</li> <li>JDT-7 5/25/23 Rate Impacts</li> <li>JDT-7 5/25/23 Returnation of Schedule 141N Supplemental Rates</li> <li>JDT-7 5/25/23 Ret Impacts</li> <li>JDT-7 9/8/23 Comparison of Tacoma LNG Tracker Revenue Requirement</li> <li>BAE-3 9/8/23 Allocation of four-mile distribution pipeline AE-4 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff DR No. 020</li> <li>AE-6 9/8/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff DR No. 029</li> </ul>	Page 6	2       RXS-3       9/8/23 Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Order of Approval No. 11386 (excerpt) (12/10/2019)         3       RXS-4       9/8/23 Response to SEIS Data and Information Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         4       Request Puget Sound Energy for Tacoma LNG (excerpt) (5/25/2018)         5       RXS-5       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 391 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         7       RXS-6       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 378, Attachment A in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067         9       RXS-7       9/8/23 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Excerpt) (3/29/2019)         10       RXS-8       9/8/23 Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law, and Order on NOC Issues 4, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, 4j, 4k, 4o, 4p, 4u, 6, and 8 (Excerpt)         13       RXS-9       9/8/23 Notice of Construction (NOC)         14       Worksheet for NOC No 11386         15       RXS-10       9/8/23 Serve Tacoma Letter re Recommendation to initiate a supplemental review of the proposed LNG plant (4/15/2019)         17       RXS-11       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-2200667         18       RXS-12       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 373 in WUTC Consolidated Dockets UE-2200667         19       RXS-13       9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data	Page 8

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

Page 9	Page 11
1 EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	1 EXAMINATION INDEX
2 RXS-16 9/8/23 US EPA, Health Effects Notebook for Hazardous Air Pollutants Xylene	PAGE NO.
3 RXS-17 9/8/23 80 Fed. Reg. 7347 (2/10/2015)	OPENING STATEMENTS 3 By Ms. Carson 24
4 RXS-18 9/8/23 Final Environmental Impact Statement	By Mr. Roberson 30 4 By Ms. Gafken 33
5 for Tacoma LNG (Excerpts) (11/9/2015) 6 XS-19 9/8/23 Shutdown Extended of Fire-Damaged	By Ms. Moser 37 5 By Mr. Fuller 38
Texas LNG Export Site, Engineering 7 News-Record (6/20/2022)	6 RONALD ROBERTS Cross-examination by Mr. Fuller 46
8 RXS-20 9/8/23 Exh. RXS-24, Deposition of Matthew Stobart (excerpt) (2/18/2021)	7 Redirect examination by Ms. Carson 61 Examination by Commissioner Rendahl 62
9 RXS-21 9/8/23 Deposition Appearance Pages (Various)	8
10 RXS-22 9/8/23 Appearance Pages, Depositions of	WILLIAM DONAHUE 9 Cross-examination by Mr. Roberson 65
11 Ranajit Sahu on March 4 & 5, 2021 12 RXS-23 9/8/23 Washington Department of Health,	Cross-examination by Mr. Fuller 73 10 Examination by Commissioner Doumit 76
Washington Environmental Health Disparities 13 Map Rankings for communities adjacent to the	Examination by Commissioner Rendahl 79 11 Examination by Commissioner Doumit (cont'd) 82
Tacoma LNG Facility	Examination by Commissioner Rendahl (cont'd) 88 12 Examination by Chair Danner 89
RXS-24 9/8/23 Order on Motion to Dismiss and for 15 Partial Summary Judgment, PCHB No. 19-087c	1.3 JOHN TAYLOŔ Examination by Chair Danner 94
(3/26/2021)	14 SUSAN FREE
16 RXS-25 9/8/23 Email from J. Lewis, UTC with "PSE	15 Cross-examination by Mr. Thomas 98
17 LNG Draft Overview.docx" attachment (4/10/2019) (highlighting added for ease of	Redirect examination by Ms. Carson 116 16 Examination by Chair Danner 119 17 DETECTION
18 reference) 19 RXS-26 9/8/23 Final Environmental Assessment, SP	17 BETTY ERDAHL Examination by Commissioner Rendahl 122
20534 Special Permit to transport LNG by 20 rail in DOT-113C120W rail tank cars, Docket	18 Cross-examination by Mr. Roberson 126 19 RANAJIT SAHU
No. PHMSA-2019-0100 (12/5/2019)	Cross-examination by Mr. Roberson         128           20         Redirect Examination By Mr. Thomas         132
RXS-27 9/8/23 Map of Puyallup Indian Reservation and Surrounding Area	Examination by Chair Danner 135 21 Examination by Commissioner Doumit 136
23 RXS-28 9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 28	22 23
RXS-29 9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data	24 25
25 Request No. 29	
Page 10	Page 12
1 EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	1 LACEY, WASHINGTON; NOVEMBER 6, 2023
2 RXS-30 9/8/23 Inslee announces opposition to two gasprojects in Washington (5/8/2019)	2 9:01 A.M.
3	3 -000-
RXS-31 9/8/23 Advocates for a Cleaner Tacoma, et 4 al. V. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, et al.,	4
Washington Court of Appeals Div. II No. 5 56938-8, Amicus Brief of the Attorney	5 JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. It is Monday,
General of the State of Washington	6 November 6th, and the time is 9:01 a.m.
6 (7/1/2022) 7 RXS-32 9/8/23 PSE Response to Public Counsel Data	7 My name is Michael Howard, and I'm joined by
Request No. 46	<ul> <li>James Brown, II. We are administrative law judges with</li> <li>the Commission, and we are presiding on this matter</li> </ul>
RXS-33 9/8/23 Document describing Tacoma LNG	10 along with the commissioners, who will be joining us
<ul> <li>Project, produced by PSE in PCHB Case No.</li> <li>19-087c (PSE02708467-PSE02708470)</li> </ul>	11 shortly.
10 RXS-34 9/8/23 Excerpt (non-confidential) from J.	12 We are here today for an evidentiary hearing in
11 Hogan 30(b)(6) testimony on behalf of PSE	13 Docket UG-230393. This case is captioned WUTC v. Puget
(1/7/2021) 12	14 Sound Energy. This proceeding is concerning PSE's
RXS-35T 10/6/23 Cross-Answering Testimony on Behalf 13 of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians	15 Tacoma liquid natural gas or LNG facility and the
14 RXS-36 10/6/23 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data Request No. 031	<ul> <li>recovery for those costs and rates.</li> <li>Let's start by taking appearances beginning with</li> </ul>
15	17Let's start by taking appearances beginning with18PSE.
RXS-37 10/6/2023 PSE Response to WUTC Staff Data 16 Request No. 32	19 MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.
17 RXS-38 10/6/2023 Table summarizing NOVs issued by PSCAA to Tacoma LNG on May 12, 2023	20 Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie, representing
18	21 Puget Sound Energy
19 20	22 MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I'm not sure if
21 22	23 you're speaking into the microphone for the hearing, but
23	24 I was not getting audio.
24 25	25 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for those of you

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

## Evidentiary Hearing - 11/6/2023

1       online for letting me know.       1       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 1 appreciate it.         2       Can you hear me now?       3       All right. 1 would like to start ou by giving a         3       Can you hear me now?       3       bitf roadmap for our hearing today. Well begin in a moment utiling on the two recent motions. Next we will a address any objections to the evidence.         4       All right. Record Center is working on hait.       File address any objections to the evidence.         7       Alt right. Record Center is working on hait.       File address any objections to the evidence.         8       MR. ROBERSON: Good moming. Judge Howard and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned staff.       The parties and that I circulated as well.         3       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       The parties additional model well be adards and short bear.         4       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       The brains of additional model well be adards and short bear.         3       Gatken, ras you able to hear me now?       This is our first additional on the orgen my appearance now?         3       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       The hearing room and on online o-word bown. This sour first hybrid adductation.         2       Gatken, ras you able to hear me now?       This is our first addite.       The hearing room and on online o-word bown. This great to see many of you hearing with us while         3       Gatken, ras you able to hear me now? <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
2         Can you hear me now?         2         All right. I would like to start begin in a moment ruling on the two recent motions. Next we will admit evidence and address any objections to the evidence.           7         If we could maybe drop a note in the chat. We are on the mercord, and Record Centre is working on that.         7           7         If we could maybe drop a note in the chat. We are on the mercord, and Record Centre is working on that.         7           7         If we could maybe drop a note in the chat. We are on the mercord, and Record Centre is working on that.         7           7         appearances from the parties right now.         7           8         Can we have an appearance for commissioned staft.         7           10         MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard is during the give may powimately three soluts to tross-examination today.         7           11         and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AGG for commissioned staft.         7         7           12         JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         7         7           13         MR. ROBERSON: Good morning.         7         7           14         and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AGA for commissioned staft.         7         7           15         MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Supparing on bhalf         7         7           16         Wood on first hybrid adjudication.         7         7		Page 13		Page 15
3         Can you hear me now?         3         brief readmap for our hearing today. Well begin in a           4         Tim going to be a Verizon commercial.         4         moment ruling on the two researt motions. Nox we will admit evidence and address any objections to the evidence.           6         All right. Record Center is working on hat.         5         All of the commissioned admit evidence and address any objections to the evidence.           10         appearances from the parties right now.         All or the commissioned admit evidence and address any objections to the evidence.           12         staff?         MR. ROBERSON: Good moming. Judge Howard.           13         MR. ROBERSON: Good moming. Judge Howard.         The parties estimate that there will be approximately three hours of cross-examination today.           14         and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned staff?         The parties estimate that there will be approximately three hours of cross-examination today.           15         staff.         JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         The is our first adjudication.           21         MS. GAFKEN: I am, yes.         The site out on the inter son and the commission as the Commission as the first.           23         Gatken, Assistant Attomey General, appearing on behalt         The is our first adjudication.           23         MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa         The is and paperadest or conomisis.           24	1	online for letting me know.	1	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I appreciate it.
4         Im going to be a Verizon commercial.         4         moment ruling on the two recent motions. Next we will admit evidence and address any objections to the evidence.           7         If we could maybe drop a note in the chat. We are on the two record, and Record Center is working on that.         5         admit evidence and address any objections to the evidence.           7         If we could maybe drop a note in the chat. We are on the two recent, and Record Center is working on that.         5         admit evidence and address any objections to the evidence.           10         The record, and Record Center is working on that.         6         admit evidence and address any objections to the evidence.           11         Can we have an appearance for commissioned staff.         11         The parties and that is circulated as well.           12         MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard         11         The parties and that there will be approximately three hours of cross-examination of withesses, at following the order of presenamination and withesses any objections to the staff.           13         MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard         11         The parties and that there will be approximately three hours of cross-examination of withesses.           14         and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned staff.         12         The parties and that on the chat. We are on the staff.           15         MS. GAFKEN: I am, yes.         13         14         approximately thrule houses	2	Can you hear me now?	2	All right. I would like to start out by giving a
5         Can you hear me now, Ms. Garken?         admit evidence and address any objections to the evidence.           7         If we could maybe drop a note in the chat. We are on the record, and Record Center is working on having my microphone carry through online. We're lust taking appearance for or the parties an opportunity to provide brief           10         appearances from the parties right now.         7           11         appearances from the parties right now.         7           12         staff?         The parties an opportunity to provide brief           13         MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard         7           14         and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned         11           15         JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         12           16         JUDGE HOWARD: Please. Thank you.         16           17         MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa         17           18         MS. MOSER: Perfect. My name is Lisa         18           19         Cank wa an appearance for MEC, Alliance of Mestor an bearing with us while         19           21         JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         14           23         And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while         15           24         JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         14           25         And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while	3	Can you hear me now?	3 brief	roadmap for our hearing today. We'll begin in a
6       All right. Record Center is working on hait.       evidence.         7       If we could maybe drop a note in the chal. We are on         9       microphone carry through online.       We'le just taking         9       appearances from the parties right now.         11       Can we have an appearance for commissioned         12       and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned         13       MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Judge Howard         14       and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned         15       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         16       Would you like me to give my appearance now?         17       MS. GAFKEN: I am, yes.         18       SAFKEN: I am, yes.         19       SAFKEN: I am, yes.         10       DIGE HOWARD: Thank you.         11       MS. GAFKEN: Parfed. Wn pame is Lisa         12       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         13       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while         14       man appearance for AWEC, Alliance of         15       MR. FULLER: Good morning.         16       We do our first hybrid adjudication.         17       Watter mer?         18       And a we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of         19       MR. FULLER:	4	I'm going to be a Verizon commercial.	4 mor	nent ruling on the two recent motions. Next we will
1       If we could maybe drop a note in the chat. We are on       After the commissiones join us, we will then         1       appearances from the parties right now.       appearances from the parties right now.         1       appearances from the parties right now.       appearances from the parties right now.         1       mark now have an appearance for commissioned       and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned         1       mark now an appearance for ACG for commissioned       approximately three hours or corse-examination to dwiteses, a bite midmoming         1       MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard       mark now an appearance for AVEC, Allance of         1       MS. GAFKEN: I am, yes.       mark sout first adjudication at the Commission as being held on a thydro basis both in person here at the hearing room and online over Zoom.         2       Gafken, Assistant Attorey General, appearing on behalf       as being held on a thydro basis both in person here at the hearing room and online over Zoom.         2       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       They are set throws an appearance for AVEC, Allance of         1       We do our first hybrid adjudication.       1         2       Cark we have an appearance for AVEC, Allance of       MA fa withes is appearing in the hearing         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       1       Torbe fire as adving any technical issue or you         1       DUGE HOWARD: Thank you.<	5	Can you hear me now, Ms. Gafken?	5 adm	it evidence and address any objections to the
a         absorb the parties and producting to provide brief           gappearances from the parties and proparations for commissioned         gappearances from the parties and producting the parties and the mutuse sack. We'll           11         Can we have an appearance for commissioned         11           12         staff?         following the order of presentation provided by the           13         MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard         13           14         and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, A&G for commission         13           15         staff.         JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         16           16         JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         16         17           17         MS. GAFKEN: I am, yes.         3a being held on a hybrid basis buin person here at           18         We dow uf first hybrid adjudication.         18         are brain and paperciance tor AWEC, Allance of           18         We do our first hybrid adjudication.         12         reporter can make a clear record and those online can           2         And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while         25         affort.           2         We do our first hybrid adjudication.         14         Foge 14           2         Fage 14         Page 16           1         reporter can make a clear record and those online can      <	6	All right. Record Center is working on that.	6 evide	ence.
9         microphone carry through online. We're just taking         9         opening statements, intel to the minutes each. We'll           10         appearances from the parties right now.         10         then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses.           11         Can we have an appearance for commissioned         11         The parties estimate that there will be           12         and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned         11         The parties estimate that there will be           13         MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard         11         The parties estimate that there will be           14         apportionately three hours of cross-examination today.         The parties estimate that there will be           14         apportionately three hours of cross-examination today.         The parties estimate that there will be           15         JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         16         The parties estimate that there will be           16         JUDGE HOWARD: Please: Thank you.         17         This is our first alphorid adjudication.           16         JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         16         17         Foorter can make a clear record and those online can hear you as well.           16         Western Energy Consumers?         17         Md appreciate everyone bearing with us while         16           17         We do our first hybrid adjudication.	7	If we could maybe drop a note in the chat. We are on	7	After the commissioners join us, we will then
10       appearances from the jarties right now.       10       then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses,         11       Can we have an appearance for commissioned       11         12       MR. ROBERSON: Good moning, Judge Howard       11         13       MR. ROBERSON: Good moning, Judge Howard       11         14       and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson. AAG for commissioned       11         15       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       16         16       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       16         17       MS. GAFKEN: I am, yes.       18         18       MS. CAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa       20         19       Would you like me to give my appearance now?       18         21       MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa       20         22       Gafken, Assistant Attomey General, appearing on behalf       10         11       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       21         22       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       22         23       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       23         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       24         25       And I a writess is appearing in the hearing       7         26       And Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       10 <t< td=""><td>8</td><td>the record, and Record Center is working on having my</td><td>8 allow</td><td>the parties an opportunity to provide brief</td></t<>	8	the record, and Record Center is working on having my	8 allow	the parties an opportunity to provide brief
11       Can we have an appearance for commissioned       11       following the order of presentation provided by the         12       staff?       MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard       13       The parties estimate that there will be         13       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       14       approximately three hours of cross-examination today.         16       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       16       break, and a lunch break, it is quite likely our hearing         17       Ms. GAFKEN: 1am, yes.       16       break, and a lunch break, it is quite likely our hearing         18       MS. GAFKEN: Partect. My name is Lisa       16       can we have an appearance now?       17         21       MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa       23       of public counsel.       11       fouring from and online over Zoom. It's great to speak         23       of public counsel.       12       graden. Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf       12       everyone bearing with us through some technical issues         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       12       17       You're here in person, please try to speak         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       25       if you're here in person, please try to speak         26       We do ur first hybrid adjudication.       2       1       reporter can make a clear record and those on line	9	microphone carry through online. We're just taking	9 oper	ning statements, limited to ten minutes each. We'll
12       staff?       12       parties and that I circulated as well.         13       MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard       13       The parties estimate that there will be approximately three hours of cross-examination today.         14       and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commission       34       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         16       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       15       if we account for opening statements, a brief midmorning         17       MS. GAFKEN: I arr., yes.       This is our first adjudication at the Commission       as being heid on a hybrid basis both in person here at the hearing room and online over Zoom. It's great to see many of you here in person, and I appreciate everyone bearing with us through some technical issues at first.         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       24       If you're here in person, please try to speak directly into the bench microphone so that our court         Page 14	10	appearances from the parties right now.	10 then	turn to the cross-examination of witnesses,
13       MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard       13       The parties estimate that there will be         14       and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned       14       approximately three hours of cross-examination today.         15       staff.       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       16       approximately three hours of tross-examination today.         16       JUDGE HOWARD: Please. Thank you.       17       ms. GAFKEN: Lam, yes.       18         20       JUDGE HOWARD: Please. Thank you.       19       as being held on a hybrid basis both in person here at the everyone bearing with us through some technical issues         21       MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa       6afken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf       21         23       of public counsel.       21       see many of you here in person, please try to speak         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       17       we do our first hybrid adjudication.       24         24       Wede our first hybrid adjudication.       Page 14       Page 16         26       MS. GARSON: Yee, Good morning.       7       And if a witness is appearing in the hearing room, here we well.         36       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       17       Hear you as well.       17         36       MS. GARSON: Yee, Good morning.       7       MS. GARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I als	11	Can we have an appearance for commissioned		
14       and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned staff.       approximately three hours of cross-examination today.         15       staff.       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       15         16       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       15         17       Ms. GafKen, are you able to hear me now?       16         18       MS. GAFKEN: I am, yes.       17         19       Would you like me to give my appearance now?       18         20       JUDGE HOWARD: Please. Thank you.       18         21       MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa       20         23       of public counsel.       20         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       21         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       25         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       24         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       25         26       We do ur first hybrid adjudication.       26         26       We do ur first hybrid adjudication.       27         27       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       28         28       M. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       11         29       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       11         21       Sorry about HA: We're just going to close one of them	12			
15       staff.         16       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         17       MS. Gafken, are you able to hear me now?         18       MS. Gafken, are you able to hear me now?         19       Would you like me to give my appearance now?         20       JUDGE HOWARD: Please. Thank you.         21       MS. Gafken, Assistant Attormey General, appearing on behalf         of public counsel.       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       25         26       Gafken, Assistant Attormey General, appearing on behalf of public counsel.       16         27       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       24         28       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       25         29       We do our first hybrid adjudication.       24         2       Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       3         3       Western Energy Consumers?       3         4       MS. CARSON: We got two computers in       1         7       And can we have an appearance for them tory       1         10       Can you hear me?       1         11       Sorry about that. We've got two computers in       1         12       the parties tok keep their microphones muted unless				-
16       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       16       break, and a lunch break, it is quite likely our hearing         17       Ms. GaFKEN: I any, es.       17         18       MS GAFKEN: I any, es.       17         20       JUDGE HOWARD: Please. Thank you.       17         21       MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa       20         22       Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf       20         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       20         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       22         26       we do our first hybrid adjudication.       22         26       We do our first hybrid adjudication.       23         26       We do our first hybrid adjudication.       24         27       We do our first hybrid adjudication.       26         28       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       17         30       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       18         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       10         7       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       10         7       Mac can we have an appearance for the Puyalup       17         7       Tribe?       9         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       10         10	14	and Judge Brown. Jeff Roberson, AAG for commissioned		
17       Ms. Gafken, are you able to hear me now?       17       Ms. Gafken, are you able to hear me now?         18       MS. GAFKEN: 1 an, yes.       This is our first adjudication at the Commission         19       Would you like me to give my appearance now?       This is our first adjudication at the Commission         20       JUDGE HOWARD: Please. Thank you.       This is our first adjudication at the Commission         21       MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa       Early on the in person, and 1 appreciate         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       If you're here in person, please try to speak         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       If you're here in person, please try to speak         25       And 1 appreciate everyone bearing with us while       Page 14         26       We do our first hybrid adjudication.       Page 14         27       We do our first hybrid adjudication.       Page 16         3       Western Energy Consumers?       And can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       MK. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       Page 16         4       Moser on behalf of AWEC.       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       And if a winess is appearing in the hearing       room, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyalup       Thole?       MR full_ER: You'Honor, I do have compoters in       If you're he	15			
18       MS. GAFKEN: 1 am, yes.       18       This is our first adjudication at the Commission as being held on a hybrid basis both in person here at the hearing room and online over Zoom. It's great to see many of you here in person, and 1 appreciate everyone bearing with us through some technical issues at the commission in the thearing room and online over Zoom. It's great to see many of you here in person, and 1 appreciate everyone bearing with us through some technical issues at first.         21       MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa       21         23       Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel.       21         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       21         25       And 1 appreciate everyone bearing with us while       22         Page 14         Page 16         Page 16         Page 16         Page 16         Page 16         Page 16<	16			
19       Would you like me to give my appearance now?       19       as being held on a hybrid basis both in person here at the hearing room and online over Zoom. It's great to see many of you here in person, and 1 appreciate overyone bearing with us through some technical issues at first.         21       MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. Wy name is Lisa       20         23       Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel.       19       as being held on a hybrid basis both in person here at the hearing room and online over Zoom. It's great to see many of you here in person, and 1 appreciate everyone bearing with us while         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       24         25       And 1 appreciate everyone bearing with us while       14         26       we do our first hybrid adjudication.       26         26       Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       1         3       Western Energy Consumers?       3         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       3         5       Moser on behalf of AWEC.       1         6       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       1         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7         7       MS. GARSON: We got wo computers in the room. Were just going to close on of them tory       10         8				
20       JUDGE HOWARD: Please. Thank you.       20       the hearing room and online over Zoom. It's great to see many of you here in person, and l appreciate everyone bearing with us through some technical issues at first.         21       GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa of public counsel.       20       the hearing room and online over Zoom. It's great to see many of you here in person, and l appreciate everyone bearing with us through some technical issues at first.         23       JUDDE HOWARD: Thank you.       21       the hearing room and online over Zoom. It's great to see many of you here in person, and l appreciate everyone bearing with us through some technical issues at first.         24       JUDDE HOWARD: Thank you.       21         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       22         26       reporter can make a clear record and those online can hear you are an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Moser on behaf of AWEC.       1         26       JUDDE HOWARD: Thank you.       7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7         36       Tribe?       9       MR, FULLER: Good morning.       6       1         37       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7       1       1       reporter can make a clear record and those online can hear you are any uper ance of the rot mains is andrew full representing the uparity.       1       1       reporter can make a clear record and those online can hear you are having any technical issue or				•
21       MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. My name is Lisa       21       see many of you here in person, and I appreciate         22       Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf       of public counsel.       23         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       24       If you're here in person, please try to speak         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       24       If you're here in person, please try to speak         26       And I appreciate overyone bearing with us while       25         27       And I appreciate overyone bearing with us while       26         28       Western Energy Consumers?       20         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       1         6       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       1         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyalup       7         6       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       6         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyalup       7         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyalup       7         8       they're speaking and also only to use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.       1         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       10       10         10       Can you hear me?       10       10       10 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
22       Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel.       22       everyone bearing with us through some technical issues at first.         23       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       24       If you're here in person, please try to speak directly into the bench microphone so that our court         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       24       If you're here in person, please try to speak directly into the bench microphone so that our court         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       25         26       We do our first hybrid adjudication.       24         2       Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       1         3       Western Energy Consumers?       And if a witness is appearing in the hearing room, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of their party.         4       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       7         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7         7       Mc. FULLER: Good morning.       7         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       9         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       10         10       Can you hear me?       10         11       Sorry about that. We've got two computers in the room. We're just going to close one of them to try is to get past that. Apologies.       11         12       the room. We're just going		-		
23       of public counsel.       23       at first.         24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       23       at first.         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       25       at first.         26       Dage 14       Page 16         27       Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       1       reporter can make a clear record and those online can hear you as well.         3       Western Energy Consumers?       3       And i a witness is appearing in the hearing room, they may feel free to sit next to the attormey of their party.         6       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       7       And i a witness is appearing in online, I would remind         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7       If you re listening in online, I would remind         8       Tribe?       If you are having any technical issue or you       observe that someone has dropped of the call, please         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       10       observe that someone has dropped of the call, please         14       This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup       11       observe that someone has dropped of the call, please         15       This of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.       12       Are there any questions or housekeeping matters         16       who are also from Perkins Coie represent		•		
24       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       24       If you're here in person, please try to speak directly into the bench microphone so that our court         25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       25       directly into the bench microphone so that our court         26       Page 14       Page 16         1       we do our first hybrid adjudication.       Page 16         2       Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       near you as well.         3       Western Energy Consumers?       3         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer       3         5       Mose on behalf of AWEC.       1         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7         8       Tribe?       9         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       9         10       Can you hear me?       10         11       Sorry about that. We've got two computers in       11         12       the room. We're just going to close one of them to try       12         13       to get past that. Apologies.       13         14       This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup       14         15       Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas				
25       And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while       25       directly into the bench microphone so that our court         21       Page 14       Page 16         1       we do our first hybrid adjudication.       Page 16         2       Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       Page 16         3       Western Energy Consumers?       And if a witness is appearing in the hearing         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning.       Page 16         5       Moser on behalf of AWEC.       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       And can we have an appearance for the Puyalup         8       Tribe?       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       If you're listening in online, I would remind         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       Page 10       If you are having any technical issue or you         10       Can you hear me?       In       In be aring when they have a speaking role.         11       Sorry about that. We've got two computers in       In       In be aring when they have a speaking role.         13       to get past that. Apologies.       In       In be aring use of the recent motions?         14       This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup       In       In the repuest for class certification.         15       And heary use also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound       In ther request for class certific				
Page 14       Page 16         1       we do our first hybrid adjudication.       1       reporter can make a clear record and those online can hear you as well.         2       Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       2       And if a witness is appearing in the hearing         3       Western Energy Consumers?       3       And if a witness is appearing in the hearing         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer       3       And if a witness is appearing in the hearing         6       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       6       If you're listening in online, I would remind         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7       the parties to keep their microphones muted unless         8       Tribe?       8       they're speaking and also only to use vide of or those         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       9       portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.         10       Can you hear me?       10       If you are having any technical issue or you         11       Sorry about that. We've got two computers in       11       observe that someone has dropped off the call, please         12       the room. We're just going to close one of them to try       12       to get past that. Apologies.       13         13       to get past that. Apologies.       13       14       Ar		-		
1       we do our first hybrid adjudication.       1       reporter can make a clear record and those online can hear you as well.         2       Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       3       Western Energy Consumers?       3         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer       3       And if a witness is appearing in the hearing room, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of         5       Moser on behalf of AWEC.       1       feer you as well.         6       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       6       their party.         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7       the parties to keep their microphones muted unless         8       Tribe?       9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       9         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       9       9         10       Can you hear me?       10       If you are having any technical issue or you         11       Sorry about that. We've got two computers in       11       observe that someone has dropped off the call, please         14       This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup       11       observe that someone has dropped off the call, please         16       with me.       11       observe there any questions or housekeeping matters         15       Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here       11<	25	And I appreciate everyone bearing with us while	25 direc	tly into the bench microphone so that our court
1       we do our first hybrid adjudication.       1       reporter can make a clear record and those online can hear you as well.         2       Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of       3       Western Energy Consumers?       3         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer       3       And if a witness is appearing in the hearing room, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of         5       Moser on behalf of AWEC.       1       room, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of         6       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       6       If you're listening in online, I would remind         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7       the parties to keep their microphones muted unless         8       Tribe?       9       Portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       9       portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.         10       Can you hear me?       10       If you are having any technical issue or you         11       Sorry about that. We've got two computers in       11       observe that someone has dropped off the call, please         14       This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup       11       observe that someone has dropped off the call, please         15       Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here       11				
2Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of2hear you as well.3Western Energy Consumers?3And if a witness is appearing in the hearing4MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer4room, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of5Moser on behalf of AWEC.5If you're listening in online, I would remind6JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.6If you're listening in online, I would remind7And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup7the parties to keep their microphones muted unless8Tribe?9MR. FULLER: Good morning.99MR. FULLER: Good morning.9portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.10Can you hear me?10If you are having any technical issue or you11Sorry about that. We've got two computers in1112the room. We're just going to close one of them to try1213to get past that. Apologies.1314This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup1415Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here1516with me.1617JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also1910Ms. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also1912Filler ergy.2424MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24		Page 14		Dago 16
2Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of2hear you as well.3Western Energy Consumers?3And if a witness is appearing in the hearing4MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer3And if a witness is appearing in the hearing5Moser on behalf of AWEC.5Trom, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of6JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.6If you're listening in online, I would remind7And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup7the parties to keep their microphones muted unless8Tribe?8they're speaking and also only to use video for those9MR. FULLER: Good morning.9110Can you hear me?10If you're listening in online, I would remind11Sorry about that. We've got two computers in11observe that someone has dropped off the call, please12the room. We're just going to close one of them to try12feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be13to get past that. Apologies.13reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup14only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16We filed a petition for class certification.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have		10.90 11		Page 10
3       Western Energy Consumers?       3       And if a witness is appearing in the hearing         4       MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer       4       room, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of         5       Moser on behalf of AWEC.       5       their party.         6       JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.       6       If you're listening in online, I would remind         7       And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup       7       If you're listening in online, I would remind         8       Tribe?       8       they're speaking and also only to use video for those         9       MR. FULLER: Good morning.       9       portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.         10       Can you hear me?       10       If you are having any technical issue or you         11       Sorry about that. We've got two computers in       11       observe that someone has dropped off the call, please         12       the room. We're just going to close one of them to try       12       feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be         13       to get past that. Apologies.       13       reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks         14       This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup       14       All right. Hearing none         15       Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also her	1		1 repo	
5Moser on behalf of AWEC.5their party.6JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.6If you're listening in online, I would remind7And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup7the parties to keep their microphones muted unless8Tribe?8they're speaking and also only to use video for those9MR. FULLER: Good morning.9portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.10Can you hear me?10If you are having any technical issue or you11Sorry about that. We've got two computers in11observe that someone has dropped off the call, please12the room. We're just going to close one of them to try12feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be13to get past that. Apologies.13reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup14only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20We filed a petition for class certification.21We a also fr		we do our first hybrid adjudication.	-	orter can make a clear record and those online can
6JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.6If you're listening in online, I would remind7And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup7the parties to keep their microphones muted unless8Tribe?8they're speaking and also only to use video for those9MR. FULLER: Good morning.9portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.10Can you hear me?10If you are having any technical issue or you11Sorry about that. We've got two computers in11observe that someone has dropped off the call, please12the room. We're just going to close one of them to try12feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be13to get past that. Apologies.13reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup14only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20We filed a petition for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification.22believe AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the<	2	we do our first hybrid adjudication. Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of	2 hea	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well.
7And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup7the parties to keep their microphones muted unless8Tribe?8they're speaking and also only to use video for those9MR. FULLER: Good morning.9portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.10Can you hear me?10If you are having any technical issue or you11Sorry about that. We've got two computers in11observe that someone has dropped off the call, please12the room. We're just going to close one of them to try12feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be13to get past that. Apologies.13reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup14only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,21We filed a petition for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification.22Lenergy.22believe AWEC has as well. We recent	2 3	we do our first hybrid adjudication. Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers?	2 hea 3	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing
8Tribe?8they're speaking and also only to use video for those9MR. FULLER: Good morning.9portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.10Can you hear me?10If you are having any technical issue or you11Sorry about that. We've got two computers in11observe that someone has dropped off the call, please12the room. We're just going to close one of them to try12feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be13to get past that. Apologies.13reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup14only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20regarding the request for class certification.21Lenergy.JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.2323JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.24their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4	we do our first hybrid adjudication. Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers? MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer	2 hea 3 4 roor	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing n, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of
9MR. FULLER: Good morning.9portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.10Can you hear me?10If you are having any technical issue or you11Sorry about that. We've got two computers in11observe that someone has dropped off the call, please12the room. We're just going to close one of them to try12feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be13to get past that. Apologies.13reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup14only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20We filed a petition for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification.22JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.2324MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5	we do our first hybrid adjudication. Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers? MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC.	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing n, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party.
10Can you hear me?10If you are having any technical issue or you11Sorry about that. We've got two computers in11observe that someone has dropped off the call, please12the room. We're just going to close one of them to try12feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be13to get past that. Apologies.13reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup14only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20regarding the request for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification.22Energy.22believe AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24	2 3 4 5 6	we do our first hybrid adjudication. Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers? MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing n, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind
11Sorry about that. We've got two computers in11observe that someone has dropped off the call, please12the room. We're just going to close one of them to try13to get past that. Apologies.1214This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup13reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20We filed a petition for class certification.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22believe AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24	2 3 4 5 6 7	we do our first hybrid adjudication. Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers? MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup Tribe?	<ul> <li>2 hea</li> <li>3</li> <li>4 roor</li> <li>5 their</li> <li>6</li> <li>7 the</li> </ul>	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing n, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless
12the room. We're just going to close one of them to try to get past that. Apologies.12feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks only.14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup 15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.12feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.141416MS. CARSON: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I can hear you fine just fine now.17All right. Hearing none MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's regarding the request for class certification.19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson, 2020We filed a petition for class certification.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22believe AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the Commission issued a determination in a related hearing that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	we do our first hybrid adjudication. Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers? MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup Tribe?	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing n, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless dre speaking and also only to use video for those
13to get past that. Apologies.13reserve for technical issues and requests for breaks14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup14only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20we filed a petition for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification. I23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23Commission issued a determination in a related hearing24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we do our first hybrid adjudication. Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers? MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup Tribe? MR. FULLER: Good morning.	<ul> <li>2 hea</li> <li>3</li> <li>4 roor</li> <li>5 their</li> <li>6</li> <li>7 the</li> <li>8 they</li> <li>9 port</li> </ul>	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.
14This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup14only.15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20we filed a petition for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification.23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23DUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.2324MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	we do our first hybrid adjudication. Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers? MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup Tribe? MR. FULLER: Good morning. Can you hear me?	<ul> <li>2 hea</li> <li>3</li> <li>4 roor</li> <li>5 their</li> <li>6</li> <li>7 the</li> <li>8 they</li> <li>9 port</li> <li>10</li> </ul>	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing n, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless r're speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you
15Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here15Are there any questions or housekeeping matters16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20regarding the request for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification.23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23Commission issued a determination in a related hearing24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of</li> <li>Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in</li> <li>the room. We're just going to close one of them to try</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obs 12 feel	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be
16with me.16before we go on to the issue of the recent motions?17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20regarding the request for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification.23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23Commission issued a determination in a related hearing24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of</li> <li>Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in</li> <li>the room. We're just going to close one of them to try</li> <li>to get past that. Apologies.</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obs 12 feel	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be
17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I17All right. Hearing none18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20regarding the request for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification.22Energy.22believe AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23Commission issued a determination in a related hearing24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of</li> <li>Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in</li> <li>the room. We're just going to close one of them to try</li> <li>to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obse 12 feel 13 rese	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks
18can hear you fine just fine now.18MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20regarding the request for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification.23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23Commission issued a determination in a related hearing24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of</li> <li>Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in</li> <li>the room. We're just going to close one of them to try</li> <li>to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obse 12 feel 13 rese 14 only	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks
19MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also19to inquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's20wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,20regarding the request for class certification.21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification. I22Energy.22believe AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23Commission issued a determination in a related hearing24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in the room. We're just going to close one of them to try to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obse 12 feel 13 rese 14 only 15 16 befo	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks the there any questions or housekeeping matters ore we go on to the issue of the recent motions?
<ul> <li>wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,</li> <li>who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound</li> <li>Energy.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to</li> <li>regarding the request for class certification.</li> <li>We filed a petition for class certification. I</li> <li>believe AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the</li> <li>Commission issued a determination in a related hearing</li> <li>that their petitions have been filed more recently and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in the room. We're just going to close one of them to try to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obse 12 feel 13 rese 14 only 15 16 befo	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks the there any questions or housekeeping matters ore we go on to the issue of the recent motions?
21who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound21We filed a petition for class certification. I22Energy.22believe AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23Commission issued a determination in a related hearing24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of</li> <li>Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in</li> <li>the room. We're just going to close one of them to try</li> <li>to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here</li> <li>with me.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I</li> <li>can hear you fine just fine now.</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obs 12 feel 13 rese 14 only 15 16 befo 17 18	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless 're speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks '. Are there any questions or housekeeping matters ore we go on to the issue of the recent motions? All right. Hearing none MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing
22Energy.22believe AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23Commission issued a determination in a related hearing24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in the room. We're just going to close one of them to try to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I can hear you fine just fine now.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also</li> </ul>	2hea34roor5their677they9port101111obsi12feel13rese14only151616befo171819to in	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless 're speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks '. Are there any questions or housekeeping matters ore we go on to the issue of the recent motions? All right. Hearing none MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing iquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's
23JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.23Commission issued a determination in a related hearing24MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to24that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of</li> <li>Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in</li> <li>the room. We're just going to close one of them to try</li> <li>to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here</li> <li>with me.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I</li> <li>can hear you fine just fine now.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also</li> <li>wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson,</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obse 12 feel 13 rese 14 only 15 16 befo 17 18 19 to in 20 rega	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks the there any questions or housekeeping matters ore we go on to the issue of the recent motions? All right. Hearing none MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing iquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's arding the request for class certification.
24 MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to 24 that their petitions have been filed more recently and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in the room. We're just going to close one of them to try to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I can hear you fine just fine now.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson, who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obse 12 feel 13 rese 14 only 15 16 befo 17 18 19 to in 20 rega 21	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks the averge on to the issue of the recent motions? All right. Hearing none MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing equire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's arding the request for class certification. We filed a petition for class certification. I
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer</li> <li>Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in the room. We're just going to close one of them to try to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup</li> <li>Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I can hear you fine just fine now.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson, who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 hea</li> <li>3</li> <li>4 roor</li> <li>5 their</li> <li>6</li> <li>7 the</li> <li>8 they</li> <li>9 port</li> <li>10</li> <li>11 obse</li> <li>12 feel</li> <li>13 rese</li> <li>14 only</li> <li>15</li> <li>16 befo</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19 to in</li> <li>20 rega</li> <li>21</li> <li>22 belia</li> </ul>	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless the speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks the there any questions or housekeeping matters ore we go on to the issue of the recent motions? All right. Hearing none MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing iquire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's arding the request for class certification. We filed a petition for class certification. I eve AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in the room. We're just going to close one of them to try to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I can hear you fine just fine now.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson, who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 hea</li> <li>3</li> <li>4 roor</li> <li>5 theii</li> <li>6</li> <li>7 the</li> <li>8 they</li> <li>9 port</li> <li>10</li> <li>11 obse</li> <li>12 feel</li> <li>13 rese</li> <li>14 only</li> <li>15</li> <li>16 befo</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19 to in</li> <li>20 rega</li> <li>21</li> <li>22 belia</li> <li>23 Con</li> </ul>	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless dre speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks dre there any questions or housekeeping matters be we go on to the issue of the recent motions? All right. Hearing none MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing quire about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's arding the request for class certification. We filed a petition for class certification. I eve AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the mission issued a determination in a related hearing
25 make sure for the record that they are listed. 25 just would like to inquire as to the status 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	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in the room. We're just going to close one of them to try to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I can hear you fine just fine now.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson, who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: We got cut off, but wanted to</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obse 12 feel 13 rese 14 only 15 16 befo 17 18 19 to in 20 rega 21 22 belie 23 Con 24 that	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless 're speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks '. Are there any questions or housekeeping matters ore we go on to the issue of the recent motions? All right. Hearing none MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing require about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's arding the request for class certification. We filed a petition for class certification. I eve AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the mission issued a determination in a related hearing their petitions have been filed more recently and
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>we do our first hybrid adjudication.</li> <li>Can we have an appearance for AWEC, Alliance of Western Energy Consumers?</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Yes. Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>And can we have an appearance for the Puyallup Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Good morning.</li> <li>Can you hear me?</li> <li>Sorry about that. We've got two computers in the room. We're just going to close one of them to try to get past that. Apologies.</li> <li>This is Andrew Fuller representing the Puyallup Tribe of Indians. My colleague Nick Thomas is also here with me.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Fuller, and I can hear you fine just fine now.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Your Honor, if I might, I also wanted to introduce Byron Starkey and Pamela Anderson, who are also from Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.</li> </ul>	2 hea 3 4 roor 5 their 6 7 the 8 they 9 port 10 11 obse 12 feel 13 rese 14 only 15 16 befo 17 18 19 to in 20 rega 21 22 belie 23 Con 24 that	orter can make a clear record and those online can r you as well. And if a witness is appearing in the hearing m, they may feel free to sit next to the attorney of r party. If you're listening in online, I would remind parties to keep their microphones muted unless 're speaking and also only to use video for those ions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issue or you erve that someone has dropped off the call, please free to mention that in the chat, which should be erve for technical issues and requests for breaks '. Are there any questions or housekeeping matters ore we go on to the issue of the recent motions? All right. Hearing none MR. FULLER: Your Honor, I do have one thing require about on behalf of the Tribe, and it's arding the request for class certification. We filed a petition for class certification. I eve AWEC has as well. We recently saw that the mission issued a determination in a related hearing their petitions have been filed more recently and

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

	Page 17		Page 19
1	response to the Tribe's petition, and I imagine AWEC may	1	costs were not specifically at issue, which would help
2	be interested in that response as well.		address why this issue developed in the way it did in
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Do you have the docket number		the testimony in this case. The motion to revise
4	where a petition class certification was filed? Was		testimony filed by PSE is granted. I'm persuaded that
5	that filed with the Commission?		this revision that these revisions to Susan Free's
6	MR. FULLER: Yes. It was the tribe's was		testimony are very limited in scope. They're reflecting
7	filed on July 28th, 2023. AWEC's was filed on July		the company's additional investigation, and that, again,
8	19th, 2023. It would be in this docket. I can pull up	8	the company relied upon language in the earlier final
9	the docket number really quick.	9	order that legal costs were not specifically at issue
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, I see. Are you asking	10	suggesting that legal costs would not be specifically at
11	about the the Docket 220066 where we entered the	11	issue in this proceeding. And those are our rulings on
12	order for case certifications?	12	those motions.
13	MR. FULLER: The one that was recently	13	And I just want to add that I'm not directly
14	issued was the one that was issued in the recent		trying to I'm not trying to speak for the
15	matter was on October 31st, and I believe that is the		commissioners or how they might rule in their final
16	correct docket number. And here, let's see, one quick	16	order in this case on any of these issues.
17	second. I'll pull up the actual docket number of our	17	With that, let's turn to the admission of the
18	petition. I guess it's within Docket No. 230393.		pretrial testimony and exhibits.
19	It doesn't have a specific docket entry number.	19	In my e-mail to the parties last week, I
20	It's a petition that was filed by the Tribe on July		circulated our exhibit list. I included all pre-filed
21	28th, 2023. A similar petition for case certification		exhibits and testimony up to and including cross
22	and notice to intent to request fund grant was filed		exhibits. This morning on my own copy, I add the
23	by AWEC on July 19th, 2023. I do not believe that		revision to Susan Free's testimony, SCF-4T showing it
24	there's been any ruling issued on this.		was revised on October 31st.
25	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for alerting me to	25	Do the parties stipulate to the admission of all
	$\mathbf{D}$		Dage 20
1	Page 18	1 1	Page 20
1	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll		the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have
2	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today.	2 ;	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company?
2 3	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class	2 ; 3	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the
2 3 4	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a	2 ; 3 4	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits.
2 3 4 5	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment.	2 ; 3 4   5	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My	2 ; 3 4   5 6	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff?
2 3 4 5	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies.	2 ; 3 4   5 6 7	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem.	2 ; 3 4   5 6 7 8 1	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the
2 3 4 5 6 7	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have	2 ; 3 4   5 6 7 8 1	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem.	2 ; 3 4   5 6 7 8 1 9	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's	2 ; 3 4   5 6 7 8 1 9   10	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file	2 ; 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 9 10 11 12	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because	2 ; 3 4   5 6 7 8 1 9   10 11 12 13 ;	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. MS. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about	2 ; 3 4   5 6 7 8 1 9   10 11 12 13 ; 14 1	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my	2 ; 3 4   5 6 7 8 1 9   10 11 12 13 ; 14 1 15	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my rulings on this fairly concise. The motion to strike is denied. This is a essentially a discovery dispute over a failure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 9 1 10 11 12 13 5 14 1 15 1 16 7 17 9	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the beginning when you were asking us for these statements. Were you also including any of the cross exhibits that were offered?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my rulings on this fairly concise. The motion to strike is denied. This is a essentially a discovery dispute over a failure alleged failure to supplement discovery responses, and,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 9 1 10 11 12 13 5 14 1 15 1 16 7 18	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the beginning when you were asking us for these statements. Were you also including any of the cross exhibits that were offered? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my rulings on this fairly concise. The motion to strike is denied. This is a essentially a discovery dispute over a failure alleged failure to supplement discovery responses, and, of course, the duty to supplement is a serious duty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 9 14 1 15 1 16 9 17 9 18 19	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the beginning when you were asking us for these statements. Were you also including any of the cross exhibits that were offered? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MS. GAFKEN: Or just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my rulings on this fairly concise. The motion to strike is denied. This is a essentially a discovery dispute over a failure alleged failure to supplement discovery responses, and, of course, the duty to supplement is a serious duty. But at the same time, there was a failure to confer in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 9 1 10 11 12 13 3 14 1 15 1 16 7 18 19 20	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the beginning when you were asking us for these statements. Were you also including any of the cross exhibits that were offered? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MS. GAFKEN: Or just JUDGE HOWARD: This includes all the cross
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my rulings on this fairly concise. The motion to strike is denied. This is a essentially a discovery dispute over a failure alleged failure to supplement discovery responses, and, of course, the duty to supplement is a serious duty. But at the same time, there was a failure to confer in this instance, and response testimony does not equate to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 9 1 10 11 12 13 9 14 1 15 1 16 7 18 19 20 21 6	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the beginning when you were asking us for these statements. Were you also including any of the cross exhibits that were offered? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MS. GAFKEN: Or just JUDGE HOWARD: This includes all the cross exhibits and the revised testimony as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my rulings on this fairly concise. The motion to strike is denied. This is a essentially a discovery dispute over a failure alleged failure to supplement discovery responses, and, of course, the duty to supplement is a serious duty. But at the same time, there was a failure to confer in this instance, and response testimony does not equate to conferring with a meeting of the rules in an effort to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 9 1 10 11 12 13 9 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 6 21 6	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the beginning when you were asking us for these statements. Were you also including any of the cross exhibits that were offered? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MS. GAFKEN: Or just JUDGE HOWARD: This includes all the cross exhibits and the revised testimony as well. MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. Thank you. My
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my rulings on this fairly concise. The motion to strike is denied. This is a essentially a discovery dispute over a failure alleged failure to supplement discovery responses, and, of course, the duty to supplement is a serious duty. But at the same time, there was a failure to confer in this instance, and response testimony does not equate to conferring with a meeting of the rules in an effort to resolve the discovery dispute.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 9 1 10 1 12 1 13 5 14 1 15 1 16 7 18 1 19 20 21 0 21 0 22 23 5	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the beginning when you were asking us for these statements. Were you also including any of the cross exhibits that were offered? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MS. GAFKEN: Or just JUDGE HOWARD: This includes all the cross exhibits and the revised testimony as well. MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. Thank you. My stipulation remains unchanged.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today.</li> <li>I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: No problem.</li> <li>So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my rulings on this fairly concise.</li> <li>The motion to strike is denied. This is a essentially a discovery dispute over a failure alleged failure to supplement discovery responses, and, of course, the duty to supplement is a serious duty.</li> <li>But at the same time, there was a failure to confer in this instance, and response testimony does not equate to conferring with a meeting of the rules in an effort to resolve the discovery dispute.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 7 9 1 10 11 12 13 9 14 1 15 1 16 7 18 19 20 21 6 22 23 9 24	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the beginning when you were asking us for these statements. Were you also including any of the cross exhibits that were offered? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MS. GAFKEN: Or just JUDGE HOWARD: This includes all the cross exhibits and the revised testimony as well. MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. Thank you. My stipulation remains unchanged. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that issue. I will certainly look into that and we'll provide any necessary rulings after this hearing today. I apologize. At first, I thought you said class certification, so I was questioning what I heard for a moment. MR. FULLER: I may have misspoke. My apologies. JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. So turning to the two recent motions, we have public counsel's motion to strike portions of PSE's rebuttal testimony and PSE's motion for lead to file revised testimony. Both motions are related because they concern PSE providing additional testimony about its legal costs in rebuttal. I'm going to keep my rulings on this fairly concise. The motion to strike is denied. This is a essentially a discovery dispute over a failure alleged failure to supplement discovery responses, and, of course, the duty to supplement is a serious duty. But at the same time, there was a failure to confer in this instance, and response testimony does not equate to conferring with a meeting of the rules in an effort to resolve the discovery dispute.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 9 1 10 1 12 1 13 5 14 1 15 1 16 7 18 1 19 20 21 0 21 0 22 23 5	the pre-filed exhibits and testimony, or do they have any objections? I would turn first to the Company? MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Can I hear from the staff? MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also stipulate to the admission of the exhibits and the testimony the pre-filed exhibits and the testimony. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, can I hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Public counsel will also stipulate to the admission of the pretrial exhibits and testimony. I apologize. I didn't quite hear at the beginning when you were asking us for these statements. Were you also including any of the cross exhibits that were offered? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MS. GAFKEN: Or just JUDGE HOWARD: This includes all the cross exhibits and the revised testimony as well. MS. GAFKEN: Perfect. Thank you. My stipulation remains unchanged.

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

Page 21Page 211MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. AWEC1microphone.2stipulates.2Mr. Roberson, go ahead.3JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.3MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judges H4Ms. Moser would you mind repeating yourself? It45came through a little unclear on my end.56MS. MOSER: I apologize. Can you hear me?67JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.78MS. MOSER: Okay. AWEC will also stipulate89to the admission of the testimony exhibits.910JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.1011Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?1112MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also1213stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.1314JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.1415I'm going to indicate that all the pre-filed testimony1515I'm going to indicate that all the pre-filed testimony15	on. ould ne is C? I and
<ul> <li>stipulates.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.</li> <li>Ms. Moser would you mind repeating yourself? It</li> <li>came through a little unclear on my end.</li> <li>MS. MOSER: I apologize. Can you hear me?</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Okay. AWEC will also stipulate</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Okay. AWEC will also stipulate</li> <li>to the admission of the testimony exhibits.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also</li> <li>stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes. All right. Thank you all.</li> <li>MS. MOSER: All right. Thank you all.</li> <li>MS. MOSER: Chay All right. Thank you all.</li> </ul>	on. ould ne is C? I and
3JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.3MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judges H4Ms. Moser would you mind repeating yourself? It3MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judges H5came through a little unclear on my end.4and Brown, Commissioners. My name is Jeff Robers6MS. MOSER: I apologize. Can you hear me?5I'm an AAG attorney for staff.7JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.6JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Gafken, w8MS. MOSER: Okay. AWEC will also stipulate8MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Good morning. My name9to the admission of the testimony exhibits.9Lisa Gafken. I'm the assistant attorney general10JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10appearing on behalf of public counsel.11Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?11JUDGE HOWARD: Can we hear from AWE12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	on. ould ne is C? I and
4Ms. Moser would you mind repeating yourself? It4and Brown, Commissioners. My name is Jeff Robers5came through a little unclear on my end.5I'm an AAG attorney for staff.6MS. MOSER: I apologize. Can you hear me?6JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Gafken, w7JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.78MS. MOSER: Okay. AWEC will also stipulate8MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Good morning. My name9to the admission of the testimony exhibits.9Lisa Gafken. I'm the assistant attorney general10JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10appearing on behalf of public counsel.11Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?11JUDGE HOWARD: Can we hear from AWE12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	on. ould ne is C? I and
5came through a little unclear on my end.5I'm an AAG attorney for staff.6MS. MOSER: I apologize. Can you hear me?6JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Gafken, w7JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.6JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Gafken, w8MS. MOSER: Okay. AWEC will also stipulate8MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Good morning. My nar9to the admission of the testimony exhibits.9Lisa Gafken. I'm the assistant attorney general10JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10appearing on behalf of public counsel.11Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?11JUDGE HOWARD: Can we hear from AWE12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	ould le is C? I and
6MS. MOSER: I apologize. Can you hear me?6JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Gafken, w7JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.7you like to give your appearance.8MS. MOSER: Okay. AWEC will also stipulate8MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Good morning. My nar9to the admission of the testimony exhibits.9Lisa Gafken. I'm the assistant attorney general10JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10appearing on behalf of public counsel.11Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?11JUDGE HOWARD: Can we hear from AWE12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	ie is C? I and
7JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.7you like to give your appearance.8MS. MOSER: Okay. AWEC will also stipulate8MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Good morning. My nar9to the admission of the testimony exhibits.9Lisa Gafken. I'm the assistant attorney general10JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10appearing on behalf of public counsel.11Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?11JUDGE HOWARD: Can we hear from AWE12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	ie is C? I and
8MS. MOSER: Okay. AWEC will also stipulate8MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Good morning. My nar9to the admission of the testimony exhibits.9Lisa Gafken. I'm the assistant attorney general10JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10appearing on behalf of public counsel.11Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?11JUDGE HOWARD: Can we hear from AWE12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	)? Land
9to the admission of the testimony exhibits.9Lisa Gafken. I'm the assistant attorney general10JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10appearing on behalf of public counsel.11Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?11JUDGE HOWARD: Can we hear from AWE12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	)? Land
10JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10appearing on behalf of public counsel.11Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?11JUDGE HOWARD: Can we hear from AWE12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appearing14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	and
11Can I hear from the Puyallup Tribe?11JUDGE HOWARD: Can we hear from AWE12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14	and
12MR. FULLER: Yes. The Puyallup Tribe also12MS. MOSER: Good morning, Judges Howar13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	and
13stipulates to the admission of the testimony exhibits.13Brown. My name is Sommer Moser, and I'm appeari14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	
14JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.14behalf of AWEC.	gon
16     and exhibits, as I've discussed, are admitted without     16     Can we hear from the tribe?	
17     exception, including the recent revision to SCF-4T.     17     MR. FULLER: Good morning, Judge Howard	
18     And I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to     18     Good morning, Commissioners.	
19     the court reporter so that will be made part of the     19     My name is Andrew Fuller. I work for Ogden	
20 record after our hearing today. 20 Murphy Wallace, and today I represent the Puyallup	ribe
21 And the commissioners should be joining us in 21 of Indians. My colleague Nicholas Thomas from Ogd	
22 just a moment. Let's go off the record for just for a 22 Murphy Wallace is also here.	
23 minute or two. 23 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	
24 (Pause in the proceedings.) 24 As I indicated, we will allow each party the	
25 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. 25 opportunity for brief opening statement today.	
Page 22 Pag	e 24
1 All right. The commissioners have joined us in 1 Let's go first to the Company.	
2 the hearing room, and I will just note for the 2 MS. CARSON: Good morning, Chair Danner,	
3 commissioners that all the pre-trial testimony and 3 Commissioner Rendahl, Commission Doumit, Judge Ho	ward.
4 exhibits have been admitted, including the revised 4 and Judge Brown.	,
5 SCF-4T that I e-mailed you to you just now. 5 Thank you for the opportunity to provide this	
6 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: You didn't put in an 6 opening statement.	
7 attachment? 7 There are four points from PSE's testimony that	
8 JUDGE HOWARD: I just sent over an e-mail. 8 I want to highlight this morning. First is the proper	
9 All right. Can we have the parties provide 9 scope of this proceeding, which is the reasonableness of	
brief appearances for the commissioners, beginning with 10 costs incurred by PSE after the decision to build the	
11 PSE. 11 Tacoma LNG facility in 2016. Second, post 2016 costs	
12 MS. CARSON: Good morning, Commissioners. 12 were reasonable, prudent, and should be allowed in	
13 My name is Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie. I 13 rates. Third, Tacoma LNG facility has been a capacity	
represent Puget Sound Energy. Also with me are Pamela 14 resource for customers since February 2022 and is use	i
15 Anderson and Byron Starkey, also with Perkins 15 and useful. And fourth, PSE improved the Tacoma LNC	
16 representing PSE. 16 site and surrounding areas and those benefits continue	
17 MR. ROBERSON: Judge Howard, I note that Ms. 17 to accrue to the residence of the area, including the	
18 Gafken just dropped in the chat that they're not getting 18 Tribe.	
19 audio again, so we may want to halt for a second. 19 So let's start with the scope of the proceeding.	
20 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for 20 In paragraph 52 of the 2022 general rate case final	
21 letting me know. 21 order, the Commission concluded PSE acted prudently	۱
22 Ms. Gafken, can you hear me right now? 22 developing and constructing the facility up through the	
23 Okay. Ms. Gafken, can you hear me right now? 23 board of the directors' decision to authorize	
24 MS. GAFKEN: Yes, we can. 24 construction on September 22, 2016. The Commission	
25 JUDGE HOWARD: It helps if I turn on my 25 allowed the parties to review and challenge subsequent	

	Page 25	]	Page 27
1	construction and operation costs in this proceeding.	1 affected the timing of the construction, contract	with
2	And again, in an order in this proceeding, the	2 Chicago Bridge and Iron.	
3	Commission stated, the Commission considers the	3 It's important to remember that PSE's IRP	's and
4	Commission will consider the prudence and reasonableness	4 updated load forecasts continue to show a need	
5	of the investments and decisions the company made after	5 resource, for the Tacoma LNG resource throug	hout the
6	September 22, 2016, when the decision to build Tacoma	6 construction of the facility, in 2017 IRP, and 201	19 IRP
7	LNG facility was made.	7 progress report, and in the 2021 IRP.	
8	There are several issues that parties seek to	8 Also important to remember is that when t	he new
9	relitigate, and the Commission should decline to do so.	9 public interest standard in RCW 80.28.425 tool	
10	First, these are the design day standards, which public	10 July 1, 2021, which of course allowed but does	
11	counsel, again, argues is outdated despite the	11 require the Commission to consider such factor	's as
12	Commission stating that PSE appropriately based planning	12 equity and environmental health, at this time,	
13	decisions on its design day standard. This is the same	13 construction of the Tacoma LNG facility was 10	0 percent
14	standard PSE has used in subsequent IRPs in 2017 and	14 complete, as Mr. Roberts has testified.	
15	2021, which were acknowledged by the Commission.	As in the 2020 general rate case, the Com	
16	Another issue that parties seek to relitigate is	should not retroactively apply a legal standard t	hat was
17	the fact that PSE customers benefit from changes to the	17 not yet enacted to this facility.	lable ee
18 19	liquefaction equipment to address changes in the	<ol> <li>My third point, Tacoma LNG has been ava</li> <li>a capacity resource since February 2022. The</li> </ol>	
20	composition of feed gas, specifically removing more of the heavy hydrocarbons from the feed gas. And air	<ol> <li>a capacity resource since February 2022. The</li> <li>began commercial operations in February 2022</li> </ol>	
21	quality issues, these issues are within the purview of	<ul> <li>began commercial operations in rebrdary 2022</li> <li>been available to provide capacity to PSE nature</li> </ul>	
22	the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, or PSCAA, and the	22 customer since that time, and as the Commissi	•
23	Pollution Control Hearings Board, or the PCHB. These	<ul><li>in the final order in the 2022 GRC, capacity by i</li></ul>	
24	are the agencies with expertise in all air qualities	<ul> <li>provides a benefit for customers and is a used</li> </ul>	
25	issues. The Commission has indicated it will not second	25 useful resource.	
	Page 26	]	Page 28
			raye 20
1	guess determinations by more specialized environmental	1 On several days during the winter of 2023, t	
1 2	guess determinations by more specialized environmental health agencies.	<ol> <li>On several days during the winter of 2023, t</li> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> </ol>	he
			he stomers
2	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues	2 Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus	he stomers peline
2 3 4 5	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is
2 3 4 5 6	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated.	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is
2 3 4 5 6 7	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollution</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollur</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> </ul>	he tomers peline is of tion h
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollur</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable,	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged witt</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent of</li> </ul>	he tomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent v</li> <li>statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> </ul>	he tomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollur</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent v</li> <li>statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> <li>health.</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged witt</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent v</li> <li>statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> <li>health.</li> <li>In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro-</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human ovided
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has properly allocated costs between PSE and Puget LNG.	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent v</li> <li>statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> <li>health.</li> <li>In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro</li> <li>benefits to the surrounding community, including</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human ovided the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent vi</li> <li>statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> <li>health.</li> <li>In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro</li> <li>benefits to the surrounding community, including</li> <li>Tribe. PSE built Tacoma LNG on ground fill sites</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human ovided the s that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has properly allocated costs between PSE and Puget LNG. In 2018, PSE conducted a reevaluation of the	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent v</li> <li>statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> <li>health.</li> <li>In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro</li> <li>benefits to the surrounding community, including</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human ovided the s that led
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has properly allocated costs between PSE and Puget LNG. In 2018, PSE conducted a reevaluation of the need and alternatives when PSCAA required a supplemental	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent vi</li> <li>statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> <li>health.</li> <li>In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro</li> <li>benefits to the surrounding community, including</li> <li>Tribe. PSE built Tacoma LNG on ground fill sites</li> <li>contained multiple abandoned buildings, chipping</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human ovided the s that led eases.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has properly allocated costs between PSE and Puget LNG. In 2018, PSE conducted a reevaluation of the need and alternatives when PSCAA required a supplemental EIS. The Tacoma LNG facility remained the prudent	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollur</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent vi</li> <li>statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> <li>health.</li> <li>In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro</li> <li>benefits to the surrounding community, including</li> <li>Tribe. PSE built Tacoma LNG on ground fill sites</li> <li>contained multiple abandoned buildings, chipping</li> <li>paint, asbestos, and uncontrolled storm water reliated</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human ovided the s that led eases. quare feet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has properly allocated costs between PSE and Puget LNG. In 2018, PSE conducted a reevaluation of the need and alternatives when PSCAA required a supplemental EIS. The Tacoma LNG facility remained the prudent alternative.	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent vistatutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> <li>health.</li> <li>In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro</li> <li>benefits to the surrounding community, including</li> <li>Tribe. PSE built Tacoma LNG on ground fill sites</li> <li>contained multiple abandoned buildings, chipping</li> <li>paint, asbestos, and uncontrolled storm water reli</li> <li>PSE remediated and demolished over 350,000 stores</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human ovided the a that led eases. quare feet ,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has properly allocated costs between PSE and Puget LNG. In 2018, PSE conducted a reevaluation of the need and alternatives when PSCAA required a supplemental EIS. The Tacoma LNG facility remained the prudent alternative. Factors beyond PSE's control have increased the	<ul> <li>Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus</li> <li>for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi</li> <li>was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the</li> <li>capacity resource.</li> <li>And my fourth point, PSE improved the site</li> <li>the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the</li> <li>facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the</li> <li>surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut</li> <li>Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged wit</li> <li>ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma</li> <li>a minor source and its emissions are consistent v</li> <li>statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to</li> <li>health.</li> <li>In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro</li> <li>benefits to the surrounding community, including</li> <li>Tribe. PSE built Tacoma LNG on ground fill sites</li> <li>contained multiple abandoned buildings, chipping</li> <li>paint, asbestos, and uncontrolled storm water rel</li> <li>PSE remediated and demolished over 350,000 sc</li> </ul>	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human ovided the s that led eases. quare feet , ions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has properly allocated costs between PSE and Puget LNG. In 2018, PSE conducted a reevaluation of the need and alternatives when PSCAA required a supplemental EIS. The Tacoma LNG facility remained the prudent alternative. Factors beyond PSE's control have increased the cost of the project. These factors include protracted litigation by the Tribe and other that increased legal costs and permitting delays due to the requirement of a	2Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus3for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi4was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the5capacity resource.6And my fourth point, PSE improved the site7the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the8facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the9surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollut10Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged with11ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma12a minor source and its emissions are consistent with13statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to14health.15In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro16benefits to the surrounding community, including17Tribe. PSE built Tacoma LNG on ground fill sites18contained multiple abandoned buildings, chipping19paint, asbestos, and uncontrolled storm water refe20PSE remediated and demolished over 350,000 sc21of buildings, recycling 83 percent of the materials22cleaned up the site, planted vegetation along port23of the green buffer, and installed a storm water sy24that provides for treatment of diffuse water source	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human bvided the s that led eases. quare feet , ions ystem
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	health agencies. And another issue is a false allegations that PSE plans to transport LNG by rail. All those issues were address in the 2022 general rate case and should not be relitigated. My second point is post 2016 costs are reasonable and appropriate and should be recovered in rates. The pre-file direct testimony of Ron Roberts sets forth the details of the construction of the company LNG facility and demonstrates that the construction and the operation costs were reasonable, appropriate, and prudent. PSE proceeded with construction after the Commission issued its cost allocation order in Docet UG-151663, and PSE has properly allocated costs between PSE and Puget LNG. In 2018, PSE conducted a reevaluation of the need and alternatives when PSCAA required a supplemental EIS. The Tacoma LNG facility remained the prudent alternative. Factors beyond PSE's control have increased the cost of the project. These factors include protracted litigation by the Tribe and other that increased legal	2Tacoma LNG facility provided service of PSE cus3for cold weather action plans and when the BC pi4was curtailed. Customers are benefitting from the5capacity resource.6And my fourth point, PSE improved the site7the Tacoma LNG facility and the area around the8facility, and the benefits continue to accrue to the9surrounding communities. PSCAA and the Pollur10Control Hearing Board, the agency is charged with11ensuring our air is clean, determined that Tacoma12a minor source and its emissions are consistent was13statutory requirements designed to avoid harm to14health.15In addition, PSE's work on Tacoma LNG pro16benefits to the surrounding community, including17Tribe. PSE built Tacoma LNG on ground fill sites18contained multiple abandoned buildings, chipping19paint, asbestos, and uncontrolled storm water relation20PSE remediated and demolished over 350,000 second21of buildings, recycling 83 percent of the materials22cleaned up the site, planted vegetation along port23of the green buffer, and installed a storm water system	he stomers peline is of tion h a LNG is with human bvided the s that led eases. quare feet , ions ystem

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

	Page 29	Page 31
1	Off site, PSE removed creosote-treated piles	1 return on the investment by PSE. Traditionally, this
2	from the Blair Waterway and its ferry ocean terminal,	2 allowing recovery of a returned deferred return on is
3	removed creosote treated over-water decking from the	3 an exceptional rate making tool that the Commission only
4	Hylebos Waterway and it's ferry ocean terminal, and the	4 allows in rare circumstances. PSE has not justified it
5	Shorelines Hearings Board found that the removal of	5 here. This is basically a piece of plant that was
6 7	creosote-treated materials will benefit surface water	<ul> <li>supposed to go into service. PSE controls the timing of</li> <li>its rate cases. It controls whether or not it settles</li> </ul>
8	quality and salmon habitat by removing a source of	
0 9	contamination. Just a few final points in closing: PSE has	<ul> <li>and gets something into rate base at the end of a rate</li> <li>case.</li> </ul>
10	self-reported to PSCAA vari variations and	10 The second issue that Staff raises is the
11	violations from the permit. Some of these resulted in	11 it's think of it as the use and useful issue, which
12	monetary penalties totaling \$46,000. It is PSCAA, the	12 is, as PSE has pointed out, the facility was online and
13	agency charged with regulating air quality in	13 it was able to vaporize as of February of, excuse me,
14	Washington, that should address these issues with PSE,	14 2022. The issue there is that PSE's customer base could
15	as it has and continues to do.	15 not absorb the full volume of gas coming out of the
16	PSE should be allowed to recover its full return	16 facility until PSE made distributions to some upgrades.
17	on the Tacoma LNG facility that was deferred from	17 It did not do that until later. Based on that, staff
18	February 2022. The magnitude of the expense, PSE's	18 urges the Commission to reduce the amount of deferred
19	earnings erosion, and inability to time the in-service	19 depreciation and return on, assuming that you reject the
20	date with a rate effective date justify recovery of the	20 earlier deferred return on argument I made based on
21	deferred return. To do otherwise would bias PSE's	21 bedrock use and useful principles.
22	decision in favor of more costly pipeline alternatives,	22 The third issue raised by Staff is the
23	where it is customary for PSE to recover its prudently	23 pre-liquefaction modifications that occurred after PSE
24	incurred deferred cost through its PGA mechanisms.	24 started building the plant. This issue is ripe for
25	The cost of the four-mile distribution pipeline	determination here because, as discussed just a second
	Page 30	Page 32
1	is also at issue and bidirectional pipeline. It is	ago, all the settlements for the rate case did was defer
2	properly allocated between PSE and PLNG. PSE's it's	2 these issues to this proceeding. Cost recovery was
3	important to remember that PSE has the superior right to	3 supposed to be handled here. Staff didn't litigate the
4	use the outgoing pipeline to service its regulated	4 pre-liquefaction modifications in the GRC because of
5	customers at any time up to 240 hours per years and this	5 that fact.
6	right supersedes the right of Puget LNG to use the	6 The Commission should disallow the incremental
7	pipeline in the inbound direction.	7 costs. They're not large, but they are it's
8	All of these issues are addressed in PSE's	8 something like half a million dollars, based on the fact
9	pretrial testimony and exhibits.	9 that PSE's decision to invest in that was not prudent
10	PSE's witnesses are prepared to answer your	10 for its regulated customers. The first step in any
11	questions this morning. Thank you for the opportunity	11 prudence investigation is the determination of whether a
12	to address these issues.	12 project is needed. When Staff specifically put that
13	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	13 question to PSE, its answer was succinct, no, it was not
14	Would Staff like to give an opening statement.	14 needed for its regulated customer. Based on that, the
15	MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. I will be	15 Commission should determine that the investment the
16 17	brief.	16 incremental investment made to modify the
17 10	In PSE's last general rate case, the	17 pre-liquefaction equipment was not prudent.
18 19	commissioners approved a number of settlements, one of	18 The final issue Staff raises is the allocation 19 of the four-mile pipeline. They're basically kind of
20	them was the LNG settlement. That settlement allowed PSE to recover the cost of the LNG facility through a	<ul> <li>of the four-mile pipeline. They're basically kind of</li> <li>stark differences between the parties. PSE has kind of</li> </ul>
20	tracker subject to a future proceeding where the parties	20 stark differences between the parties. PSE has kind of 21 arbitrarily decided that you should split it evenly
21	can challenge cost. This is that proceeding.	22 between two customer bases, Puget LNG on one hand and
23	There are four major issues that Staff raises	23 PSE's customer base on the other hand. Staff testimony
24	for the Commission's consideration. The first is as	24 provides a principle way to do that based on actual use,
25	well, as noted in Mr. Earl's testimony, the deferred	<ul> <li>25 recognizing the limits on PSE's permit.</li> </ul>
	,	

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

	Page 33		Page 35
1	Staff's witnesses are also here and ready to	1	report doing any economic analysis to support that
2	take your questions.	2	decision.
3	And with that, I will stop.	3	As it relates to Tacoma LNG, Puget did not
4	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Could we hear	4	incorporate the costs versus the benefits of maintaining
5	from the Public Counsel?	5	the design day standard, even as the capital cost of the
б	MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Public Counsel	6	projects grew 31 percent over the amount estimated.
7	recommends in this case, as it did in the Puget Sound	7	Further, Puget did not discuss with its board of
8	Energy 2022 general rate case that the Commission find	8	directors the underlying basis for the design day
9	the Tacoma liquefied natural gas facility impudent and	9	standard. In discovery, Public Counsel specifically
10	disallow costs for that facility in rates. This case,	10	asked Puget whether it provided the board of directors
11	unlike the 2022 general rate case, has a limited focus	11	with any additional materials on the design day standard
12	on Puget's post-2016 decisions and investment in the	12	that were not already part of the exhibits presented in
13	facility.	13	this docket. Puget confirmed there were no additional
14	In the rate case, the Commission approved	14	materials. Additionally, Puget uses the design day
15	Puget's initial decision on September 22nd, 2016, to	15	standard to disregard actual weather and demand outcomes
16	build the Tacoma LNG facility. I want to be very clear	16	as irrelevant as it continued to construct and invest in
17	that Public Counsel's analysis and recommendation are	17	Tacoma LNG.
18	limited to Puget's actions after its initial decision to	18	Because the design day standard was based on
19	build on September 22nd, 2016.	19	such outdated data, the balancing of the benefits to
20	That leaves the vast majority of Puget's	20	rate payers versus the cost of the design day standard
21	decision making with the facility that are at issue in	21	were misaligned and Puget's reliance on the design day
22	this case. Only the initial decision to build was	22	standard was imprudent.
23	addressed in the rate case. In this case, the	23	Turning to vaporization, Puget claims its use of
24	Commission will evaluate Puget's decisions to continue	24	the facility to vaporize gas during this last winter
25	investing in LNG and the ultimate construction of the	25	justifies a finding of prudence. This is simply not the
-	Page 34		Page 36
1	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but	1	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is
2	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is	2	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of
2 3	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First,	2 3	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is
2 3 4	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was	2 3 4	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were
2 3 4 5	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during	2 3 4 5	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of
2 3 4 5 6	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility	2 3 4 5 6	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas,
2 3 4 5 6 7	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and	2 3 4 5 6 7	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The design day standard is a criteria in heating degrees	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very clear statutory mandate that equity be centered in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The design day standard is a criteria in heating degrees that is used for system planning. The design day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very clear statutory mandate that equity be centered in the Commission's decision making. This includes ensuring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The design day standard is a criteria in heating degrees that is used for system planning. The design day standard Puget used in evaluating Tacoma LNG was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very clear statutory mandate that equity be centered in the Commission's decision making. This includes ensuring that the Commission's decision making not perpetuate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The design day standard is a criteria in heating degrees that is used for system planning. The design day standard Puget used in evaluating Tacoma LNG was developed in the company's 2005 IRP. Puget has not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very clear statutory mandate that equity be centered in the Commission's decision making. This includes ensuring that the Commission's decision making not perpetuate historic harms, and, in this case, approving the Tacoma
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The design day standard is a criteria in heating degrees that is used for system planning. The design day standard Puget used in evaluating Tacoma LNG was developed in the company's 2005 IRP. Puget has not updated its design day standard since its 2025 I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very clear statutory mandate that equity be centered in the Commission's decision making. This includes ensuring that the Commission's decision making not perpetuate historic harms, and, in this case, approving the Tacoma LNG facility would perpetuates historic harms.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The design day standard is a criteria in heating degrees that is used for system planning. The design day standard Puget used in evaluating Tacoma LNG was developed in the company's 2005 IRP. Puget has not updated its design day standard since its 2025 I'm sorry, 2005 IRP. Even when it was developed, it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very clear statutory mandate that equity be centered in the Commission's decision making. This includes ensuring that the Commission's decision making not perpetuate historic harms, and, in this case, approving the Tacoma LNG facility would perpetuates historic harms. There are some additional issues I will cite
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The design day standard is a criteria in heating degrees that is used for system planning. The design day standard Puget used in evaluating Tacoma LNG was developed in the company's 2005 IRP. Puget has not updated its design day standard since its 2025 I'm sorry, 2005 IRP. Even when it was developed, it was based on outdated data. In Puget's most recent IRP, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very clear statutory mandate that equity be centered in the Commission's decision making. This includes ensuring that the Commission's decision making not perpetuate historic harms, and, in this case, approving the Tacoma LNG facility would perpetuates historic harms. There are some additional issues I will cite here but not discuss in greater detail. I will discuss
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The design day standard is a criteria in heating degrees that is used for system planning. The design day standard Puget used in evaluating Tacoma LNG was developed in the company's 2005 IRP. Puget has not updated its design day standard since its 2025 I'm sorry, 2005 IRP. Even when it was developed, it was based on outdated data. In Puget's most recent IRP, the company stated that it was maintaining the design day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very clear statutory mandate that equity be centered in the Commission's decision making. This includes ensuring that the Commission's decision making not perpetuate historic harms, and, in this case, approving the Tacoma LNG facility would perpetuates historic harms. There are some additional issues I will cite here but not discuss in greater detail. I will discuss them in our legal briefing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	facility. Prudence is not a one and done concept but rather spans the entire life of a project, so why is Puget's investment in Tacoma LNG imprudent. First, Puget's reliance on its chosen design day standard was imprudent. Second, Puget's use of vaporization during this last winter does not establish that this facility is needed. Third, the facility is inequable and inconsistent with the State's energy policies. Pointing first to the design date issue, when the Commission found the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build in September 2016, Puget's I'm sorry. I lost my train on thought on that. While the Commission found that the design day standard to be acceptable for Puget's initial decision to build, in September 2016, Puget's continued reliance on the design day standard was imprudent. The design day standard is a criteria in heating degrees that is used for system planning. The design day standard Puget used in evaluating Tacoma LNG was developed in the company's 2005 IRP. Puget has not updated its design day standard since its 2025 I'm sorry, 2005 IRP. Even when it was developed, it was based on outdated data. In Puget's most recent IRP, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	case. Puget's stated justification for the facility is that it was required for peak shaving. Puget's use of vaporization does not show that the facility is necessary for peak shaving because the demands were significantly lower than Puget's pre-Tacoma LNG level of resources. And Puget vaporized a tiny amount of gas, making the use of Tacoma LNG performative at best. Turning to equities, Washington leads the nation in requiring the Commission to require to consider equity in evaluating the public interest. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility on nearby communities has been raised many times over the course of Puget's development of the facility. The impact of the Tacoma LNG facility will carry forward for decades to come and it's absurd to argue that parties and the Commission should simply ignore that fact. Washington is very has a very clear statutory mandate that equity be centered in the Commission's decision making. This includes ensuring that the Commission's decision making not perpetuate historic harms, and, in this case, approving the Tacoma LNG facility would perpetuates historic harms. There are some additional issues I will cite here but not discuss in greater detail. I will discuss

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

	Evidentiary Hea		
	Page 37		Page 39
1	LNG facility should be disallowed and the Commission	1	Tacoma LNG project and its potential and actual impacts
2	should order an audit of its legal expenses, cost	2	to the Tribe and its members through this work on behalf
3	controls, and recordkeeping. And in the event that the	3	of the Tribe.
4	Commission allows Puget to include Tacoma LNG end rates,	4	The Tribe is presenting Dr. Sahu's testimony
5	it should reject Puget's proposed allocation for the	5	because it provides the Commission important context
6	four-mile pipe upgrade, as Public Counsel's witness, Dr.	6	regarding the disproportionate burdens that are created
7	Robert Earl, demonstrates that the gas utility uses no	7	by the Tacoma LNG project in which fall on the Tribe and
8	more than 25.6 percent of the upgraded pipe.	8	surrounding communities. Dr. Sahu's testimony falls
9	To conclude, the Commission should reject	9	into three broad topics. First, he speaks to the
10	Puget's investment into LNG, rule that the investment	10	metaphorical dark clouds that are over the Tacoma LNG
11	was imprudent, and disallow all post-September 2016	11	project, and I refer I'm referring to the negative
12	costs for rates.	12	externalities that are associated to the facility.
13	Public Counsel's expert witness, Dr. Robert	13	These negative externalities disproportionally burden
14	Earl, is present and ready to answer any and all of your	14	the Tribe and other nearby highly impacted communities,
15	questions today. Thank you.	15	and these externalities are the source of the Tribe's
16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would AWEC like to give an opening statement?	16 17	ongoing opposition to the project and why it has
18	MS. MOSER: Thank you.	18	intervened in this matter.
19	Good morning, again, to Commissioner Rendahl,	19	Second topic that Mr. Sahu's testimony touches on is why the permits that have been issued to the
20	Commissioner Doumit, Judge Howard, Judge Brown. I just	20	Tacoma LNG facility should not be interpreted as
20	have a couple of brief remarks.	21	evidence that the facility cannot or that it has not
22	As you may have noticed, AWEC did not file	22	already caused inequable impacts to the Tribe and its
23	testimony in this proceeding. We were signatories to	23	surrounding communities.
24	the Tacoma LNG stipulation from the rate case, which	24	The Tribe will present in evidence that PSE has
25	addressed prudence, revenue requirement, rate spread,	25	repeatedly violated its air permit and that excess
	······································		
	Page 38		Page 40
1	rate design, and the cost recovery mechanism associated	1	emissions associated wit those violations are, in fact,
2	with Tacoma LNG facility. We did review all testimony	2	harmful to the Tribe.
3	as it was filed, all discovery in this case, and did not	3	Finally, regarding the specific costs that PSE
4	find that the concerns and issues raised by other	4	seeks to recoup through this proceeding, Dr. Sahu
5	parties implicated issues that AWEC felt the need to	5	discusses why many of the costs that were incurred by
6	respond to. But we will are continuing to monitor	6	PSE after September 22nd, 2016, are for features or
7	the evidentiary portion of this proceeding and will	7	activities that provide little or no benefit to
8	address any non-evidentiary issues or legal issues in	8	ratepayers, particularly when those benefits are
9	briefing as necessary.	9	considered relative to the substantial benefits that
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	10	these investments are providing to PSE's for-profit
11	Would the Puyallup Tribe like to give an opening	11	operations.
12	statement?	12	And because the Tacoma LNG facility poses a very
13	MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.	13	real threat to the Tribe and its members, it should be
14	Excuse me. Good morning, Judge Howard,	14	no surprise that the Tribe was very disheartened by the
1 -	Commissioners Doumit, Brown, Danner, and Rendahl.	15	portion of the Commission's decision in Final Order 2410
15		1.0	reporting the prudence of the Terrors INO present of the
16	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about	16	regarding the prudence of the Tacoma LNG project, and it
16 17	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about the impacts and the inequities of the Tacoma LNG	17	was particularly disappointing that even though Dr. Sahu
16 17 18	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about the impacts and the inequities of the Tacoma LNG project, which is why it's before the Commission here	17 18	was particularly disappointing that even though Dr. Sahu was present and available throughout the previous
16 17 18 19	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about the impacts and the inequities of the Tacoma LNG project, which is why it's before the Commission here today. The Commission has recognized that the Tribe has	17 18 19	was particularly disappointing that even though Dr. Sahu was present and available throughout the previous proceeding, the Commission did not ask him any questions
16 17 18 19 20	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about the impacts and the inequities of the Tacoma LNG project, which is why it's before the Commission here today. The Commission has recognized that the Tribe has a substantial interest in this proceeding and that its	17 18 19 20	was particularly disappointing that even though Dr. Sahu was present and available throughout the previous proceeding, the Commission did not ask him any questions about his testimony or the basis of his conclusions.
16 17 18 19 20 21	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about the impacts and the inequities of the Tacoma LNG project, which is why it's before the Commission here today. The Commission has recognized that the Tribe has a substantial interest in this proceeding and that its participation here is in the public interest.	17 18 19 20 21	was particularly disappointing that even though Dr. Sahu was present and available throughout the previous proceeding, the Commission did not ask him any questions about his testimony or the basis of his conclusions. And worst, in the absence of any inquiry to probe Dr.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about the impacts and the inequities of the Tacoma LNG project, which is why it's before the Commission here today. The Commission has recognized that the Tribe has a substantial interest in this proceeding and that its participation here is in the public interest. As in the prior proceeding regarding the Tacoma	17 18 19 20 21 22	was particularly disappointing that even though Dr. Sahu was present and available throughout the previous proceeding, the Commission did not ask him any questions about his testimony or the basis of his conclusions. And worst, in the absence of any inquiry to probe Dr. Sahu's credentials or to resolve any questions about his
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about the impacts and the inequities of the Tacoma LNG project, which is why it's before the Commission here today. The Commission has recognized that the Tribe has a substantial interest in this proceeding and that its participation here is in the public interest. As in the prior proceeding regarding the Tacoma LNG settlement, the Tribe has retained Dr. Ranajit Sahu	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was particularly disappointing that even though Dr. Sahu was present and available throughout the previous proceeding, the Commission did not ask him any questions about his testimony or the basis of his conclusions. And worst, in the absence of any inquiry to probe Dr. Sahu's credentials or to resolve any questions about his testimony, Dr. Sahu's credibility was then subsequently
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about the impacts and the inequities of the Tacoma LNG project, which is why it's before the Commission here today. The Commission has recognized that the Tribe has a substantial interest in this proceeding and that its participation here is in the public interest. As in the prior proceeding regarding the Tacoma LNG settlement, the Tribe has retained Dr. Ranajit Sahu to provide testimony here. As his previous testimony	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was particularly disappointing that even though Dr. Sahu was present and available throughout the previous proceeding, the Commission did not ask him any questions about his testimony or the basis of his conclusions. And worst, in the absence of any inquiry to probe Dr. Sahu's credentials or to resolve any questions about his testimony, Dr. Sahu's credibility was then subsequently impugned and the Tribe's concerns were largely dismissed
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The Tribe has long expressed its concerns about the impacts and the inequities of the Tacoma LNG project, which is why it's before the Commission here today. The Commission has recognized that the Tribe has a substantial interest in this proceeding and that its participation here is in the public interest. As in the prior proceeding regarding the Tacoma LNG settlement, the Tribe has retained Dr. Ranajit Sahu	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was particularly disappointing that even though Dr. Sahu was present and available throughout the previous proceeding, the Commission did not ask him any questions about his testimony or the basis of his conclusions. And worst, in the absence of any inquiry to probe Dr. Sahu's credentials or to resolve any questions about his testimony, Dr. Sahu's credibility was then subsequently

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

## Evidentiary Hearing - 11/6/2023

	Page 41		Page 43
1	Today, despite its frustration with its	1	proceeding and then as you analyze the evidence that
2	treatment during the prior proceeding, the Tribe has	2	comes in: Is there a reasonable explanation for the
3	again provided testimony from Dr. Sahu, and the purpose	3	Tribe's continuing strong opposition to the Tacoma LNG
4	of that testimony is to assist the Commission's inquiry	4	project other than that they have a sincere belief that
5	into the prudence of PSE's post-September 2016 costs.	5	the project presents unacceptable risks to the Tribe and
6	Dr. Sahu has again been made available here at	6	its members? I hope that Dr. Sahu's testimony and any
7	this hearing to answer the Commission's questions, and I	7	questions that you have for him today help you answer
8	sincerely hope you take advantage of this opportunity to	8	that question and come to an understanding that the
9	address any concerns you may have with his pre-submitted	9	Tribe's concerns are well-founded, very real, and not at
10	testimony and and learn more about the information	10	all theoretical.
11	that he's developed about the facility and its impacts.	11	When considering the costs that PSE is
12	Now, having touched on the testimony that's been	12	requesting from ratepayers, the Commission should give
13	submitted by the Tribe, I'm going to shift gears and	13	significant weight to the fact that the Tacoma LNG
14	briefly discuss the scope of the prudence analysis that	14	project is very unique in that it's a dual purpose
15	the Commission has engaged in in this proceeding.	15	facility that has been constructed in no small part to
16	Judge Howard recently discussed the scope of the	16	generate profits for Puget LNG and PSE's for-profit
17	ongoing prudence analysis in the Recent Order No. 4	17	funds.
18	which denied PSE's motions to strike portions of the	18	In that process, as the Commission determines
19	testimony that was submitted by the Tribe and Public	19	how to apply the updated public safety standards during
20	Counsel. And there, in Order 4, Judge Howard explained	20	this prudence analysis, we ask it carefully hold PSE to
21	that the Commission has yet to determine whether and	21	its burden of proving that any costs to be recovered
22	where to apply the expanded public interest standards	22	from ratepayers were, in fact, incurred prudently and in
23	set forth in RCW 80.28.425(1) during its continued	23	the public interest.
24	review of the Tacoma LNG facility.	24	And speaking of that burden of proof, one last
25	Further, Order 4 notes that the Commission	25	comment before I wrap up, regarding PSE's legal costs, I
	Derra 40		Dama 44
	Page 42		Page 44
1	agrees with the tribe with the Tribe that the	1	believe the commissioners should ask themselves the
2	Commission cannot hope to rectify historic or ongoing	2	following question: Why would PSE resist an independent
3	inequities without first developing such a record	3	audit if its legal costs if such an audit is directed at
4	developing a record of such inequities. Systemic	4	ensuring that they were, in fact, reasonable and that
5	inequities must be acknowledged before they can be	5	they were incurred in the public interest.
6	addressed. In that context, Mr. Sahu's testimony is	6	Thank you for all of your time. That concludes
7	relevant and it serves the public interest by ensuring	7	
0		0	my opening statement.
8	that the commissioners are aware of and can take into	8	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr.
9	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma	9	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and
9 10	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's	9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of
9 10 11	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of	9 10 11	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses.
9 10 11 12	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers.	9 10 11 12	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of
9 10 11 12 13	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE	9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE.
9 10 11 12 13 14	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in	9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the following question, which gets at the reason why the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. RONALD ROBERTS, having been first duly sworn by the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the following question, which gets at the reason why the Tribe is participating in this hearing: Is there a	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the following question, which gets at the reason why the Tribe is participating in this hearing: Is there a reason	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. RONALD ROBERTS, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the following question, which gets at the reason why the Tribe is participating in this hearing: Is there a reason JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry. If you're observing,	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. RONALD ROBERTS, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows: JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, if you could
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the following question, which gets at the reason why the Tribe is participating in this hearing: Is there a reason JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry. If you're observing, you might want to make sure your line is muted.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. RONALD ROBERTS, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows: JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, if you could please introduce the witness and confirm whether there
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the following question, which gets at the reason why the Tribe is participating in this hearing: Is there a reason JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry. If you're observing, you might want to make sure your line is muted. Sorry, Mr. Fuller.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. RONALD ROBERTS, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows: JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, if you could please introduce the witness and confirm whether there are any changes to the witness's testimony.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the following question, which gets at the reason why the Tribe is participating in this hearing: Is there a reason JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry. If you're observing, you might want to make sure your line is muted. Sorry, Mr. Fuller. MR. FULLER: No problem.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. RONALD ROBERTS, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows: JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, if you could please introduce the witness and confirm whether there are any changes to the witness's testimony. MS. CARSON: Please state your name and
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the following question, which gets at the reason why the Tribe is participating in this hearing: Is there a reason JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry. If you're observing, you might want to make sure your line is muted. Sorry, Mr. Fuller. MR. FULLER: No problem. So my question to the commissioners is this: I	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. RONALD ROBERTS, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows: JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, if you could please introduce the witness and confirm whether there are any changes to the witness's testimony. MS. CARSON: Please state your name and spell your name and state your title for the record.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	account the scope of inequities created by the Tacoma LNG project as they're determining whether PSE's decisions were prudently made and made on behalf of ratepayers. So as each of you weights whether the cost PSE seeks to recoup during this proceeding were incurred in the public interest or instead to serve the company's for-profit interests, I would like you to consider the following question, which gets at the reason why the Tribe is participating in this hearing: Is there a reason JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry. If you're observing, you might want to make sure your line is muted. Sorry, Mr. Fuller. MR. FULLER: No problem.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. That's the end of our opening statements, and with that, we would turn to the examination of witnesses. And our first witness on the order of presentation is Ronald Roberts for PSE. Mr. Roberts, if you would please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. RONALD ROBERTS, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows: JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, if you could please introduce the witness and confirm whether there are any changes to the witness's testimony. MS. CARSON: Please state your name and

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

	Page 45		Page 47
1	Title is vice president of energy supply.	1	And is it your understanding that this
2	MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has	2	destruction efficiency requirement that is set forth in
3	been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. RJR-1T	3	Condition 15 was intended to limit the amount of
4	through RJR-10 and RJR-11T through RJR-17 in this	4	hazardous and toxic air pollutants that are released
5	docket?	5	from the facility?
6	THE WITNESS: I do.	6	A. It was intended to ensure the efficiency of the
7	MS. CARSON: Do these exhibits constitute	7	flare when it is in operation, and, yes, it has exceeded
8	your pretrial direct and rebuttal testimony and related	8	95 percent efficiency.
9	exhibits?	9	Q. I'll repeat my question.
10	THE WITNESS: They do.	10	What I'm trying to get at is, was the intent of
11	MS. CARSON: Do you have any revisions to	11	including a high destruction efficiency, 99 percent, to
12	these other than what has been submitted to the	12	ensure the destruction of toxic and hazardous air
13	Commission?	13	pollutants that would otherwise be released to the air
14	THE WITNESS: No, I do not.	14	shed?
15	MS. CARSON: Thank you.	15	MS. CARSON: Objection; foundation. This
16	With that, Mr. Roberts is available for	16	witness can't speak to the intent of the permit.
17	cross-examination.	17	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Fuller, can we I'm
18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	18	going to grant the objection. Can we
19	And Public Counsel indicated cross?	19	MR. FULLER: I'll ask a different question.
20	MS. GAFKEN: Your Honor, public counsel can	20	Mr. Roberts
21	waive cross as I was primarily going to show him the	21	JUDGE HOWARD: Just for clarity, because my
22	exhibits and identify them and then move them into the	22	microphone was not on again, I will grant the objection,
23	record, and if they have already been admitted into the	23	and if we can please back up and establish foundation.
24	record, I can save us a little bit of time and waive our	24	BY MR. FULLER:
25	cross.	25	Q. Mr. Roberts, why does the enclosed ground flare
	Page 46		Page 48
		1	
1	JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. That's your call	1	
1 2	JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. That's your call to make.	1	at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose
2	to make.	2	at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?
2 3	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this	2 3	at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare? A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs
2 3 4	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.	2 3 4	at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare? A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the
2 3 4 5	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness. MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li><li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness. MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief. CROSS EXAMINATION	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness. MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. FULLER:	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness. MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief. CROSS EXAMINATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness. MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. FULLER: Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness. MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. FULLER: Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning. First I would like to ask, are you familiar with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness. MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. FULLER: Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning. First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct? </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness. MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. FULLER: Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning. First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct. There were a number of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to make. The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness. MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. FULLER: Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning. First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency? A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in front of me, but yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct? A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. Q. And a number of those violations were issued for</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in front of me, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Understood. Thank you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct? A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. Q. And a number of those violations were issued for the Tacoma LNG facilities use of the flare bypass which</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BYMR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in front of me, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Understood. Thank you.</li> <li>And am I correct that Condition 15 of the permit</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct? <ul> <li>A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.</li> <li>Q. And a number of those violations were issued for the Tacoma LNG facilities use of the flare bypass which resulted in releases of unburned waste gases directly to</li> </ul></li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in front of me, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Understood. Thank you.</li> <li>And am I correct that Condition 15 of the permit requires that and this is a quote: The owner and,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct? A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. Q. And a number of those violations were issued for the Tacoma LNG facilities use of the flare bypass which resulted in releases of unburned waste gases directly to the air shed; is that correct?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the</li> <li>Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in front of me, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Understood. Thank you.</li> <li>And am I correct that Condition 15 of the permit requires that and this is a quote: The owner and, slash, or operator shall ensure the enclose ground flare</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct? A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. Q. And a number of those violations were issued for the Tacoma LNG facilities use of the flare bypass which resulted in releases of unburned waste gases directly to the air shed; is that correct? </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the</li> <li>Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in front of me, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Understood. Thank you.</li> <li>And am I correct that Condition 15 of the permit requires that and this is a quote: The owner and, slash, or operator shall ensure the enclose ground flare achieves a minimum of 99 percent destruction of all</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.</li> <li>Q. And a number of those violations were issued for the Tacoma LNG facilities use of the flare bypass which resulted in releases of unburned waste gases directly to the air shed; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Could you rephrase that one more time for me, please?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in front of me, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Understood. Thank you.</li> <li>And am I correct that Condition 15 of the permit requires that and this is a quote: The owner and, slash, or operator shall ensure the enclose ground flare achieves a minimum of 99 percent destruction of all volatile organic compounds?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.</li> <li>Q. And a number of those violations were issued for the Tacoma LNG facilities use of the flare bypass which resulted in releases of unburned waste gases directly to the air shed; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Could you rephrase that one more time for me, please?</li> <li>Q. Sorry. I'll break that up.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>O. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in front of me, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Understood. Thank you.</li> <li>And am I correct that Condition 15 of the permit requires that and this is a quote: The owner and, slash, or operator shall ensure the enclose ground flare achieves a minimum of 99 percent destruction of all volatile organic compounds?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit - facilities air permit; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.</li> <li>Q. And a number of those violations were issued for the Tacoma LNG facilities use of the flare bypass which resulted in releases of unburned waste gases directly to the air shed; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Could you rephrase that one more time for me, please?</li> <li>Q. Sorry. I'll break that up.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>to make.</li> <li>The Puyallup Tribe also indicated cross for this witness.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: I believe this will be brief.</li> <li>CROSS EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, thank you for your time this morning.</li> <li>First I would like to ask, are you familiar with the terms of the air permit that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?</li> <li>A. I'm familiar with most of them. I can't repeat them off the top of my head without the document in front of me, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Understood. Thank you.</li> <li>And am I correct that Condition 15 of the permit requires that and this is a quote: The owner and, slash, or operator shall ensure the enclose ground flare achieves a minimum of 99 percent destruction of all volatile organic compounds?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>at the Tacoma LNG facility operate? What is the purpose of the ground flare?</li> <li>A. It is a thermal destruction unit to destroy VOCs coming out of the stack during the operation of the facility.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Roberts, why is it important that the VOCs are destroyed?</li> <li>A. Because they're a hazardous air pollutant.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>In May 2023, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency issued a number of notices of violation to PSE in response to violations of conditions of the Tacoma LNG's air permit facilities air permit; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct. There were a number of self-reported incidents that were carried out and reported to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.</li> <li>Q. And a number of those violations were issued for the Tacoma LNG facilities use of the flare bypass which resulted in releases of unburned waste gases directly to the air shed; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Could you rephrase that one more time for me, please?</li> <li>Q. Sorry. I'll break that up.</li> </ul>

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

	Page 49	Page 51
1	issued a number of notices of violations to PSE for the	1 Q. Okay. Are you aware of the representations that
2	Tacoma LNG facility's violation of the air permit;	2 were made by PSE's witnesses and counsel to the PCHB
3	correct?	<sup>3</sup> during the challenge to the air permit regarding the
4	A. That is correct.	4 likelihood of the flare bypass at the Tacoma LNG
5	Q. And some of those violations, the notice of	5 facility being used?
6	NOVs, were issued for use of the flare bypass at the	6 A. I was not made aware of those commitments until
7	Tacoma LNG facility; correct?	7 I read them in the cross documents that you sent.
8	A. They were issued for times when the flare bypass	8 Q. Okay. So speaking of the cross documents, I
9	did open. That is correct. Those are driven by	9 would like you to take a look at what has been marked as
10	malfunctions in the flare.	10 it's Exhibit RJR-18X.
11	Q. And, Mr. Roberts, for those violations that were	11 Do you have that in front of you?
12	issued related that are related to uses of the flare	12 A. Yes.
13	bypass, were those events that were classified as	13 Q. And off the front page, can you read to me what
14	violations events that resulted in releases of unburned	14 this exhibit is, the description at the bottom of the
15	waste gas from the Tacoma LNG facility directly into the	15 page?
16	air shed?	16 A. "Excerpt of opening statement of Joshua Frank,
17	A. Which is the basis for PSCAA's violations, yes.	17 PSE Counsel"
18	Q. So yes?	18 Q. Oh, sorry. I'm looking to what I believe is
19	Okay. And I'll ask, has PSE quantified the	19 RJR-18X. This would be the Stobart document.
20	actual emissions released by the Tacoma LNG facility	20 A. Let me see that one. Okay. That's excerpted
21	during these bypass events?	21 testimony of Matthew sorry. I was missing the
22	A. I have not.	22 numbers on the X.
23	Q. Has PSE quantified the actual commission the	23 Q. No problem.
24	emissions of the facility during those bypass events?	24 A. Yeah.
25	A. I'm not aware of that. But that's not saying	25 <b>Q.</b> And so can you turn to page 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,
	Page 50	Page 52
		rage J2
1	that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to	1 to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,
1 2	5	
	that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to	1 to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,
2	that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> </ul>
2 3	that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those. Q. Okay. Thank you.	<ol> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> </ol>
2 3 4	that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those. Q. Okay. Thank you. And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged	<ol> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C;</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C; correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> <li>that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> <li>that.</li> <li>A. (Witness peruses document.) I have read through</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you've attached decisions from that</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> <li>that.</li> <li>A. (Witness peruses document.) I have read through</li> <li>it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you've attached decisions from that proceeding to your testimony as exhibits RJR-15 and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> <li>that.</li> <li>A. (Witness peruses document.) I have read through</li> <li>it.</li> <li>Q. All right. And this is a question. This is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you've attached decisions from that proceeding to your testimony as exhibits RJR-15 and RJR-16; correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> <li>that.</li> <li>A. (Witness peruses document.) I have read through</li> <li>it.</li> <li>Q. All right. And this is a question. This is</li> <li>a - the testimony of Mr. Stobart, and he's being</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you've attached decisions from that proceeding to your testimony as exhibits RJR-15 and RJR-16; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> <li>that.</li> <li>A. (Witness peruses document.) I have read through</li> <li>it.</li> <li>Q. All right. And this is a question. This is</li> <li>a the testimony of Mr. Stobart, and he's being</li> <li>questioned regarding the use of the flare bypass; is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you've attached decisions from that proceeding to your testimony as exhibits RJR-15 and RJR-16; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Were you present at the PCHB proceedings that</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> <li>that.</li> <li>A. (Witness peruses document.) I have read through</li> <li>it.</li> <li>Q. All right. And this is a question. This is</li> <li>a the testimony of Mr. Stobart, and he's being</li> <li>questioned regarding the use of the flare bypass; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you've attached decisions from that proceeding to your testimony as exhibits RJR-15 and RJR-16; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Were you present at the PCHB proceedings that those decisions come out of?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> <li>it.</li> <li>Q. All right. And this is a question. This is</li> <li>a the testimony of Mr. Stobart, and he's being</li> <li>questioned regarding the use of the flare bypass; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that we have not worked with PSCAA on this and come to some numbers, but I'm not aware of those.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And are you aware of whether PSE has challenged or appealed any of the notices of violation that were issued to the Tacoma LNG facility in May 2023?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears and ask a few questions about some materials that you submitted in your testimony.</li> <li>So in your direct testimony in this matter, which is marked as Exhibit RJR-1T, you referred to the proceedings that were before the Puget or the Pollution Control Hearings Board in response to the challenge to the PSCAA air permit for the Tacoma LNG facility, which was docket PCHB Docket P19087C; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you've attached decisions from that proceeding to your testimony as exhibits RJR-15 and RJR-16; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Were you present at the PCHB proceedings that</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>to page 9 of that exhibit, which the top of the page,</li> <li>the page number is page 2041.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And can you read to me lines 11 through 17 of</li> <li>that page, which starts with "Q. Okay."</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Objection. The exhibit speaks</li> <li>for itself. This is cross-examination, so there should</li> <li>be a question, not just reading the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Objection</li> <li>granted.</li> <li>Perhaps the witness can review this portion and</li> <li>then answer any necessary questions about it.</li> <li>MR. FULLER: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. FULLER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Roberts, please review that section, lines</li> <li>11 through 17, and let me know once you've read through</li> <li>that.</li> <li>A. (Witness peruses document.) I have read through</li> <li>it.</li> <li>Q. All right. And this is a question. This is</li> <li>a the testimony of Mr. Stobart, and he's being</li> <li>questioned regarding the use of the flare bypass; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> </ul>

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

	Page 53		Page 55
1	often would the bypass be expected to be used once the	1	Q. So does Mr. Van Slyke indicate that this permit
2	facility begins normal operations, his response is: I	2	does that such events are not compliant with the
3	hope it never gets used, but it's a safety device, just	3	permit?
4	like release valves are a safety device. They're there	4	A. Yes.
5	in case you need them, but we hope that it never gets	5	Q. And next I'll ask you to take a look at RJR-20X,
6	used. It might get used over a couple of times over the	6	and I'll have you turn to page 7, which is the number
7	lifetime of the facility.	7	at the top of the page is page 1861. I flipped to the
8	Was my reading of that accurate?	8	wrong exhibit. Actually, that's the one I was just
9	A. Yes.	9	looking at. They all do look the same.
10	Q. Thank you.	10	This Exhibit RJR-19X at page 6 of this exhibit,
11	Now we'll shift to – and I'm skipping for a	11	this one is labelled page 1783, and here at lines 5
12	moment Exhibit RJR-19X. We're going to now ask you to	12	through 20, can you read those to yourself really
13	take a look at Exhibit RJR-20X, the excerpt of the	13	quickly?
14	testimony of Steven Van Slyke.	14	A. (Witness peruses document.) I've read it.
15	A. Okay. That's PSE's supplemental response to the	15	Q. So this is a statement from PSE counsel Joshua
16	UTC Discovery Request 32? Is that it?	16	Frank in the PCHB hearing discussing the allegations
17	Q. Sorry. No. This is RJR-20X. It looks very	17	made by the Tribe in that hearing about potential harms
18	similar to the previous one. At the bottom of the page,	18	associated with the Tacoma LNG facility.
19	it should read "Excerpt of testimony of Steven Van	19	It discusses two of the – the potential
20	Slyke."	20	violation of two enforcement permit limits, and am I
21	A. Got it. Okay.	21	correct that the violation that has been described here
22	Q. All right. And turning to turning to page 7	22	and which are being dismissed in counsel's testimony to
23	of that document, which at the top of that page is	23	PCHB as very unlikely and that these types of violations
24	listed as page 1861, can you read to yourself lines 10	24	have now occurred.
25	through 18 and let me know when you're complete.	25	First, that the Tacoma LNG will violate permit
	Page 54		Page 56
1	A. (Witness peruses document) I'm complete.	1	conditions requiring 99 percent destruction of VOCs in
2	Q. Thank you.	2	the flare, has that occasion occur?
3	It appears that Ms. Dold (phonetic) was asking	3	MS. CARSON: I object to the form of the
4	Mr. Van Slyke, who is as indicated after the first	4	question. It's compound and ambiguous.
5	page sorry, I should have made this clear. He's the	5	JUDGE HOWARD: I can grant it.
6	PSCAA director of compliance. She asks questions about	6	If we can just break up in that question in two
7	emission controls, and his response, he states: As an	7	distinct parts. Thank you.
8	example, there's been a discussion about bypasses or	8	BY MR. FULLER:
9	upsets and that the agency permit conditions prohibit	9	Q. Am I correct that Mr. Frank notes that the first
10	those	10	violation noted by the Tribe would require PSE not
11	MS. CARSON: Your Honor, I object to this	11	meeting 99 percent destruction of VOCs in the flare?
12	just reading of exhibits that are already in the record.	12	A. That is his statement there.
13	I didn't hear a question.	13	Q. And is his second statement that the Tribe
14	JUDGE HOWARD: Granted.	14	hypothesizes that the all gas would be routed to the
15 16	I would I would encourage Mr. Fuller to move	15	flare that is routed to the flare would instead be
16 17	on to his questions now that the witness has had a chance to review that portion of the testimony.	16 17	sent to an emergency safety bypass that Mr. Stobart of CBNI does not believe will ever operate?
18	MR. FULLER: All right. I'll cut to the	18	MS. CARSON: Again, I object to the
19	chase.	19	characterization of the testimony or the opening
20	BY MR. FULLER:	20	statement here. That's in the record. Rather than
21	Q. Does Mr. Van Slyke indicate that it is	21	paraphrase it, the record stands for itself.
22	permissible under the permits for Tacoma LNG to utilize	22	MR. FULLER: Okay. I'll move on. Thank
23	the flare bypass valve at the facility?	23	you.
24	A. It is not contained in the permit, but that is	24	BY MR. FULLER:
25	why there are NOVs issued for that.	25	Q. Mr. Frank testifies that the Tribe is concerned
	-		

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

	Page 57		Page 59
1	that the 99 percent destruction efficiency requirement	1	ask a question about, and then he can pose a question
2	will be violated.	2	following that.
3	Has that destruction efficiency been violated at	3	MR. FULLER: I'll reframe that.
4	the Tacoma LNG facility?	4	BY MR. FULLER:
5	MS. CARSON: Objection or clarification.	5	Q. Does Mr. Frank represent in this transcript that
6	This is not testimony from Mr. Frank.	6	Dr. Sahu's concerns about the emergency bypass events
7	MR. FULLER: My this is a representation	7	continuing for long durations, that those would
8	made to the PCHB, and my question for Mr. Roberts is,	8	sorry. Am I correct that that is his representation,
9	has such a violation occurred.	9	that Dr. Sahu will claim that these bypass events will
10	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the	10	continue for a long duration?
11	objection to the characterization of this testimony	11	A. The events where the bypass opens are very short
12	being given as an argument by counsel, but if you	12	duration. And, like I said, it's usually related to
13	could if the witness could please answer that last	13	Q. Mr. Roberts, I'm asking about the document in
14	question posed by Mr. Fuller.	14	front of us here and the representation of the document.
15	THE WITNESS: To my knowledge, there has not	15	MS. CARSON: So I'm going to object. It
16	been an level below the 99 percent per our reporting	16	seems like, again, characterizing an opening statement
17	with PSCAA on a design efficiency standard.	17	and referring to what a witness says, and the opening
18	BY MR. FULLER	18	statement addresses it. It's not something that this
19	Q. Mr. Roberts, are you aware of what the	19	witness can speak to.
20	destruction efficiency of the flare achieved during the	20	JUDGE HOWARD: I would agree. And I would
21	flare bypass events?	21	just encourage Mr. Fuller, if you can just perhaps refer
22	A. No, because the flare bypass events occur at a	22	the witness to the lines at issue and then pose your
23	time when the flare is malfunctioning and there's a loss	23	question to the witness about his position or his
24	of flame inside the flare, which it's no longer safe to	24	testimony.
25	put gas through that facility. That's when the bypass	25	BY MR. FULLER:
	Page 58		Page 60
1	valve opens, and so when we do have a bypass event, the	1	Q. Mr. Roberts are you aware of the total period of
2	flare is not actually operating at that time. That's	2	time that flare bypass events have occurred at the
3	the reason for the bypass.	3	Tacoma LNG facility?
4	Q. So would it be an appropriate interpretation	4	A. All of those flare diversion events have been
5	that when the flare is not operating and the waste gases	5	reported to PSCAA. I do not know the duration of each
6	are bypassing the flare, the destruction efficiency of	6	event in total off the top of my head, but all of those
7	the flare is zero percent for those waste gases that are	7	have been self-reported to PSCAA, and they're dealing
8	released for those periods of flare bypass?	8	with that as we speak, and we're dealing with PSCAA as
9	A. The bypass is there as a safety feature, so when	9	we speak.
10	the flare is not operating, yes, it does bypass gas	10	Q. Okay. I'll just ask two I believe my last
11	outside of the flare itself for short periods of time.	11	two questions.
12	Q. And the flare is not effectively destroying any	12	Is it your testimony in your rebuttal testimony
13	of the waste gases; is that correct?	13	that PSE has worked diligently to identify and address
14	A. It can't because it's not operating at that	14	the root causes of the incidents notified or sorry,
15	time.	15	of the incidents identified in the NOVs and taken
16	Q. Thank you.	16	appropriate action to reduced the likelihood of
17	And my last question about this exhibit is Dr.	17	occurrence?
18	Sahu Mr. Frank testifies that Dr. Sahu is concerned	18	A. Yes.
19	that these emergency bypass events will continue for a	19	Q. And having taken those actions and identified
20	long duration, even if the permit requires the facility	20	the root causes and addressed them, is PSE now prepared
21	to stop operating if the flare goes out	21	to commit to removing or disabling the flare bypass to
22	MS. CARSON: So I renew my objection.	22	prevent such violations from occurring in the future?
23	That's not testimony from Mr. Frank. My apologies.	23	A. I think that presents a safety issue at the
24	JUDGE HOWARD: Granted, but I believe I'll	24	plant. Our primary operation of the facility is to
25	allow Mr. Fuller to refer to the sentence he wishes to	25	provide for the safe operation of that facility. That

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

	Page 61	Page 63	;
1	is a safety feature of the plant. I do not want to put	1 that's getting liquefied. We have exceeded that a	
2	gas into a hot environment without a flame in it. That	2 couple of times primarily due to blow-off gas from the	
3	presents an issue. So, to me, the safety feature that	<ul> <li>top of the tank is closed. It's already been liquefied</li> </ul>	
4	is there is there for a reason and it will be utilized	4 once. It gets recirculated back in and reliquefies, so	
5	and needs to be utilized at times. The number of	<ul> <li>we believe the intent of the 250,000 gallons a day was</li> </ul>	
6	occurrences that happened, albeit there were quite a few	6 to account for pipeline gas coming in, not the boil-off	
7	earlier in the development of the project and earlier in	7 gas. Subsequent to the concerns from Puget Sound Clean	
8	the start up of the project, we have done a tremendous	8 Air Agency, we did include that boil-off gas as part of	
9	amount of work bringing outside consultants in to help	9 it and have not gone over that limit since.	
10	with the flare design, to help troubleshoot and help	10 Q. Okay. So I was going to ask if you have	
11	come to the root causes of the issues at hand, which has	11 resolved this permit issue, and it sounds like you have?	
12	been flame stability in the flare.	12 A. Yes, ma'am.	
13	Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. That's the end of my	13 <b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b>	
14	questions.	14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's all I	
15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any	15 have.	
16	redirect?	16 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further	
17	REDIRECT EXAMINATION	17 questions from the bench?	
18	BY MS. CARSON:	18 It appears we have none.	
19	Q. Has the flare been out for a day, as Mr. Sahu	19 Thank you, Mr. Roberts, for your testimony	
20	claimed?	20 today. You're excused.	
21	A. No. It's minutes. Usually several minutes up	21 Our next witness is William Donahue for the	
22	to I think the longest I saw was 41 minutes, but	22 company. Would it let's probably continue through	
23	certainly not 24 hours in any stretch.	Mr. Donahue's examination, and then we can take our	
24	Q. Are some of them less than 41 minutes?	24 mid-morning break, if that sounds agreeable.	
25	A. Yes, yes, most of them are. And, again, this is	All right. Mr. Donahue, if you're ready, please	
	Page 62	Page 64	ł
1			ŀ
1 2	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The		ł
1 2 3	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge,	1 raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.	ł
2	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and	<ol> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> </ol>	ł
2 3	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge,	<ol> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> </ol>	ł
2 3 4	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do	<ol> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> <li>Judge, testified as follows:</li> </ol>	ł
2 3 4 5	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> <li>Judge, testified as follows:</li> </ul>	ł
2 3 4 5 6	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event. Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> <li>Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> </ul>	ł
2 3 4 5 6 7	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event. <b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b> A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> <li>Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event. <b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b> A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> <li>Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and</li> <li>confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event. <b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b> A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> <li>Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and</li> <li>confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event. <b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b> A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> <li>Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and</li> <li>confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.</li> <li><b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b></li> <li>A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.</li> <li><b>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</b></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the</li> <li>Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and</li> <li>confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last</li> <li>name for the court reporter.</li> </ul>	ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.</li> <li><b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b></li> <li>A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.</li> <li><b>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</b> JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-on-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult</li> </ul>	ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.</li> <li>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</li> <li>A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-on-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a</li> </ul>	ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.</li> <li>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</li> <li>A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr. Roberts.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-on-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event. <b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b> A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself. <b>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</b> JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr. Roberts. <b>EXAMINATION</b>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-o-n-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult exclusively to PSE.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. WFD-1T</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event. <b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b> A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself. <b>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</b> JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr. Roberts. <b>EXAMINATION</b> BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: <b>Q. Good morning, Mr. Roberts.</b> A. Good morning.	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-o-n-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a</li> <li>recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult</li> <li>exclusively to PSE.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has</li> <li>been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. WFD-1T</li> <li>through WFD-4 and WFD-5T through WFD-6 in this docket.</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.</li> <li><b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b></li> <li>A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.</li> <li><b>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</b> JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr. Roberts.</li> <li><b>EXAMINATION</b></li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li><b>Q. Good morning, Mr. Roberts.</b></li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li><b>Q. So I'm going to ask another issue that's been</b></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-o-n-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult exclusively to PSE.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. WFD-1T through WFD-4 and WFD-5T through WFD-6 in this docket.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.</li> <li><b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b></li> <li>A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.</li> <li><b>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</b> JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr. Roberts.</li> <li><b>EXAMINATION</b></li> <li><b>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</b></li> <li><b>Q. Good morning, Mr. Roberts.</b></li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li><b>Q. So I'm going to ask another issue that's been identified for by Staff and the Tribe, and this has</b></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-o-n-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult exclusively to PSE.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. WFD-1T through WFD-4 and WFD-5T through WFD-6 in this docket.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: And do these exhibits</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event. <b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b> A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself. <b>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</b> JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr. Roberts. <b>EXAMINATION</b> BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: <b>Q. Good morning, Mr. Roberts.</b> A. Good morning. <b>Q. So I'm going to ask another issue that's been identified for by Staff and the Tribe, and this has to do with the production limit of 250,000 gallons.</b>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-o-n-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a</li> <li>recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult</li> <li>exclusively to PSE.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has</li> <li>been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. WFD-1T</li> <li>through WFD-4 and WFD-5T through WFD-6 in this docket.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: And do these exhibits</li> <li>constitute your pre-filed direct and rebuttal testimony</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event. <b>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</b> A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself. <b>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</b> JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr. Roberts. <b>EXAMINATION</b> BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: <b>Q. Good morning, Mr. Roberts.</b> A. Good morning. <b>Q. So I'm going to ask another issue that's been identified for by Staff and the Tribe, and this has to do with the production limit of 250,000 gallons.</b> <b>So if has the facility exceeded its daily LNG</b>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-o-n-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a</li> <li>recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult</li> <li>exclusively to PSE.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has</li> <li>been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. WFD-1T</li> <li>through WFD-4 and WFD-5T through WFD-6 in this docket.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: And do these exhibits</li> <li>constitute your pre-filed direct and rebuttal testimony</li> </ul>	Ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.</li> <li>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</li> <li>A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Nothing further. <ul> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Roberts. <ul> <li>EXAMINATION</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Roberts.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> </ul> <li>Q. So I'm going to ask another issue that's been identified for by Staff and the Tribe, and this has to do with the production limit of 250,000 gallons. So if has the facility exceeded its daily LNG production limit of 250,000 gallons a day?</li>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-o-n-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult exclusively to PSE.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. WFD-1T</li> <li>through WFD-4 and WFD-5T through WFD-6 in this docket.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: And do these exhibits</li> <li>constitute your pre-filed direct and rebuttal testimony</li> <li>and exhibits related to this proceeding.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, they do.</li> </ul>	ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.</li> <li>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</li> <li>A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Nothing further.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr. Roberts.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Roberts.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. So I'm going to ask another issue that's been identified for by Staff and the Tribe, and this has to do with the production limit of 250,000 gallons. So if has the facility exceeded its daily LNG production limit of 250,000 per day limit is</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-o-n-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult exclusively to PSE.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. WFD-1T through WFD-4 and WFD-5T through WFD-6 in this docket.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: And do these exhibits</li> <li>constitute your pre-filed direct and rebuttal testimony and exhibits related to this proceeding.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, they do.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have any corrections to</li> </ul>	ł
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>a flare that is designed to run at high efficiency. The operation of it during start-up is a bit of a challenge, but we did bring outside experts in to work on that, and we continue to bring them in to stay focused on how do we stay focused to reduce that event.</li> <li>Q. Is PSE working diligently to resolve this issue?</li> <li>A. Very. We've thrown a lot of resources at it both internal and external. We've brought in many consultants, experts in the field to work on the flare itself.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Nothing further. <ul> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Roberts. <ul> <li>EXAMINATION</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Roberts.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> </ul> <li>Q. So I'm going to ask another issue that's been identified for by Staff and the Tribe, and this has to do with the production limit of 250,000 gallons. So if has the facility exceeded its daily LNG production limit of 250,000 gallons a day?</li>	<ul> <li>raise your right hand and then I'll swear you in.</li> <li>WILLIAM DONAHUE, having been first duly sworn by the Judge, testified as follows:</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Carson, if you can introduce the witness and confirm if there's any changes to his testimony.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>Please state your name and title and spell your last name for the court reporter.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: William F. Donahue,</li> <li>D-o-n-a-h-u-e. I guess my title is consultant. I'm a recent retiree of from 30 years at PSE and consult exclusively to PSE.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Do you have before you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit Nos. WFD-1T</li> <li>through WFD-4 and WFD-5T through WFD-6 in this docket.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: And do these exhibits</li> <li>constitute your pre-filed direct and rebuttal testimony</li> <li>and exhibits related to this proceeding.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, they do.</li> </ul>	Ł

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

	Page 65	Page 67
1	Commission?	1 categories, correct, like storage, production,
2	THE WITNESS: No, I do not.	2 transmission?
3	MS. CARSON: Thank you.	3 A. Well, that's one level. Ultimately
4	Mr. Donahue is available for cross-examination.	4 Q. That's functionalization; correct?
5	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Staff indicated	5 A it's spread out down at the lower levels,
б	Cross.	6 yes.
7	Before Mr. Roberson begins, Mr. Donahue, you may	7 Q. That's classification and allocation; correct?
8	want to bring your bench microphone a little closer just	8 A. It could be. I think it's often characterized
9	because these tend to have a very short range.	9 that way, but there still may be multiple levels of
10	Okay. Mr. Roberson, you may proceed.	10 functionalization.
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION	11 Q. Okay. If you turn to page 5, starting on line
12	BY MR. ROBERSON:	12 <b>21</b> , and going on to the next page, you discuss PSE's
13	Q. Good morning, Mr. Donahue.	13 right of sole use of the line during peak shaving;
14	A. Good morning.	14 correct?
15	Q. Do you have a copy of your rebuttal testimony in	15 A. Yes.
16	front of you?	16 Q. That's limited by the permit, though; correct?
17	A. I do.	17 A. No.
18	Q. Would you please turn to page 4, beginning at	18 Q. Okay. If PSE uses the facility to vaporize for
19	line 16.	19 <b>240 hours in January, can it vaporize again?</b>
20	A. Yes, I'm there.	A. In a calendar year, it's limited to 240 hours of
21	Q. So you began discussing function of the	21 vaporization. That does not limit the use by PSE of
22	four-mile pipe there; is that correct?	that pipeline. It is a limit on vaporization at the
23	A. That's correct.	23 plant.
24	Q. Does PSE debate this is a distribution pipe?	<b>Q.</b> Okay. So the facility was built as a peak
25	A. It's a unique distribution pipe, yes. It is a	25 shaver; correct?
	Page 66	Page 68
1	distribution pipe.	1 A. It is a dual function.
2	Q. It's okay. When you went to functionalize,	2 Q. For PSE's purposes, it's
3	did you look at the Commission's rules governing costs	3 A. Yes.
4	of service, which is WAC as relevant here, it's WAC	4 Q a peak shaver?
5	480.85.060?	5 A. Yes, it is.
6	A. I did not look directly at that. I discussed	6 Q. For Puget LNG
7	what our what the priorities were in terms of my	7 THE COURT REPORTER: We need to speak one at
8	understanding was direct assignment wherever possible	8 a time, please.
9	and then to look at, you know, the functionalization,	9 MR. ROBERSON: That's my fault. I
10	and then ultimately if there were no other direct	10 apologize.
11	assignment options available, my understanding was	11 I apologize, Mr. Donahue.
12	that's when peak and average is utilized.	12 THE WITNESS: No worries.
13	Q. So did you do you do kind of independently	13 BY MR. ROBERSON:
14	research on cost allocations, or did you just discuss	14 Q. For Puget LNG, it's a marine fuelling station;
15	this with other people at PSE?	15 correct?
16	A. I believe I've discussed it with a couple of	16 A. Yes, and truck.
17	other people at PSE.	17 Q. Okay. Fair enough.
18 19	Q. Okay. And did you discuss kind of the level of granularity that's usually applied to cost	18I have another set of questions, and then I19think I don't have any more for you.
20	functionalization?	20 Page 6, lines 11 and 12, you claim that staff
20 21	A. I did not.	21 seeks an allocation that results in the lowest possible
22	Q. Have you ever seen cost functionalization?	22 allocation for PSE; correct?
23	A. Yes.	23 A. That's what I said, yes.
24	Q. So generally when a commission or	24 Q. Did you read that in Mr. Earl's testimony?
25	functionalizes cost, it assigns kind of broad	25 A. I took it, the utilization of the 240-hour
-		

1			
	Page 69		Page 71
1	vaporization limit as the the I think Staff's	1	on the cost causation principles, which I've argued for
2	interpretation of that as the cost causation to be quite	2	in numerous other cases in other jurisdictions, is that
3	limited. The reality is we designed the pipe long	3	it would be based on what is the cost driver. And,
4	before there was an air permit limitation stated. The	4	again, this is a case where how big the pipe needed to
5	need for the pipe was the fact that there had to be	5	be and who was it being built for. I came to the
6	physical capacity built to flow gas, whether it's an	6	conclusion both, you know, the need to take gas out of
7	hour, a minute, or whether it's 240 hours or every day.	7	the plant and into the plant were separate functions.
8	That pipe had to be built, and that was the primary cost	8	Fortunately, we're in a location where we could build
9	driver.	9	only one we were able to only need to build one pipe,
10	Q. So	10	and, therefore, what was the fair, just, and reasonable
11	A. To argue later that, oh, but they can only use	11	way to allocate the cost, not about who was a winner and
12	it ten days a year, so they shouldn't be having to pay	12	who was a loser.
13	for it, that did not make sense. It's not consistent	13	Q. Okay. Then let's circle back around because you
14	with direct allocation of cost, and it's not not	14	just talked about functionalization, two functions.
15	consistent with how rate design is done on most	15	When commissions or utilities functionalize, do
16	pipelines, so that's why	16	they recognize sub functions like the flow in one
17	Q. So you're	17	direction or another?
18	A I had an issue with the ignoring the cost	18	A. You may, depending on the circumstance.
19	driver.	19	Q. Does the Commission's rules just generally
20	Q. Okay. You're inferring from the result that	20	assign things to distribution and transmission, or does
21	that was less than ten?	21	it recognize sub functions?
22	A. I couldn't figure out another way to explain it.	22	A. I don't know; however, I don't believe the
23	Q. Okay. Puget LNG is a corporate affiliate of	23	Commission has ever dealt with a true bidirectional
24	PSE; correct?	24	pipeline.
25	A. Yes.	25	Q. Okay. But there are other parts of PSE's system
	Page 70		Page 72
1	Q. And costs that aren't allocated to PSE are	1	where energy flows both ways; correct?
2	allocated to Puget LNG; correct?	2	A. Not contractually.
3	A. And vice versa, yes.	3	Q. You
4	Q. And you work for PSE	4	A. That's the difference here.
5	A. Yes.	5	Q. Net metering? There's a tariff; right?
6	Q as a consultant?	6	A. There may be. I don't know.
7	A. Yes.	7	Q. Does PSE functionalize both directions its
8	Q. And you've worked there for 30 years?	8	distribution system for electricity?
9	A. I was an employee for over 30 years.	9	A. I honestly don't know.
10	Q. How long?	10	MR. ROBERSON: Okay. That's all the
11	A. 31 and a half years.	11	questions I have for Mr. Donahue. Thank you.
12	Q. You rose through the ranks there?	12	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Any redirect following
13	A. Yes, yeah.	13	the Staff's cross?
14	Q. Kind of your corporate home?	14	MS. CARSON: No redirect. Thank you.
15	A. Yeah.	15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Public Counsel
16	Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that PSE has an	16	also indicated cross for this witness.
17	incentive to shift costs to itself to spare its	17	MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	corporate affiliate those costs?	18	Based similar to the last witness, Public Counsel
19	A. No, I don't.	19	will waive cross of Mr. Donahue and save us a little
20	Q. It wouldn't reduce Puget LNG's profitability if	20	time. Thank you.
21	those costs are shifted to it dollar for dollar?	21	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. The Tribe also
22	A. I have I have no idea whether it would affect	22	indicated cross.
23	it materially or not. It might affect it, but I can't	23	MR. FULLER: Yes, I'll be brief.
24	imagine that it would be material. The reality is, we	24	///
25	were looking at what was fair and reasonable. And based	25	///

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

	Page 73		Page 75
1	CROSS-EXAMINATION	1 injected into the distribution system on	ly on the days
2	BY MR. FULLER:	2 when that supply of gas is insufficient t	
3	Q. Good morning, Mr. Donahue. I believe staff has	3 nonboil sorry the inter the pipeline	
4	touched on some of the things I was going to ask about.	4 there's not sufficient quantity to meet ra	-
5	I'll touch on just a quick question about the	5 needs?	
6	functionalization and allocation of the four-mile	6 A. I think I finally understood what you'	're
7	pipeline.	7 referring to. No, boil-off gas occurs every	
8	You were involved in that process; correct?	8 is it is not a choice. It happens. It is	my
9	A. Yes, I was.	9 understanding is it's the physics of the pro-	
10	Q. Okay. And you've testified that that four-mile	LNG project. So that gas, as it comes off	
11	pipeline is a unique facility because of its	11 entirely in a closed system. It goes to to	owards the
12	bidirectional functionality; correct?	12 outlet of the plant to where it would conne	
13	A. Yes, and there's multiple parts to the	distribution system. Now, if we are liquely	ying that
14	bidirectional, yes.	gas, whether it's PSE or PLNG, that gas of	-
15	Q. All right. Am I correct that PSE is not aware	15 through the pre-liquefaction treatment pro	-
16	of any singular pipe segment on its own distribution	16 it's already been treated and it gets liquefi	
17	system that has this bidirectional characteristic?	we're not liquefying at the plant, that goes	into the
18	A. That is my testimony.	distribution plant, and PSE uses that gas	
19	Q. Okay. So knowing that this is a unique facility	around thousand dekatherms on average	and delivers that
20	and it's the only one on PSE's system, is it correct	to PSE gas customers in lieu of buying ga	as at Sumas' or
21	that this is the only functionalization and allocation	21 Rocky's or withdrawing from another stora	age project. So
22	of a bidirectional pipeline that PSE has presented to	it's there to serve customers every day wh	nether or not
23	the Commission for review and approval?	we fully utilize the interstate capacity.	
24	A. I don't know the long history of what may or may	Q. Okay. Yeah, and that that so t	he
25	not have been presented, but to the best of my	<sup>25</sup> interstate capacity, regardless of wheth	ner there is
	Page 74		
	rage / i		Page 76
1		1 sufficient interstate capacity or insuffi	
1 2	knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true	<ol> <li>sufficient interstate capacity or insuffi</li> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> </ol>	cient
			cient at times
2	knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that	2 interstate capacity where liquefaction	cient at times
2 3	knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.	<ul><li>2 interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li><li>3 liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-or</li></ul>	cient at times
2 3 4	knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before. <b>Q. So it appears to be a question of first</b>	<ul> <li>2 interstate capacity where liquefaction</li> <li>3 liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>4 available to the distribution system?</li> </ul>	cient at times
2 3 4 5	knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before. <b>Q. So it appears to be a question of first</b> <b>impression?</b>	<ul> <li>2 interstate capacity where liquefaction</li> <li>3 liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>4 available to the distribution system?</li> <li>5 A. It doesn't matter.</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> <li>liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> <li>liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is uestions. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> <li>liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is questions. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> <li>liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redired</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is uestions. I ect? hank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction- liquefaction is not occurring, the boil- available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redired</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. T</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is questions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction- liquefaction is not occurring, the boil- available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redire</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. T</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is questions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction- liquefaction is not occurring, the boil- available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redired</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. T</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I</li> <li>questions from the bench for Mr. Dona</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is questions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it.</li> <li>Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction- liquefaction is not occurring, the boil- available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redired</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. T</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I</li> <li>questions from the bench for Mr. Dona</li> <li>COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is questions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline</li></ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> <li>liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redired</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. Th</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If</li> <li>questions from the bench for Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is questions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? 'es, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it.</li> <li>Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> <li>liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redire</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. Th</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I</li> <li>questions from the bench for Mr. Dona</li> <li>COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is questions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? 'es, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before. <b>Q. So it appears to be a question of first</b> <b>impression?</b> A. Yeah. <b>Q. Thank you.</b> And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's insufficient pipeline gas to serve PSE ratepayer needs? A. Could you repeat that? Which pipeline are we referring to?	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction- liquefaction is not occurring, the boil- available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redired MS. CARSON: No redirect. The JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If questions from the bench for Mr. Dona COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. So a few questions on the pipelin Donahue.</li> <li>First of all, directing your attention</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is uestions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? Yes, Your Honor. ine. Thanks, Mr. on to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it.</li> <li>Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's insufficient pipeline gas to serve PSE ratepayer needs?</li> <li>A. Could you repeat that? Which pipeline are we referring to?</li> <li>Q. Sorry. That was could have been more clear.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> <li>liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redire</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. Ti</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If</li> <li>questions from the bench for Mr. Dona</li> <li>COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So a few questions on the pipeli</li> <li>Donahue.</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is uestions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? Yes, Your Honor. ine. Thanks, Mr. on to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before. <b>Q. So it appears to be a question of first</b> <b>impression?</b> A. Yeah. <b>Q. Thank you.</b> And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's insufficient pipeline gas to serve PSE ratepayer needs? A. Could you repeat that? Which pipeline are we referring to?	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction- liquefaction is not occurring, the boil- available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redired MS. CARSON: No redirect. The JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If questions from the bench for Mr. Dona COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. So a few questions on the pipelin Donahue.</li> <li>First of all, directing your attention</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is uestions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? Yes, Your Honor. ine. Thanks, Mr. on to the e first case,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it.</li> <li>Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's insufficient pipeline gas to serve PSE ratepayer needs?</li> <li>A. Could you repeat that? Which pipeline are we referring to?</li> <li>Q. Sorry. That was could have been more clear. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days that PSE I may</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> <li>liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-</li> <li>available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redired</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. The JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If</li> <li>questions from the bench for Mr. Donahu</li> <li>COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So a few questions on the pipeli</li> <li>Donahue.</li> <li>First of all, directing your attention</li> <li>settling parties in the settlement in the</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is uestions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? 'es, Your Honor. ine. Thanks, Mr. on to the e first case, ppendix A to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it.</li> <li>Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's insufficient pipeline gas to serve PSE ratepayer needs?</li> <li>A. Could you repeat that? Which pipeline are we referring to?</li> <li>Q. Sorry. That was could have been more clear. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days that PSE I may excuse me. I may be using the wrong term.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction-</li> <li>liquefaction is not occurring, the boil-or</li> <li>available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redire</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. Th</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If</li> <li>questions from the bench for Mr. Dona</li> <li>COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So a few questions on the pipeli</li> <li>Donahue.</li> <li>First of all, directing your attention</li> <li>settling parties in the settlement in the</li> <li>which is that document UG-151662, Application.</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is uestions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? 'es, Your Honor. ine. Thanks, Mr. on to the e first case, ppendix A to the at, I'll ask a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before. Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression? A. Yeah. Q. Thank you. And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's insufficient pipeline gas to serve PSE ratepayer needs? A. Could you repeat that? Which pipeline are we referring to? Q. Sorry. That was could have been more clear. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days that PSE I may excuse me. I may be using the wrong term. The interstate pipeline sources firm commitments	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction- liquefaction is not occurring, the boil- available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redire</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. Th</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If</li> <li>questions from the bench for Mr. Dona</li> <li>COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So a few questions on the pipeli</li> <li>Donahue.</li> <li>First of all, directing your attention</li> <li>settling parties in the settlement in the</li> <li>which is that document UG-151662, Application</li> <li>So at paragraph 29, settling parties</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is uestions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? 'es, Your Honor. ine. Thanks, Mr. on to the e first case, ppendix A to the at, I'll ask a es agree the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before.</li> <li>Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it.</li> <li>Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's insufficient pipeline gas to serve PSE ratepayer needs?</li> <li>A. Could you repeat that? Which pipeline are we referring to?</li> <li>Q. Sorry. That was could have been more clear. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days that PSE I may excuse me. I may be using the wrong term.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction- liquefaction is not occurring, the boil- available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redired MS. CARSON: No redirect. The JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If questions from the bench for Mr. Dona COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. So a few questions on the pipelit Donahue.</li> <li>First of all, directing your attention settling parties in the settlement in the which is that document UG-151662, Ap Final Order 10, and when you have tha question.</li> <li>So at paragraph 29, settling parties</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is questions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? 'es, Your Honor. ine. Thanks, Mr. on to the e first case, ppendix A to the at, I'll ask a es agree the shall be allocated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	knowledge, PSE has never had to deal with a true bidirectional pipeline on their system, so I doubt that we've brought anything before the Commission before. Q. So it appears to be a question of first impression? A. Yeah. Q. Thank you. And quickly I'll just I would like to ask a couple of quick questions about your discussion with boil-off gas which was a new issue for me. I believe it came up for the first time in your rebuttal testimony, just a real quick question about it. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days when PSE's pipeline capacity is exceeded and, therefore, it's there's insufficient pipeline gas to serve PSE ratepayer needs? A. Could you repeat that? Which pipeline are we referring to? Q. Sorry. That was could have been more clear. Does PSE inject boil-off gas into the distribution system only on days that PSE I may excuse me. I may be using the wrong term. The interstate pipeline sources firm commitments	<ul> <li>interstate capacity where liquefaction- liquefaction is not occurring, the boil- available to the distribution system?</li> <li>A. It doesn't matter.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>Thank you. That concludes my q</li> <li>appreciate your time, Mr. Donahue.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Any redire</li> <li>MS. CARSON: No redirect. Th</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If</li> <li>questions from the bench for Mr. Dona</li> <li>COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Y</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So a few questions on the pipeli</li> <li>Donahue.</li> <li>First of all, directing your attention</li> <li>settling parties in the settlement in the</li> <li>which is that document UG-151662, Application</li> <li>So at paragraph 29, settling parties</li> </ul>	cient at times off gas is questions. I ect? hank you. Do we have any ahue? 'es, Your Honor. ine. Thanks, Mr. on to the e first case, ppendix A to the at, I'll ask a es agree the shall be allocated

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

	Page 77	Pa	ige 79
1	You see that, right?	1 Rendahl has a follow-up on that question.	
2	MS. CARSON: Excuse me. Is the reference to	2 EXAMINATION	
3	the settlement stipulate?	3 BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:	
4	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yeah.	4 Q. Mr. Donahue, so my understanding is the Co	mpany
5	MS. CARSON: So it's Attachment A.	5 for the portion of the I might have this wrong. TI	
б	THE WITNESS: Oh, it's the attachment.	6 portion of the pipeline that is the additional capacit	
7	Sorry.	7 for the distribution, so there's the 12-inch pipeline	. <b>y</b>
8	BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:	8 and expanded it to 16 inch for the distribution;	
9	Q. Sorry. Appendix A.	9 correct?	
10	A. Yes, I I think I'm there with you.	10 A. That's on the leaving the plant for the	
11	Q. Okay. Great.	11 vaporization, yes.	
12	So the simple question based on that statement	12 Q. Okay. So as I understand PSE's allocation, th	ne
13	in the settlement, did the settlement, in your opinion,	13 Company has allocated 50 percent for PSE custom	
14	provide enough or any guidance on the allocation of the	14 50 percent for Puget LNG, and then the portion of I	
15	bidirectional four-mile pipeline?	15 LNG's is then is then further allocated by the 90/	-
16	A. Just that which what I would presume to be	16 split.	
17	absent a limitation. It's the direction that you should	17 Do I have that correct?	
18	use cost causation, which is what I believe I did.	18 A. Respectfully, no.	
19	Q. Okay. That was that was essentially a	<ol> <li>19</li> <li>Q. Okay. So can you please explain? Because</li> </ol>	
20	question you felt you your calculation was in accord	<ul> <li>that's the way I read the testimony.</li> </ul>	
21	with the settlement stipulation?	A. Sure. Well, first I looked at 50 percent of the	
22	A. I believe it is, yes.	nominal 12-inch pipe. The cost of a 12-inch pipe	
23	Q. Okay. And along the same lines, at paragraph	equivalent. 50 percent of that is functionalized to	
24	26, the same document, the settlement provided for a	<ul><li>putting gas in, 50 percent to taking gas out. And then</li></ul>	
25	90/10 split on liquefaction, and you partially factored	who uses that? Why is it needed? Who uses it? 90	
		····· , ···· , ···· ··· ···	
	Page 78	Pa	
	Fage / 6		ıge 80
1	5		2
1 2	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the	1 percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG	
2	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.	<ol> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> </ol>	n on
2 3	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the	<ol> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> </ol>	n on
2 3 4	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the	<ol> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> </ol>	n on G has no
2 3	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?	<ol> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> </ol>	n on G has no
2 3 4 5	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline? A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the	<ol> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And thei</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> </ol>	n on G has no
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And then</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> </ol>	n on G has no
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And then</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ol>	n on G has no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And then</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ol>	n on G has no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> </ol>	n on G has no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> </ul>	n on G has no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> </ul>	n on G has no <b>1</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline? A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And thei</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> </ul>	al
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline? A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And their</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirection.</li> </ul>	al
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline? A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And then</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirection</li> </ul>	al
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline? A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to put gas in and the other 10 percent for PSE to put gas	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And then</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirectional</li> <li>pipe. You split it 50/50 to recognize the different</li> <li>uses of the pipe.</li> </ul>	al
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline? A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to put gas in and the other 10 percent for PSE to put gas in. And then on coming out, it's 100 percent PSE on the	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And there</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirectional</li> <li>pipe. You split it 50/50 to recognize the different</li> <li>uses of the pipe.</li> <li>Why is it necessary to go to the additional</li> </ul>	al to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline? A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to put gas in and the other 10 percent for PSE to put gas in. And then on coming out, it's 100 percent PSE on the vaporization, and so that the liquefaction limitation	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And there</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirectional</li> <li>pipe. You split it 50/50 to recognize the different</li> <li>uses of the pipe.</li> <li>Why is it necessary to go to the additional</li> <li>calculation of the allocation if you're not going</li> </ul>	al to r
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline. Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline? A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to put gas in and the other 10 percent for PSE to put gas in. And then on coming out, it's 100 percent PSE on the vaporization, and so that the liquefaction limitation is what limits the use into the plant.	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And there</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirection:</li> <li>pipe. You split it 50/50 to recognize the different</li> <li>uses of the pipe.</li> <li>Why is it necessary to go to the additional</li> <li>calculation of the allocation if you're not going</li> <li>use the allocation from the original settlement for</li> </ul>	al to r
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to put gas in and the other 10 percent for PSE to put gas in. And then on coming out, it's 100 percent PSE on the vaporization, and so that the liquefaction limitation is what limits the use into the plant.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirectional</li> <li>pipe. You split it 50/50 to recognize the different</li> <li>uses of the pipe.</li> <li>Why is it necessary to go to the additional</li> <li>calculation of the allocation if you're not going</li> <li>use the allocation from the original settlement for</li> <li>the for the allocation, why are you then adding</li> </ul>	al to r
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to put gas in and the other 10 percent for PSE to put gas in. And then on coming out, it's 100 percent PSE on the vaporization, and so that the liquefaction limitation is what limits the use into the plant.</li> <li>A. That's how I draw it.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirectional</li> <li>pipe. You split it 50/50 to recognize the different</li> <li>uses of the pipe.</li> <li>Why is it necessary to go to the additional</li> <li>calculation of the allocation if you're not going</li> <li>use the allocation from the original settlement for</li> <li>the for the allocation, why are you then adding</li> <li>now to add additional costs to customers?</li> </ul>	al to r
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to put gas in and the other 10 percent for PSE to put gas in. And then on coming out, it's 100 percent PSE on the vaporization, and so that the liquefaction limitation is what limits the use into the plant.</li> <li>A. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>A. That's how I draw it.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And the</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirectional</li> <li>pipe. You split it 50/50 to recognize the different</li> <li>uses of the pipe.</li> <li>Why is it necessary to go to the additional</li> <li>calculation of the allocation if you're not going</li> <li>use the allocation from the original settlement for</li> <li>the for the allocation, why are you then adding</li> <li>now to add additional costs to customers?</li> </ul>	al to r
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to put gas in and the other 10 percent for PSE to put gas in. And then on coming out, it's 100 percent PSE on the vaporization, and so that the liquefaction limitation is what limits the use into the plant.</li> <li>A. That's how I draw it.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Puget LNG and PSE each needed to liquefy a</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And there</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirectional</li> <li>pipe. You split it 50/50 to recognize the different</li> <li>uses of the pipe.</li> <li>Why is it necessary to go to the additional</li> <li>calculation of the allocation if you're not going</li> <li>use the allocation from the original settlement for</li> <li>the for the allocation, why are you then adding</li> <li>now to add additional costs to customers?</li> <li>A. Well, okay, I don't believe there was any</li> <li>allocation of the cost of this pipe to anyone prior to</li> </ul>	al to r
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that into the Company's proposed allocation for the four-mile pipeline.</li> <li>Why is that 90/10 split appropriate to the Company's functionalized approach in the case of the pipeline?</li> <li>A. Well, again, there were two purposes for the pipeline: One to put gas in, one to take out. I don't want it to be lost that we pulled 15 percent of the total cost out of the equation because it represented the cost of making the pipe larger for coming out of the plant. And then we looked at, okay, you're left with effectively a 12-inch pipe in and out. How is that used? What causes it to be built? And 90 percent of the capacity of that pipe was needed for Puget LNG to put gas in and the other 10 percent for PSE to put gas in. And then on coming out, it's 100 percent PSE on the vaporization, and so that the liquefaction limitation is what limits the use into the plant.</li> <li>A. That's how I draw it.</li> <li>A. Puget LNG and PSE each needed to liquefy a certain quantity consistent with their rights to use the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>percent of the going-in part is related to Puget LNG</li> <li>10 percent of the going-in part is for PSE. And there</li> <li>the coming out, it's 100 percent PSE because PLN</li> <li>right to put gas into the system at that location.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's for the 12-inch portion, and</li> <li>then the full amount of the remaining 4 inches</li> <li>capacity</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q goes to Puget customers?</li> <li>A. That's correct. Well, it goes, yes, to PSE's</li> <li>vaporization use, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. But I guess the question still</li> <li>stands. You've already split it. It's a bidirectional</li> <li>pipe. You split it 50/50 to recognize the different</li> <li>uses of the pipe.</li> <li>Why is it necessary to go to the additional</li> <li>calculation of the allocation if you're not going</li> <li>use the allocation from the original settlement for</li> <li>the for the allocation, why are you then adding</li> <li>now to add additional costs to customers?</li> <li>A. Well, okay, I don't believe there was any</li> <li>allocation of the cost of this pipe to anyone prior to</li> <li>what we're doing here today.</li> </ul>	al to r

	Page 81	Page 83
1	liquefaction portion and the distribution portion, why	1 Q. So the one would think then the use of the
2	do you then add on the additional functionality to add	2 PSE customers of the liquefied gas and it's revaporized,
3	additional costs to customers if you've already split it	3 when they're using it, is the same same amount, I
4	half and half, recognizing the bidirectional function of	4 guess that would be used to serve the LNG customers,
5	the pipeline?	5 50/50 in terms of use; is that sort of what you're
6	A. Okay. I need to step back. I understand your	6 saying?
7	question now. My apologies.	7 A. Yes. I mean, both needs were important. Again,
8	Again, cost causation, if you are if you are	8 we think about it as, you could have built two
9	building a pipe to take gas to the liquefaction pipe,	<ul> <li>9 pipelines, one to go in and one to go out because they</li> </ul>
10	how much do you need? 21,000, 3 or 4 hundred a day.	10 might have gone to different locations. If you did
11	That's what the plant will take. That's that is the	11 that, you would have two 12 well, two \$23 million
12	plant that's the size of pipe that was needed. And	12 pipelines, and if you can consolidate them and to use
13	that would be a 12-inch pipe. So we looked at that and	13 to get them to functionally work for separate uses but
14	said, Okay, that's cost causation. You're going to	14 non simultaneously, you can lower the cost. That's what
15	build a 12-inch pipe in and you're going to build it and	15 we did.
16	take it out. But the out customer, in this case, the	16 <b>Q. Okay.</b>
17	vaporization need, needed a much bigger pipe. It needed	17 A. But a 50/50 allocation is what is typically used
18	a 16-inch pipe. All we did was we compared what was the	18 on many interstate pipelines, many Canadian pipelines,
19	cost of a 12-inch versus a 16. You only needed a	19 when there's a multiple parties using and they're
20	12-inch to go in. You needed 16 to come out. Why would	20 separately contracting to go in opposite directions, you
21	you allocate the cost of the of the larger pipe going	21 spread the cost to the two directions first, and then
22	in when they didn't ask for it. No party did. In fact,	22 spread the cost out among the contracting parties. I
23	originally, the consideration was that there might be	23 use that same principle here.
24	two pipes because we didn't know where we were going to	24 Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.
25	connect the vaporization portion of the project into the	25 I just want to move on to a couple of points
	Page 82	Page 84
1	Page 82 system. We knew we thought we knew where we were	Page 84 1 that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the
1 2		
	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were	1 that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the
2	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> </ul>
2 3	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution	<ol> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> </ol>
2 3 4	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.	1that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the2boil-off and then on the superior right as well.3So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,4paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the5boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's6distribution system, and it sounds like you said that7that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.8Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a
2 3 4 5 6 7	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.	1that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the2boil-off and then on the superior right as well.3So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,4paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the5boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's6distribution system, and it sounds like you said that7that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.8Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part. Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part. Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued) BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part. Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued) BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part. Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued) BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</li> <li>A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</li> <li>A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So that is metered every day. It's also</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part. <b>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my</b> <b>question, but that's I'll be done.</b> <b>EXAMINATION (continued)</b> BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: <b>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle</b> <b>cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</b> A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were equally needed, so assuming that PSE would have been	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So that is metered every day. It's also</li> <li>internal to the plant. It is measured because we keep</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</li> <li>A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were equally needed, so assuming that PSE would have been comfortable with only vaporizing 22,000 a day, we could</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li><b>Q. Okay.</b></li> <li>A. So that is metered every day. It's also</li> <li>internal to the plant. It is measured because we keep</li> <li>track of it being recycled when it's liquefied again.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</li> <li>A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were equally needed, so assuming that PSE would have been comfortable with only vaporizing 22,000 a day, we could have built one 12-inch pipe and it would have been</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li><b>Q. Okay.</b></li> <li><b>Q. Okay.</b></li> <li><b>Q. Okay.</b></li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part. <b>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my</b> <b>question, but that's I'll be done.</b> <b>EXAMINATION (continued)</b> BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: <b>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle</b> <b>cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</b> A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were equally needed, so assuming that PSE would have been comfortable with only vaporizing 22,000 a day, we could have built one 12-inch pipe and it would have been allocated 50 percent in and 50 percent out. There was a	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li><b>Q. Okay.</b></li> <li>A. So that is metered every day. It's also</li> <li>internal to the plant. It is measured because we keep</li> <li>track of it being recycled when it's liquefied again.</li> <li><b>Q. Okay.</b></li> <li>A. So we track that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</li> <li>A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were equally needed, so assuming that PSE would have been comfortable with only vaporizing 22,000 a day, we could have built one 12-inch pipe and it would have been allocated 50 percent in and 50 percent out. There was a larger pipe needed on the withdrawal side.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So that is metered every day. It's also</li> <li>internal to the plant. It is measured because we keep</li> <li>track of it being recycled when it's liquefied again.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So we track that.</li> <li>Q. So those records are accessible?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</li> <li>A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were equally needed, so assuming that PSE would have been comfortable with only vaporizing 22,000 a day, we could have built one 12-inch pipe and it would have been allocated 50 percent in and 50 percent out. There was a larger pipe needed on the withdrawal side.</li> <li>Q. I understand that.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So that is metered every day. It's also</li> <li>internal to the plant. It is measured because we keep</li> <li>track of it being recycled when it's liquefied again.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So we track that.</li> <li>Q. So those records are accessible?</li> <li>A. Yes, they are.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</li> <li>A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were equally needed, so assuming that PSE would have been comfortable with only vaporizing 22,000 a day, we could have built one 12-inch pipe and it would have been allocated 50 percent in and 50 percent out. There was a larger pipe needed on the withdrawal side.</li> <li>Q. I understand that. I'm just saying, even on the 12-inch pipe,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So that is metered every day. It's also</li> <li>internal to the plant. It is measured because we keep</li> <li>track of it being recycled when it's liquefied again.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So we track that.</li> <li>Q. So those records are accessible?</li> <li>A. Yes, they are.</li> <li>Q. So and I guess then one could count the next</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</li> <li>A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were equally needed, so assuming that PSE would have been comfortable with only vaporizing 22,000 a day, we could have built one 12-inch pipe and it would have been allocated 50 percent in and 50 percent out. There was a larger pipe needed on the withdrawal side.</li> <li>Q. I understand that. I'm just saying, even on the 12-inch pipe, you're saying basically in and out is 50/50?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So that is metered every day. It's also</li> <li>internal to the plant. It is measured because we keep</li> <li>track of it being recycled when it's liquefied again.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So we track that.</li> <li>Q. So those records are accessible?</li> <li>A. Yes, they are.</li> <li>Q. So and I guess then one could count the next</li> <li>question I was going to ask is, how do the volumes</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>system. We knew we thought we knew where we were going to get the gas, but we didn't know where we needed to tie in to spread it out to all distribution customers. So, again, one pipe might have been a 12 inch; one might have been a 16. All we did is we separated that extra, and that's only 15 percent of the cost. We tied that to the vaporization, the withdrawal part.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm not sure you're answering my question, but that's I'll be done. EXAMINATION (continued)</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:</li> <li>Q. So if I can go back to 50/50, why principle cost causation, why 50/50 on a 12-inch pipe?</li> <li>A. Well, which came first: The need to put gas into the tank or to take gas out of the tank. Both were equally needed, so assuming that PSE would have been comfortable with only vaporizing 22,000 a day, we could have built one 12-inch pipe and it would have been allocated 50 percent in and 50 percent out. There was a larger pipe needed on the withdrawal side.</li> <li>Q. I understand that. I'm just saying, even on the 12-inch pipe,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that you addressed with staffing with the Tribe on the</li> <li>boil-off and then on the superior right as well.</li> <li>So in your rebuttal testimony WFD-5T at page 6,</li> <li>paragraph 18 through 7, paragraph 14, you discussed the</li> <li>boil-off gas back into the distribution system, PSE's</li> <li>distribution system, and it sounds like you said that</li> <li>that averages a thousand dekatherms a day.</li> <li>Does PSE have accurate measurements of that on a</li> <li>daily basis?</li> <li>A. Yes. There is a flow meter. There are three</li> <li>meters at the intersection of the plant with the</li> <li>four-mile pipe, and there's three meters, two for</li> <li>well, one for inbound, one for vaporization, and one for</li> <li>boil-off coming back into the system.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So that is metered every day. It's also</li> <li>internal to the plant. It is measured because we keep</li> <li>track of it being recycled when it's liquefied again.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. So we track that.</li> <li>Q. So those records are accessible?</li> <li>A. Yes, they are.</li> <li>Q. So and I guess then one could count the next</li> </ul>

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

	Page 85	Page 87
1	and Public Counsel and their allocations? I guess you	1 A. What's it
2	can determine that based on these records, but what's	2 Q. What's the value? What's the monetary value?
3	the what percentage of that thousand dekatherms a	3 A. I would say the monetary value is the cost of
4	day, I guess, needs to be the larger peak shaving	4 the 15-percent increment and the and the 50 percent
5	volumes that you use.	5 of the cost of the four of the 12-inch nominal
6	Does that make sense?	6 portion of the pipeline. I mean, that's ultimately the
7	A. I'm not sure what time period we're talking	7 cost. Now, value, the value is part of a larger
8	about.	8 equation that would include the alternative of building
9	Q. Yeah. I think let me think about that one in	9 a pipeline from Northern British Columbia to Tacoma
10	a moment, and I'll just ask the next question.	10 Q. Well, you're saying staff
11	Can you explain in more detail how the boil-off	11 A as an alternative resource.
12	gas factored into the proposed cost allocation or	12 Q. And I'm sorry. Sorry about that.
13	that you referenced it, but I don't know how the	13 In Staff's testimony, did you say you said
14	did you factor it into your actual cost causation or	14 they didn't take into account the essentially, the
15	your cost allocation?	15 exclusive right of use during peak shaving events?
16	A. I consider it I considered it, but it did not	16 A. What I was referring to there is Staff and to
17	change the math. And the reason is, again, cost	17 some extent public counsel have been arguing that
18	causation, a contract to take gas to the plant and a	18 they the air permit says you can only vaporize 240
19	contract to take gas from the plant, and basically on	19 hours a year, right, but it's 240 hours where a pipe has
20	the way in, one customer has a need of over 19,000 a day	20 to be there ready to operate and ready to push others
21	and the other one for about 2,000 a day, that's PLNG and	21 out of the way from using it because it can only flow in
22	PSE on liquefaction. And then PSE 66,000 of withdraw	22 one direction at a time, and so when you have a higher
23	going the other direction. That was that's what	right, that firm right to push others out of the way,
24	drove the need for the pipe and the size of the pipe.	that it doesn't matter how often you do it. The fact
25	That difference between 22 and 66 being that extra 15	<sup>25</sup> is, you have the right to do it at any time. In
	Page 86	Page 88
1	percent to build a larger pipe.	1 addition, there was the consideration that when we did
2	Q. Okay. Good, but	2 the allocation, the cost of the pipe, there was no air
3	A. That	3 permit limit. Now the air permit limit is there, I
4	Q. Go ahead. I'm sorry.	4 would have built a different pipe, but you still needed
5	A. That is their demand, their required peak volume	5 it for the 240 hours.
6	usage that both parties are reserving, so any time they	6 Q. One last question: So on the right, where is
7	use less of it, they're within their rights. So the	<ul> <li>7 that embodied in the contract?</li> <li>8 A. I don't know that it's in a specific contract.</li> </ul>
8	thousand a day of boil-off gas is well within PSE's	
-	rights to use up to 66,000, and so it's it's another use, but it doesn't really matter. I have to build the	i indy be part of the officient and operating agreement
10 11	larger pipe anyway.	10between PSE and PLNG, that they have the right at the11plant. There is no contract between PSE and itself for
12	Q. Okay. One last question.	12 the pipe, but there is a contract between PSE and PLNG,
13	On the on the superior rights, which I think	13 and there it states their right is is not firm. It
14	you you claim it to be, this would be your rebuttal	14 can be interrupted when PSE chooses to vaporize.
15	testimony, right, at the bottom of last line of page	15 <b>Q.</b> And that contract is available?
16	5 and the top of page 6, the right of sole use during	16 A. It's been file would the Commission.
17	peak shaving?	17 Q. Okay. Thank you. Nothing further. Thanks.
18	A. Yes.	18 EXAMINATION
19	Q. What is that worth?	19 BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
20	A. What is that worth?	20 <b>Q. It's been filed in this proceeding?</b>
21	Q. What is that right worth?	A. I don't think so, but I'll let counsel determine
22	A. It is it's the ability to	22 that. It was the subject of an affiliate it was a
23	Q. I think I know what it is. It is exclusive	23 discussion with staff and an affiliate filing related to
24	right. But, in your mind, do you have any idea what	the sale of gas. I don't know if the tariff-mandated
25	it's worth?	25 standard rate schedule was filed or not.

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

	Page 89		Page 91
1	Q. Okay. My issue is just whether it's in the case	1	it's transportation, and you said, Yes, and truck. So,
2	or not.	2	in fact, it's not allocated to LNG; it's allocated to
3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Ms. Carson?	3	PSE and ratepayers for 90 percent of that?
4	MS. CARSON: Yes. I do not believe it's	4	A. No. I'm sorry. I think we got confused. I
5	filed in the case. I think it was filed in Docket	5	was his question, my recollection of that, no
6	UG-210111. If you would like it filed in this case, we	6	offense, but was that he said it was for marine
7	can certainly do that.	7	marine fuel, and I said marine and truck, so
8	CHAIR DANNER: I think it should unless we	8	Q. Okay. And
9	can take notice of evidence. So if we can take notice	9	A Puget LNG is there to serve both markets.
10	of it. But let's get confirmation it was filed in that	10	They have done very little to serve the truck market to
11	case before we don't put it in this one.	11	date.
12	MS. CARSON: We can confirm that.	12	Q. Okay. So you weren't talking about allocation
13	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And if not,	13	then. You were just talking about what the facility is
14	we'll do a bench request for that. So after the break,	14	capable of doing?
	if you can let us know, that would be helpful.	15	
15 16	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.	16	A. That was my recollection of the context, yes. MS. CARSON: Your Honor and Chair Danner.
17	EXAMINATION	17	I'll just point you to Exhibit RJR-1T page 15 and 16
18	BY CHAIR DANNER:	18	that has that allocation for each different function of
18 19		18	
20	Q. Good morning, Mr. Donahue. So when you were getting questions from Mr. Roberson, he said, you know,	20	the plant. BY CHAIR DANNER:
20		20	-
21	for PSE, it's peak shaving. For LNG, he says, that's for transportation. And you said, Yes, and truck.	22	Q. Okay. That's fine. I just have confusion
22		22	because the I thought the discussion between you and
23	And I want to just get your understanding. When	23	Mr. Roberson was talking about allocation. So thank
24 25	we're talking about use of the LNG facility for trucking	24	you.
20	or for loading into trucks, where are you putting that	25	And since we're on the subject of other things,
	Page 90		Page 92
1	allocation? Is that is any of that being allocated	1	LNG by rail, can you tell me specifically what role
2	to the to the distribution system, or is that all on	2	there is for this plant for LNG by rail?
3	the LNG on the PLNG sides? And how much how much	3	A. None that I'm aware of. The first I heard of it
4	are we talking about there?	4	was somebody else's testimony in this case. I never
5	A. Well, in the old settlement agreement, I'm not	5	heard anything of it.
6	going to remember the name of the docket, but the one	6	Q. Okay. That's a little less than a hard no,
7	where we where the creation of a separate affiliate	7	SO
8	was hired and there was a general there was an	8	A. I'll say no.
9	agreement on the allocation of the four or five major	9	Q. Okay.
10	component costs of the LNG facility, truck loading was	10	A. But I'm not I'm no longer an employee, so I
11	one of those parcels of facility, so you had	11	can't speak for the Company on that score.
12	liquefaction, vaporization, storage, marine loading, and	12	Q. All right. Thank you. No further questions.
13	truck loading, and then I think general plan.	13	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Any further questions
14	So truck loading is there's two there's two	14	from the bench?
15	lanes where you can hook up bring in a semi truck and	15	All right. Hearing none, Mr. Donahue, thank you
16	hook it up and fill it with LNG, a tanker. That's been	16	for your testimony. You are excused.
17	used by PSE quite a bit, more than PLNG has used it, and	17	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
18	yet I believe a significant portion I want to I	18	JUDGE HOWARD: With that, let's take our
19	want to say by memory, maybe 90 percent of the cost of	19	mid-morning break. Let's take a 15-minute break, and
20	that truck loading equipment was allocated to PLNG, and	20	we'll resume at 11:17. We were are off the record.
21	that's, to my knowledge, only been used two or three	21	(A break commenced from
22	times; whereas, I know there's been at least 20	22	11:02 a.m. to 11:21 a.m.)
23	truckloads of LNG hauled to Gig Harbor.	23	JUDGE BROWN: And we are back on record.
24	Q. Okay. So that is different than what you	24	The next witness is John Taylor.
			•
25	responded to Mr. Roberson, because he said. And for LNG.	25	MS. CARSON: Good morning. Mr. Tavlor.
25	responded to Mr. Roberson, because he said, And for LNG,	25	MS. CARSON: Good morning, Mr. Taylor.

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

	Page 93	Page 95
1	Can you please state your name and title and	1 A. Yes, I have it in front of me.
2	spell your name for the court reporter.	2 <b>Q. Okay. Yeah.</b>
3	JUDGE BROWN: Before we do that, let's swear	3 Can you explain to me, why is it appropriate for
4	him in.	4 PSE to recover this revenue in excess of the amount that
5	MS. CARSON: Sorry.	5 was allocated to Puget LNG under schedule 808T?
6		6 A. Yeah, sure.
7	JOHN TAYLOR, having been first duly sworn by the	7 Q. So there's 808T and 807T, so
8	Judge, testified as follows:	8 A. Right.
9		9 <b>Q. Yeah.</b>
10	JUDGE BROWN: Proceed.	10 A. So under the settlement that came out of the
11	MS. CARSON: Thank you.	11 last GRC, we had revenue targets and rates that were
12	Okay. Mr. Taylor, please state your name and	12 approved and filed with the compliance filing. Puget
13	title for the record and spell your name for the court	13 LNG would have and they are currently an 807T
14	reporter.	14 customer with an estimated annual revenue of \$1.3
15	THE WITNESS: John Taylor, J-o-h-n,	15 millions under 807T. With the direct assignment of the
16	T-a-y-l-o-r, managing partner of Atrium Economics.	16 bidirectional pipeline that's currently recovered in
17	MS. CARSON: Mr. Taylor, do you have before	17 141-D, they will pay under the Company's proposal
18	you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit	18 approximately \$1.1 million under schedule 141-D, and so
19	Nos. JDT-1T through JDT-7 and JDT-18 in this docket?	19 to keep the revenue targets and the outcomes from the
20	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.	20 GRC, they needed to create a rate 808T for Puget LNG
21	MS. CARSON: Do these exhibits constitute	21 that would recover that delta, the difference between
22	your pre-filed, direct, and rebuttal testimony and	the \$1.1 million they will pay under 141-D and the \$1.3
23	exhibits?	they would have paid under 807T.
24	THE WITNESS: Yes, they do.	24 Q. Okay. So that would be recovered just through
25	MS. CARSON: Do you have any corrections to	25 this tariff, so not so there's how would you
	Page 94	Page 96
1	this testimony and exhibits?	1 how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,
1 2		
	this testimony and exhibits?	1 how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,
2	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not.	<ol> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> </ol>
2 3	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> </ul>
2 3 4	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness.	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed.	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor.	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out.	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench?	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question.	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So – all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION BY CHAIR DANNER:	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION BY CHAIR DANNER: <b>Q. Good morning, Mr. Taylor.</b>	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I see this as kind of setting up the foundation</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION BY CHAIR DANNER: <b>Q. Good morning, Mr. Taylor.</b> A. Good morning.	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I see this as kind of setting up the foundation</li> <li>and the various parts of 141-D and then that direct</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER: Q. Good morning, Mr. Taylor.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. So in your direct testimony, and that's JDT-1T</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I see this as kind of setting up the foundation</li> <li>and the various parts of 141-D and then that direct</li> <li>assignment to 808T and then proposing a new 808T as a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER: Q. Good morning, Mr. Taylor. A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. So in your direct testimony, and that's JDT-1T on page 5, you discussed the Company's proposal to</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So - all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I see this as kind of setting up the foundation</li> <li>and the various parts of 141-D and then that direct</li> <li>assignment to 808T and then proposing a new 808T as a</li> <li>tariff rate class, that would be included in, you know,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER: Q. Good morning, Mr. Taylor.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. So in your direct testimony, and that's JDT-1T on page 5, you discussed the Company's proposal to recover the expected \$200,000 in revenue that the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I see this as kind of setting up the foundation</li> <li>and the various parts of 141-D and then that direct</li> <li>assignment to 808T and then proposing a new 808T as a</li> <li>tariff rate class, that would be included in, you know,</li> <li>the next GRC as a as a class in the class cost to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER: Q. Good morning, Mr. Taylor. A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. So in your direct testimony, and that's JDT-1T on page 5, you discussed the Company's proposal to recover the expected \$200,000 in revenue that the company would have recovered from Puget LNG under</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I see this as kind of setting up the foundation</li> <li>and the various parts of 141-D and then that direct</li> <li>assignment to 808T and then proposing a new 808T as a</li> <li>tariff rate class, that would be included in, you know,</li> <li>the next GRC as a as a class in the class cost to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>this testimony and exhibits? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: No, I do not.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness.</li> <li>Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed.</li> <li>MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out.</li> <li>Any questions from the bench?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER: <ul> <li>Good morning.</li> <li>Mr. Taylor.</li> <li>Good morning.</li> <li>As in your direct testimony, and that's JDT-1T on page 5, you discussed the Company's proposal to recover the expected \$200,000 in revenue that the company would have recovered from Puget LNG under Schedule 807T until the next general rate case.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I see this as kind of setting up the foundation</li> <li>and the various parts of 141-D and then that direct</li> <li>assignment to 808T and then proposing a new 808T as a</li> <li>tariff rate class, that would be included in, you know,</li> <li>the next GRC as a as a class in the class cost to</li> <li>service and ability to see what the total revenue</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>this testimony and exhibits? THE WITNESS: No, I do not. MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination. JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness. Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed. MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor. JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out. Any questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER: Q. Good morning, Mr. Taylor. A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. So in your direct testimony, and that's JDT-1T on page 5, you discussed the Company's proposal to recover the expected \$200,000 in revenue that the company would have recovered from Puget LNG under Schedule 807T until the next general rate case. Do you see that testimony? Do you have that in</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I see this as kind of setting up the foundation</li> <li>and the various parts of 141-D and then that direct</li> <li>assignment to 808T and then proposing a new 808T as a</li> <li>tariff rate class, that would be included in, you know,</li> <li>the next GRC as a as a class in the class cost to</li> <li>service and ability to see what the total revenue</li> <li>requirement is and what the revenue target should be for</li> <li>that class like you do for all classes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>this testimony and exhibits? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: No, I do not.</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Thank you. Mr. Taylor is available for cross-examination.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: As I have it right now, it doesn't seem as if any of the parties will be cross-examining the witness.</li> <li>Are there any I'm sorry. Staff, please proceed.</li> <li>MR. ROBERSON: That's actually okay. I plan on waiving cross of Mr. Taylor.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Well, that worked out.</li> <li>Any questions from the bench?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have a question. EXAMINATION</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER: <ul> <li>Good morning.</li> <li>Mr. Taylor.</li> <li>Good morning.</li> <li>As in your direct testimony, and that's JDT-1T on page 5, you discussed the Company's proposal to recover the expected \$200,000 in revenue that the company would have recovered from Puget LNG under Schedule 807T until the next general rate case.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>how would you treat this 200,000 in the next rate case,</li> <li>or would you have to?</li> <li>A. I think the next rate case, there will be an</li> <li>opportunity to directly assign facilities to 808T to</li> <li>look at, you know, the resulting cost of service and</li> <li>cost to serve all rate classes and either the parties</li> <li>through settlement or litigated outcome will set the</li> <li>expected revenues for each of the classes or rather the</li> <li>target revenues, and one of those classes would be 808T,</li> <li>and so it would be an opportunity to, you know, decide</li> <li>what the revenue level is for all classes in the next</li> <li>GRC.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So all right. So we would treat that</li> <li>in the GRC? That's the plan?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I see this as kind of setting up the foundation</li> <li>and the various parts of 141-D and then that direct</li> <li>assignment to 808T and then proposing a new 808T as a</li> <li>tariff rate class, that would be included in, you know,</li> <li>the next GRC as a as a class in the class cost to</li> <li>service and ability to see what the total revenue</li> </ul>

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

	Page 97		Page 99
1	JUDGE BROWN: That will be all. Thank you.	1	employees of PSE.
2	The next witness is Susan Free.	2	Do I have that right?
3	Ms. Free, raise your right hand please.	3	A. Yes.
4		4	Q. Okay. And I want to talk a little bit about
5	SUSAN FREE, having been first duly sworn by the	5	what PSE has referred to as internal legal costs.
6	Judge, testified as follows:	6	And you recently amended your testimony with
7		7	respect to internal legal costs; correct?
8	JUDGE BROWN: You may proceed.	8	A. Yes.
9	MS. CARSON: Thank you, Your Honor. Ms.	9	Q. All right. From your testimony, I'm a little
10	Free, please state your name and title for the record,	10	unclear.
11	and spell your name for the court reporter.	11	Can you explain to us who specifically charged
12	THE WITNESS: My name is Susan Free,	12	these internal legal costs to PSE?
13	S-u-s-a-n, F-r-e-e. I'm the director of revenue	13	A. Internal in-house counsel of PSE charged their
14	requirements and regulatory compliance for PSE.	14	time.
15	MS. CARSON: Ms. Free, do you have before	15	Q. Okay. And anyone besides in-house counsel, like
16	you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit	16	consultants, expert witnesses, anything like that?
17	Nos. SEF-1T through SEF-3 and SEF-4TR in docket in	17	A. Yes. There would have been charges to the
18	this docket?	18	project for the for certain consultants likely, but
19	THE WITNESS: I do.	19	there I'm not sure exactly what costs you're talking
20	MS. CARSON: Do these exhibits constitute	20	about.
21	your pretrial direct and rebuttal testimony and related	21	Q. Yeah, I'm just what PSE is claiming in this
22	exhibits?	22	matter is internal legal costs. I'm wondering if that's
23	THE WITNESS: They do.	23	just in-house counsel related costs or costs from people
24	MS. CARSON: Do you have any changes other	24	who aren't attorneys like consultants.
25	than what has been provided to the Commission?	25	A. I don't believe I believe what has been
	Page 98		Page 100
1	THE WITNESS: I do not.	1	reported as in-house as legal costs are in-house or
2	MS. CARSON: Thank you.	2	external legal.
3	Ms. Free is available for cross-examination.	3	Q. Okay. So attorneys only?
4	JUDGE BROWN: You may proceed, Staff.	4	A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.
5	MR. ROBERSON: Staff will also waive its	5	Q. Okay. Do you know again, I don't I don't
6	cross of Ms. Free.	6	want you speculating or guessing.
7	JUDGE BROWN: Next we have the Puyallup	7	A. I haven't looked at every single invoice.
8	Tribe. You may proceed.	8	Q. Okay. All right. Let's take a quick look at
9	MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.	9	page 23 of your amended testimony, because I guess that
10	Nicholas Thomas here taking over for Andrew Fuller for	10	is the active one, and on page 23, you state: PSE's
11	this witness.		legal fees related to the Tacoma LNG project are
12	CROSS-EXAMINATION	12	reasonable and appropriate.
13	BY MR. THOMAS:	13	Do you see that? Am I reading that right?
14	Q. Ms. Free, thank you for being here. I have a	14	A. Yes. <b>O</b> All right. Can you tall all of us what makes a
15 16	couple of questions for you. I'll try to move through	15 16	Q. All right. Can you tell all of us what makes a legal fee reasonable versus unreasonable?
16 17	this quickly. If you don't know the answer to a question that's fine. Please don't speculate because	17	-
17 18	question, that's fine. Please don't speculate because it's going to require a bunch of time and follow-up from	18	A. I'm not really the expert on the type of legal costs that are charged. I know that where they were
18	me to figure out if you're speculating.	18	costs that are charged. I know that where they were charged and to the project and how we account for them
20	Fair enough?	20	at PSE. I think it's up to the attorneys to know the
20	A. Totally fair.	20	work they're doing and how they charge the time to the
22	Q. Okay. Puget Sound Energy employs in-house	22	projects that get assigned to the accounting.
23	counsel; correct?	23	Q. Okay. Same question for the word "appropriate"
24	A. Correct.	24	that you used in your testimony.
25	Q. And PSE's in-house counsel are salaried	25	Can you tell all of us what makes a legal fee
-			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

	Page 101	Page 103
1	appropriate versus inappropriate?	1 MS. CARSON: Objection; that's not for this
2	A. I think that in my testimony when I say it was	2 witness to answer. Those invoices are attorney/client
3	appropriately charged, we followed our procedures	<sup>3</sup> privileged documents, and so we would object.
4	internally to determine that the attorneys were working	4 MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, may I meet that?
5	on the LNG, that they were responding to legal matters	5 JUDGE BROWN: I'll listen to what you have
6	on the LNG project, and internally we followed our	6 to say before I make my ruling, go ahead.
7	procedures to charge them correct to the project.	7 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	Q. So the words "reasonable" and "appropriate" mean	8 I'm not asking the witness to disclose anything
9	procedurally reasonable and appropriate, not necessarily	9 that's privileged or confidential in this hearing at
10	in terms of the amounts charged? Am I understanding	10 all. It was it was a question regarding committing
11	what you're saying right?	11 to providing those to the UTC for the UTC's own review.
12	A. That's not what I that's not my testimony,	12 It is very, very common where a party seeks an award of
13	no. I think that the procedures provide that the type	13 legal fees to provide those for in camera review to a
14	of work done and the amounts charged are appropriate.	14 tribunal, in this case, the UTC.
15	That's the intention of the procedures that were	15 JUDGE BROWN: Is there a way we can word it
16	followed.	16 differently?
17	Q. Okay. So then again, what makes a legal fee	17 MR. THOMAS: I mean, I'm not sure, Your
18	reasonable reasonable versus unreasonable, just as a	18 Honor. I just asked if PSE would commit to providing
19	general matter?	19 those to the UTC. It doesn't seek anything privileged
20	A. I think I stated earlier that the attorneys were	20 or confidential. It seeks a commitment or a refusal to
21	responding to legal matters related to LNG and	21 commit.
22	appropriately charged them to the project, which were	22 JUDGE BROWN: What do you want to say,
23	then appropriately allocated between PSE customers on	23 Counsel?
24	the nonregulated side.	24 MS. CARSON: PSE will commit to providing
25	Q. Okay. I'm not sure I'm understanding the	anything that the Commission requests PSE to provide,
	Page 102	Page 104
1	answer, but I'll move on.	1 but we do have concerns about providing detailed
2	Do you understand that there are accepted	2 descriptions of legal work that have been done,
3	methods of determining the appropriateness of legal fees	<ul> <li>a particularly to a party opponent in another proceeding.</li> </ul>
4	and costs?	4 JUDGE BROWN: I'll grant the objection.
5	A. I'm not clear of what I'm sorry. I don't	5 MR. THOMAS: I'll move on.
6	-	
7	understand the question.	6 BY MR. THOMAS: 11 Move on.
	understand the question. Q. All right, So, you know, I'm an attorney and.	6 BY MR. THOMAS:
8	Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and,	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> </ul>
8 9	Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> </ul>
	Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and,	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>9 First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> </ul>
9	Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> </ul>
9 10	Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> </ul>
9 10 11	Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court. And I'm first of all, are you aware of that	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12	Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court. And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's let's look at page</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of determining whether the legal fees a party seeks are</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's let's look at page</li> <li>18, lines 10 to 12 of your testimony. Hopefully my</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of determining whether the legal fees a party seeks are appropriate or inappropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that</li> <li>knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's let's look at page</li> <li>18, lines 10 to 12 of your testimony. Hopefully my</li> <li>laptop cooperates with me here.</li> <li>Let me know when you're there, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of determining whether the legal fees a party seeks are appropriate or inappropriate.</li> <li>Are you aware of that, that there's a ways of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that</li> <li>knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's let's look at page</li> <li>18, lines 10 to 12 of your testimony. Hopefully my</li> <li>laptop cooperates with me here.</li> <li>Let me know when you're there, please.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of determining whether the legal fees a party seeks are appropriate or inappropriate.</li> <li>Are you aware of that, that there's a ways of making those decisions?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that</li> <li>knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's let's look at page</li> <li>18, lines 10 to 12 of your testimony. Hopefully my</li> <li>laptop cooperates with me here.</li> <li>Let me know when you're there, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of determining whether the legal fees a party seeks are appropriate or inappropriate.</li> <li>Are you aware of that, that there's a ways of making those decisions?</li> <li>A. Not no.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that</li> <li>knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's let's look at page</li> <li>18, lines 10 to 12 of your testimony. Hopefully my</li> <li>laptop cooperates with me here.</li> <li>Let me know when you're there, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You beat me.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of determining whether the legal fees a party seeks are appropriate or inappropriate.</li> <li>Are you aware of that, that there's a ways of making those decisions?</li> <li>A. Not no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You've never heard of that?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that</li> <li>knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's let's look at page</li> <li>18, lines 10 to 12 of your testimony. Hopefully my</li> <li>laptop cooperates with me here.</li> <li>Let me know when you're there, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You beat me.</li> <li>Okay. Lines 10 to 12, quote, The core arguments</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of determining whether the legal fees a party seeks are appropriate or inappropriate.</li> <li>Are you aware of that, that there's a ways of making those decisions?</li> <li>A. Not no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You've never heard of that?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Will PSE commit to providing the Commission with the legal bills PSE wants reimbursed</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that</li> <li>knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's let's look at page</li> <li>18, lines 10 to 12 of your testimony. Hopefully my</li> <li>laptop cooperates with me here.</li> <li>Let me know when you're there, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You beat me.</li> <li>Okay. Lines 10 to 12, quote, The core arguments</li> <li>for the attached and appeals have been simply repeated</li> <li>in these different forums in the hopes of getting a</li> <li>different answer, do you see that?</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of determining whether the legal fees a party seeks are appropriate or inappropriate.</li> <li>Are you aware of that, that there's a ways of making those decisions?</li> <li>A. Not no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You've never heard of that?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Will PSE commit to providing the Commission with the legal bills PSE wants reimbursed so the Commission can analyze the appropriateness of the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that</li> <li>knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's let's look at page</li> <li>18, lines 10 to 12 of your testimony. Hopefully my</li> <li>laptop cooperates with me here.</li> <li>Let me know when you're there, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You beat me.</li> <li>Okay. Lines 10 to 12, quote, The core arguments</li> <li>for the attached and appeals have been simply repeated</li> <li>in these different forums in the hopes of getting a</li> <li>different answer, do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. All right. So, you know, I'm an attorney and, you know, in, you know, this world, you know, there's parties sometimes seek reimbursement of their legal fees from a court.</li> <li>And I'm first of all, are you aware of that fact?</li> <li>A. Generally, I think you just informed me, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And there's accepted methods of determining whether the legal fees a party seeks are appropriate or inappropriate.</li> <li>Are you aware of that, that there's a ways of making those decisions?</li> <li>A. Not no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You've never heard of that?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Will PSE commit to providing the Commission with the legal bills PSE wants reimbursed</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. Let's talk about the cases that the fees are</li> <li>related to.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, can you list out all of</li> <li>the pieces of litigation for which PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of its legal fees?</li> <li>A. I cannot at the time do that. I don't have that</li> <li>knowledge on the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's - let's look at page</li> <li>18, lines 10 to 12 of your testimony. Hopefully my</li> <li>laptop cooperates with me here.</li> <li>Let me know when you're there, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You beat me.</li> <li>Okay. Lines 10 to 12, quote, The core arguments</li> <li>for the attached and appeals have been simply repeated</li> <li>in these different forums in the hopes of getting a</li> <li>different answer, do you see that?</li> </ul>

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

## Evidentiary Hearing - 11/6/2023

	Page 105		Page 107
1	that have been simply repeated in different forums in	1	core defenses
2	the hopes of getting a different answer?	2	A. No.
3	A. I'm not the best witness to answer that	3	Q that you testified?
4	question.	4	A. I have the details with how these costs were
5	Q. This is your testimony. Okay. All right. I'm	5	charged.
6	sorry. But I have to continue asking questions about	6	Q. But you said no as to the core defenses?
7	this to make the record.	7	A. Correct. I said no.
8	Was Tacoma LNG's compliance with air quality	8	Q. Okay. All right. Are you familiar with the
9	standards litigated before the Washington Shoreline	9	litigation concerning the permit that Tacoma LNG
10	Hearings Board in SHB Case No. 16-002, if you know?	10	received pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act?
11	MS. CARSON: I'm going to object. She said	11	A. No.
12	she's not the witness to answer these questions. Mr.	12	Q. Okay. Were safety risks that Tacoma LNG poses
13	Roberts would be the appropriate witness.	13	to the surrounding community a part of that case, if you
14	JUDGE BROWN: The objection	14	know?
15	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, before ruling, I'm	15	MS. CARSON: So I object. This witness
16	simply asking the witness about the witness's testimony.	16	testifies to the appropriateness of the legal fees and
17	That is what this cross-examination is for.	17	how they were accounted for at PSE, and at a very high
18	JUDGE BROWN: Mr. Roberts was available for	18	level, testifies about the nature of the appeal ongoing
19	as a witness earlier, so	19	by the Tribe. The details of that are in Ron Roberts'
20	MR. THOMAS: Understood, Your Honor, but I'm	20	testimony, so he would be the appropriate witness to ask
21	not asking about Mr. Roberts' testimony. I'm asking	21	about those details.
22	this witness about her testimony.	22	MR. THOMAS: Again, Your Honor, this witness
23	JUDGE BROWN: That's not how it sounded to	23	has referenced litigation and had made some specific
24	me. The objection is granted.	24	statements with respect to that litigation. I'm simply
25	BY MR. THOMAS:	25	asking the questions about the testimony she provided.
	Page 106		Page 108
1	Q. All right. All right. Let's take a look at	1	JUDGE BROWN: I understand your point. The
2	another piece from your testimony, Ms. Free, same page	2	objection is granted.
3	and lines 12 to 13 this time: PSE ultimately prevailed	3	BY MR. THOMAS:
4	on all of these appeals and did so by repeating its core	4	Q. Okay. Let's move on to page 19, line 2, where
5	defenses in each of the various forums, end quote.	5	it reads, quote, Although PSE prevailed at every level
6	Do you see that?	6	in each of the three rounds of appeals filed by the
7	A. Yes.	7	Tribe?
8	Q. Okay. And I'm reading from your testimony, not	8	Do you see that, Ms. Free?
9	Mr. Roberts'; correct?	9	A. Yes.
10	A. Yes.	10	Q. And that's your testimony; correct?
11	Q. Okay. Thank you.	11	A. I haven't flipped the page yet, so yes, it's
12	First of all, wasn't the air permit remanded	12	still my testimony.
13	because the Tribe prevailed on multiple grounds?	13	Q. Okay. Well, I the language at page 19, line
14	A. I don't know the details, the exact details of	14	2?
15	all of the proceedings. I do know that from others that	15	A. Yes. O Okey All right So Lunderstand this what
16	I've consulted with, that this part of my testimony is	16	Q. Okay. All right. So I understand this, what
17	supported.	17	are the three rounds of appeals filed by the Tribe that
18	Q. Can you please tell all of us, what are the,	18	you are referring to here in your testimony?
19 20	quote, core defenses that you are referring here to in	19	A. I don't have those details.
20	your testimony?	20	Q. Okay. All right. Let's take a look at page 19, lines 8 to 11 and places give that a guick look and let
21 22	A. I think I just answered the question that I	21	lines 8 to 11, and please give that a quick look and let
22	don't have all of the details. Q. Okay. Well, I was asking about the core	22 23	me know when you're ready.
23 24	defenses.	23	A. (Witness peruses document.) I'm sorry. Can you give me the line numbers again?
24 25	Do you have the details on what constitutes the	24	Q. Yes. 8 to 11.
25			
		1	

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

	Page 109	Page 111
1	A. Thank you. I see it.	1 A handy.
2	Q. Okay. So having just read that, is it your	2 Q. Yeah, fair enough. Fair enough.
3	testimony that PSE responded to three amicus briefs in	3 Can you tell me, does the claimed amount,
4	the still-pending litigation before the Court of	4 whatever that amount is, is that does that include
5	Appeals?	5 litigation costs separate from attorney fees? Does that
б	A. That testimony was written in response to a	6 include litigation costs for things like expert
7	comment I think in Dr. Earl's testimony that indicated	7 witnesses, consulting experts and the like, or is it
8	there shouldn't be any costs during this time period,	8 only attorney fees?
9	and so this is response to indicate why there would be	9 A. I think you asked me that before, and I'm pretty
10	costs.	10 sure I said I don't think so, but you didn't want me to
11	Q. But your testimony is PSE responded to two	11 speculate, so (Pause.)
12	amicus briefs?	12 Q. Yeah, and I don't again. I'm sorry if I asked
13	A. That's what it says, yes.	13 the same question twice.
14	Q. Okay. Can you tell us what are the two amicus	14 But fair to say PSE received bills each month
15	briefs that PSE responded to?	15 from outside counsel for work performed; correct?
16	A. I don't know those details.	16 A. Correct.
17	Q. Okay. Isn't it true that PSE only responded to	<b>Q.</b> Okay. Did and I may have asked a similar
18	one amicus brief, the one filed by the Washington	18 question earlier, but I'm asking a little bit more about
19	Attorney General's Office?	19 procedure now.
20	A. I don't have those details.	20 Did PSE review the bills that came in from
21	Q. Okay. I okay. We can move on.	21 outside counsel? Did PSE review the bills to make sure
22	Let's look at page 20, Table 1.	22 they were appropriate?
23	A. I'm there.	A. There's a process to review bills when they come
24	Q. Okay. And this is called "Internal Legal Hours	<sup>24</sup> in as they're being paid to make sure that they're being
25	Worked and External Legal Costs"; yes?	25 charged correctly.
	Page 110	Page 112
1	Page 110 A. Correct.	Page 112 1 Q. And who performed the review?
1 2		
	A. Correct.	1 Q. And who performed the review?
2	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked</li> </ul>	1Q. And who performed the review?2A. I don't know. It would have been probably
2 3	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q. And who performed the review?</li> <li>A. I don't know. It would have been probably</li> <li>some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q. And who performed the review?</li> <li>A. I don't know. It would have been probably</li> <li>some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts</li> <li>payable department.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of</li> <li>the legal costs from outside counsel that it had</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q. And who performed the review?</li> <li>A. I don't know. It would have been probably</li> <li>some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts</li> <li>payable department.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of</li> <li>the legal costs from outside counsel that it had</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q. And who performed the review?</li> <li>A. I don't know. It would have been probably</li> <li>some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts</li> <li>payable department.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of</li> <li>the legal costs from outside counsel that it had</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs"</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Q. And who performed the review?</li> <li>A. I don't know. It would have been probably</li> <li>some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts</li> <li>payable department.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of</li> <li>the legal costs from outside counsel that it had</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now coming back to your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> </ul>	1Q. And who performed the review?2A. I don't know. It would have been probably3some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts4payable department.5Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of6the legal costs from outside counsel that it had7incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?8A. Not to my knowledge.9Q. Okay. All right. Now coming back to your10reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Q. And who performed the review?</li> <li>A. I don't know. It would have been probably</li> <li>some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts</li> <li>payable department.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of</li> <li>the legal costs from outside counsel that it had</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now coming back to your</li> <li>reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can</li> <li>you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Q. And who performed the review?</li> <li>A. I don't know. It would have been probably</li> <li>some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts</li> <li>payable department.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of</li> <li>the legal costs from outside counsel that it had</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now coming back to your</li> <li>reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can</li> <li>you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys</li> <li>in Western Washington in 2016?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below</li> </ul>	1Q. And who performed the review?2A. I don't know. It would have been probably3some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts4payable department.5Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of6the legal costs from outside counsel that it had7incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?8A. Not to my knowledge.9Q. Okay. All right. Now coming back to your10reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can11you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys12in Western Washington in 2016?13MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1.</li> </ul>	1Q. And who performed the review?2A. I don't know. It would have been probably3some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts4payable department.5Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of6the legal costs from outside counsel that it had7incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?8A. Not to my knowledge.9Q. Okay. All right. Now coming back to your10reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can11you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys12in Western Washington in 2016?13MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this14witness's knowledge and testimony.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1. All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time</li> </ul>	1       Q. And who performed the review?         2       A. I don't know. It would have been probably         3       some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts         4       payable department.         5       Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of         6       the legal costs from outside counsel that it had         7       incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?         8       A. Not to my knowledge.         9       Q. Okay. All right. Now coming back to your         10       reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can         11       you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys         12       in Western Washington in 2016?         13       MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this         14       witness's knowledge and testimony.         15       JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1. All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time Entry," this table reflects time worked by who?</li> </ul>	1       Q. And who performed the review?         2       A. I don't know. It would have been probably         3       some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts         4       payable department.         5       Q. To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of         6       the legal costs from outside counsel that it had         7       incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?         8       A. Not to my knowledge.         9       Q. Okay. All right. Now coming back to your         10       reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can         11       you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys         12       in Western Washington in 2016?         13       MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this         14       witness's knowledge and testimony.         15       JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.         16       MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, okay, should I be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1.</li> <li>All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time Entry," this table reflects time worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal internal legal counsel for PSE.</li> </ul>	1 <b>Q.</b> And who performed the review?2A. I don't know. It would have been probably3some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts4payable department.5 <b>Q.</b> To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of6the legal costs from outside counsel that it had7incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?8A. Not to my knowledge.9 <b>Q.</b> Okay. All right. Now coming back to your10reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can11you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys12in Western Washington in 2016?13MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this14witness's knowledge and testimony.15JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.16MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, okay, should I be17responding to objections, because it's happening often
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1.</li> <li>All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time Entry," this table reflects time worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal internal legal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. I'm just reviewing these tables,</li> </ul>	1 <b>Q.</b> And who performed the review?         2       A. I don't know. It would have been probably         3       some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts         4       payable department.         5 <b>Q.</b> To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of         6       the legal costs from outside counsel that it had         7       incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?         8       A. Not to my knowledge.         9 <b>Q.</b> Okay. All right. Now coming back to your         10       reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can         11       you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys         12       in Western Washington in 2016?         13       MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this         14       witness's knowledge and testimony.         15       JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.         16       MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, okay, should I be         17       responding to objections, because it's happening often         18       fast before I can meet the objection?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1.</li> <li>All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time Entry," this table reflects time worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal internal legal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. I'm just reviewing these tables, if you'll give me a moment.</li> </ul>	1 <b>Q.</b> And who performed the review?         2       A. I don't know. It would have been probably         3       some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts         4       payable department.         5 <b>Q.</b> To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of         6       the legal costs from outside counsel that it had         7       incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?         8       A. Not to my knowledge.         9 <b>Q.</b> Okay. All right. Now coming back to your         10       reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can         11       you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys         12       in Western Washington in 2016?         13       MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this         14       witness's knowledge and testimony.         15       JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.         16       MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, okay, should I be         17       responding to objections, because it's happening often         18       fast before I can meet the objection?         19       JUDGE BROWN: I'll let you respond, and I'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1.</li> <li>All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time Entry," this table reflects time worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal internal legal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. I'm just reviewing these tables, if you'll give me a moment. Ms. Free, if you can tell me, exactly how much</li> </ul>	1 <b>Q.</b> And who performed the review?         2       A. I don't know. It would have been probably         3       some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts         4       payable department.         5 <b>Q.</b> To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of         6       the legal costs from outside counsel that it had         7       incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?         8       A. Not to my knowledge.         9 <b>Q.</b> Okay. All right. Now coming back to your         10       reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can         11       you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys         12       in Western Washington in 2016?         13       MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this         14       witness's knowledge and testimony.         15       JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.         16       MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, okay, should I be         17       responding to objections, because it's happening often         18       fast before I can meet the objection?         19       JUDGE BROWN: I'll let you respond, and I'll         20       rule again.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1.</li> <li>All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time Entry," this table reflects time worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal internal legal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. I'm just reviewing these tables, if you'll give me a moment. Ms. Free, if you can tell me, exactly how much is PSE asking ratepayers to reimburse it for external</li> </ul>	1 <b>Q.</b> And who performed the review?         2       A. I don't know. It would have been probably         3       some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts         4       payable department.         5 <b>Q.</b> To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of         6       the legal costs from outside counsel that it had         7       incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?         8       A. Not to my knowledge.         9 <b>Q.</b> Okay. All right. Now coming back to your         10       reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can         11       you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys         12       in Western Washington in 2016?         13       MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this         14       witness's knowledge and testimony.         15       JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.         16       MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, okay, should I be         17       responding to objections, because it's happening often         18       fast before I can meet the objection?         19       JUDGE BROWN: I'll let you respond, and I'll         20       MR. THOMAS: Yeah, if the witness doesn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1.</li> <li>All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time Entry," this table reflects time worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal internal legal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. I'm just reviewing these tables, if you'll give me a moment.</li> <li>Ms. Free, if you can tell me, exactly how much is PSE asking ratepayers to reimburse it for external legal costs in this matter?</li> </ul>	1 <b>Q.</b> And who performed the review?         2       A. I don't know. It would have been probably         3       some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts         4       payable department.         5 <b>Q.</b> To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of         6       the legal costs from outside counsel that it had         7       incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?         8       A. Not to my knowledge.         9 <b>Q.</b> Okay. All right. Now coming back to your         10       reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can         11       you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys         12       in Western Washington in 2016?         13       MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this         14       witness's knowledge and testimony.         15       JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.         16       MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, okay, should I be         17       responding to objections, because it's happening often         18       fast before I can meet the objection?         19       JUDGE BROWN: I'll let you respond, and I'll         20       MR. THOMAS: Yeah, if the witness doesn't         21       MR. THOMAS: Yeah, if the witness doesn't know, but this goes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1.</li> <li>All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time Entry," this table reflects time worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal internal legal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. I'm just reviewing these tables, if you'll give me a moment.</li> <li>Ms. Free, if you can tell me, exactly how much is PSE asking ratepayers to reimburse it for external legal costs in this matter?</li> <li>A. I believe that was disclosed in Exhibit RLE-12.</li> </ul>	1 <b>Q.</b> And who performed the review?         2       A. I don't know. It would have been probably         3       some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts         4       payable department.         5 <b>Q.</b> To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of         6       the legal costs from outside counsel that it had         7       incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?         8       A. Not to my knowledge.         9 <b>Q.</b> Okay. All right. Now coming back to your         10       reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can         11       you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys         12       in Western Washington in 2016?         13       MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this         14       witness's knowledge and testimony.         15       JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.         16       MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, okay, should I be         17       responding to objections, because it's happening often         18       fast before I can meet the objection?         19       JUDGE BROWN: I'll let you respond, and I'll         10       rule again.         21       MR. THOMAS: Yeah, if the witness doesn't         22       know, she can simply say she doesn't know, but this goes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. First of all, internal legal hours worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Now, still looking at this table, what constitutes an external legal cost being claimed in this table?</li> <li>A. External legal representation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that's what that "External Costs" column is here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. All right. Now let's look at Table 2 just below Table 1.</li> <li>All right. Table 2, "Internal Legal Hours Time Entry," this table reflects time worked by who?</li> <li>A. Internal internal legal counsel for PSE.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. I'm just reviewing these tables, if you'll give me a moment.</li> <li>Ms. Free, if you can tell me, exactly how much is PSE asking ratepayers to reimburse it for external legal costs in this matter?</li> </ul>	1 <b>Q.</b> And who performed the review?         2       A. I don't know. It would have been probably         3       some sorry. It would be somebody in our accounts         4       payable department.         5 <b>Q.</b> To your knowledge, did PSE ever dispute any of         6       the legal costs from outside counsel that it had         7       incurred in connection with the Tacoma LNG facility?         8       A. Not to my knowledge.         9 <b>Q.</b> Okay. All right. Now coming back to your         10       reasonable and appropriate testimony from page 23, can         11       you tell us the market rate for environmental attorneys         12       in Western Washington in 2016?         13       MS. CARSON: Objection; that's outside this         14       witness's knowledge and testimony.         15       JUDGE BROWN: Sustained.         16       MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, okay, should I be         17       responding to objections, because it's happening often         18       fast before I can meet the objection?         19       JUDGE BROWN: I'll let you respond, and I'll         20       MR. THOMAS: Yeah, if the witness doesn't         21       MR. THOMAS: Yeah, if the witness doesn't know, but this goes

28 (Pages 109 to 112)

	Dago 113		Dago 115
	Page 113		Page 115
1	she doesn't know, but she provided testimony that the	1	A. No.
2	fees were reasonable and appropriateness. It's fair for	2	Q. Okay. And then you would not be able to tell me
3	me to explore that with her on cross-examination.	3	the hourly rate that PSE paid each attorney there; is
4	JUDGE BROWN: I'll allow you to answer that.	4	that correct?
5	THE WITNESS: Could you please repeat the	5	A. Correct. I cannot tell you that.
6	question?	6	Q. All right. Then let's talk about the Puget
7	BY MR. THOMAS:	7	Sound Clean Air Agency permit legal costs very quickly,
8	Q. Yup.	8	and that's PCHB Case No. 19-087C.
9	I'm asking if you can tell us the market rates	9	Can you tell us what outside attorneys billed
10	for environmental attorneys in Western Washington in	10	PSE for time worked on this case?
11	2016?	11	A. No.
12	A. No, I cannot.	12	Q. Okay. And then one by one, you're not able to
13	Q. Okay. In 2017, same question.	13	tell me the hourly rate that PSE paid each attorney; is that fair?
14	A. No.	14 15	
15	Q. Okay. In 2018, same question.		<ul> <li>A. Correct. I cannot tell you that.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> </ul>
16 17	A. No. <b>Q. In 2019?</b>	16 17	•
17 18	• • • •	18	All right. So outside of those three pieces of litigation, are there any other cases for which PSE is
18 19	<ul> <li>A. I cannot tell you the market rate for any year that you will ask me.</li> </ul>	19	asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible for
20	Q. All right. Thank you.	20	legal costs incurred by PSE?
20	JUDGE BROWN: And just for the just for	20	MS. CARSON: Objection; overbroad, not clear
21	the integrity of the record, I will overrule on that	22	what all ratepayers you're referring to, whether it's
23	objection. Thank you.	23	this case or in general, so I object.
24	MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.	24	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, I can clean the
25	JUDGE BROWN: Thank you.	25	question up, if I may.
23			
	Page 114		Page 116
1	BY MR. THOMAS:	1	
1	BT WR. THOWAS.		ILIDGE RROWNE Voc. Blooco rophroco vour
2	O Mc Eron are you familiar with Tam Wood of the		JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please rephrase your
2	Q. Ms. Free, are you familiar with Tom Wood of the Stoel Rives law firm?	2	question.
3	Stoel Rives law firm?	2 3	question. MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.
3 4	Stoel Rives law firm? A. No.	2 3 4	question. MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you. BY MR. THOMAS:
3 4 5	Stoel Rives law firm? A. No. Q. You're not?	2 3 4 5	question. MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you. BY MR. THOMAS: <b>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking</b>
3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have. JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect?</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us</li> <li>what outside attorneys billed PSE for time worked on SHB</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have. JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect? MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your Honor.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us</li> <li>what outside attorneys billed PSE for time worked on SHB</li> <li>Case 16-002?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>question. MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have. JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect? MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE BROWN: Proceed, please.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us</li> <li>what outside attorneys billed PSE for time worked on SHB</li> <li>Case 16-002?</li> <li>A. I don't have that information handy.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>question. MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have. JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect? MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Proceed, please. REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us</li> <li>what outside attorneys billed PSE for time worked on SHB</li> <li>Case 16-002?</li> <li>A. I don't have that information handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so then you wouldn't be able to tell</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have. JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect? MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Proceed, please. REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MS. CARSON:</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not? Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act litigation. First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us what outside attorneys billed PSE for time worked on SHB Case 16-002?</li> <li>A. I don't have that information handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so then you wouldn't be able to tell me the hourly rate that PSE paid each attorney</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect? MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Proceed, please. REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MS. CARSON:</li> <li>Q. Ms. Free, in your role as director of revenue</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us</li> <li>what outside attorneys billed PSE for time worked on SHB</li> <li>Case 16-002?</li> <li>A. I don't have that information handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so then you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me the hourly rate that PSE paid each attorney</li> <li>representing it in that case; is that fair?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect? MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Proceed, please. REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MS. CARSON:</li> <li>Q. Ms. Free, in your role as director of revenue requirement, is it your tell us about how you pull</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us</li> <li>what outside attorneys billed PSE for time worked on SHB</li> <li>Case 16-002?</li> <li>A. I don't have that information handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so then you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me the hourly rate that PSE paid each attorney</li> <li>representing it in that case; is that fair?</li> <li>A. That is correct. I cannot.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect?</li> <li>MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Proceed, please.</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MS. CARSON:</li> <li>Q. Ms. Free, in your role as director of revenue requirement, is it your - tell us about how you pull together costs that are submitted to the Commission for</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us</li> <li>what outside attorneys billed PSE for time worked on SHB</li> <li>Case 16-002?</li> <li>A. I don't have that information handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so then you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me the hourly rate that PSE paid each attorney</li> <li>representing it in that case; is that fair?</li> <li>A. That is correct. I cannot.</li> <li>Q. All right. Well, let's then talk about the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have. JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect? MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Proceed, please. REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MS. CARSON:</li> <li>Q. Ms. Free, in your role as director of revenue requirement, is it your - tell us about how you pull together costs that are submitted to the Commission for recovery in a case like this or in rate cases as well.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Stoel Rives law firm?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not?</li> <li>Okay. So if I asked you whether PSE is seeking</li> <li>reimbursement of Mr. Woods's time from the Clean Air Act</li> <li>litigation before the PHCB, you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me; is that fair?</li> <li>A. I don't have that handy, no.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's talk a little bit about fees</li> <li>incurred in connection with the Shoreline Management Act</li> <li>litigation.</li> <li>First of all, Ms. Free, are you able to tell us</li> <li>what outside attorneys billed PSE for time worked on SHB</li> <li>Case 16-002?</li> <li>A. I don't have that information handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so then you wouldn't be able to tell</li> <li>me the hourly rate that PSE paid each attorney</li> <li>representing it in that case; is that fair?</li> <li>A. That is correct. I cannot.</li> <li>Q. All right. Well, let's then talk about the</li> <li>Clean Water Act litigation as PCHB Case No. 16-120C.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>question.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. THOMAS:</li> <li>Q. All right. For the ratepayers we are talking about at issue in this case, are there any other legal costs for which PSE is asking the Commission to make ratepayers responsible beyond the three pieces of litigation that I just asked you about?</li> <li>A. I don't have those details handy.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Ms. Free, thank you for your time. Those are all the questions I have. JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect? MS. CARSON: Yes, there is. Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BROWN: Proceed, please. REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MS. CARSON:</li> <li>Q. Ms. Free, in your role as director of revenue requirement, is it your - tell us about how you pull together costs that are submitted to the Commission for recovery in a case like this or in rate cases as well.</li> <li>A. So there is multiple departments at PSE who are</li> </ul>

29 (Pages 113 to 116)

		1	
	Page 117		Page 119
1	and, you know, essentially making sure the financials	1	BY CHAIR DANNER:
2	are accurate, and I rely on those departments to help	2	Q. Good morning. So I just want to be clear.
3	build my testimony so I can get a general understanding	3	You're making basically reasonability reasonableness
4	of how things are done. And, for instance, attorneys	4	determinations based on documents that were submitted to
5	internal attorneys' time gets charged to regular O&M	5	you by others, and you're saying you really don't have a
6	unless they're working on a project, when they actually	6	basis for reviewing those, and so what are you basing
7	go through a process to charge their time directly to a	7	the reasonableness on?
8	capital project, and I can be I'm aware of that	8	A. On working with others in the legal department
9	through, you know, working with those in my company who	9	who were directly involved in the proceedings that were
10	are, you know, the ones that are actually doing that	10	brought up here and their representation that that
11	work.	11	they followed the procedures that are instituted at PSE
12		12	
	Q. And so in this case, is it fair to say that you	13	to make sure that the costs were charged appropriately
13	consult with the legal department in terms of legal	1	to the work orders.
14	costs that are were that PSE is submitting in this	14	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And I have a question.
15	case?	15	There was Mr. Thomas was he raised I
16	A. Correct.	16	don't know. It's not exactly testimony, but he raised
17	MR. THOMAS: Object, Your Honor. Counsel is	17	there was one amicus brief you responded to and not two.
18	leading her own witness.	18	And you said you didn't know.
19	MS. CARSON: Well, I'll rephrase it.	19	Is it possible we get clarification on that, or
20	BY MS. CARSON:	20	should we do a bench request on that, or is it possible
21	Q. So tell me how you are able, in this case, to	21	we can get that into the record somehow?
22	put forward this testimony about the legal fees.	22	MS. CARSON: Yes, we're happy to respond to
23	A. So I did work with the legal folks at my	23	a bench request.
24	company, and they are the ones that, you know, are	24	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.
25	responsible for overseeing the work that's done that's	25	JUDGE BROWN: Any further questions from
	Page 118		Page 120
1	charged to the project, and it's their opinion that it	1	the
2	was charged directly, and so I carry that into my	2	CHAIR DANNER: Yes, yes, I'm not done yet,
3	testimony. I also know that Ron Roberts has a lot of	3	Your Honor.
4	detailed testimony around this and was definitely a lot	4	JUDGE BROWN: I'm sorry.
5	more aware of all the details that I was requested to	5	CHAIR DANNER: It's all right.
6		6	BY CHAIR DANNER:
7	answer. Q. And are there others at PSE who might look at		Q. Can you look at your rebuttal testimony, SEF-4T
8	invoices more closely than you that are charged with	8	
-			at page 3.
9	that?	9	A. I'm there.
10	A. Most definitely, yes.	10	Q. Great.
11	MR. THOMAS: Objection. That calls for	11	This is where you discuss the recovery of PSE's
12	speculation. She's asking the witness what might	12	deferred costs under the accounting petition in the
13	happen. The witness is here to provide knowledge, what	13	Docket 210915.
14	she knows, not speculate about who might do what.	14	Can you clarify whether PSE requests in this
15	JUDGE BROWN: Objection denied. Proceed.	15	case a return on its deferred operation and maintenance
16	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't actually the	16	expenses at PSE's currently authorized rate of return?
17	procedures that at PSE prevent me from actually	17	A. I'm sorry. Could you ask that again.
18	posting entries into the system. I'm not the one that	18	Q. Sure.
19	actually does that work, but, again, I rely on the	19	Can you clarify whether PSE requests in this
20	people who do do the reviews and actually record the	20	case a return on the deferred O&M expenses as PSE's
21	entries to help prepare my testimony.	21	current rate of return?
22	MS. CARSON: I have no further questions.	22	A. We are not requesting anything anything
23	JUDGE BROWN: Any questions from the bench?	23	sorry. We are not requesting a rate of return on top of
24	CHAIR DANNER: So I just yeah, thank you.	24	O&M expenses.
25	EXAMINATION	25	Q. You are not?
		1	

30 (Pages 117 to 120)

	Page 121	Page 123
1	A. We are not.	1 A. Yes.
2	Q. Okay. That's what wasn't clear to me.	2 <b>Q. Okay.</b>
3	CHAIR BROWN: So thank you. I have no	3 So switching to another topic actually, what
4	further questions.	4 would be the justification for earning a return on
5	JUDGE BROWN: Are there any other questions	5 operating expenses, if the Company were asking for that?
6	from the bench?	6 A. Typically, in the past, the Commission has only
7	All right. You may step down.	7 allowed a return on investment that's deferred in a
8	At this time, I would like to ask, are there any	8 couple of cases. One is if there's an incentive for
9	questions from the bench for Betty Erdahl for Staff or	9 something like EV, electric vehicles, and that's
10	Robert Earl from Public Counsel?	10 actually in law, and another is the extraordinary
11	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for	11 circumstance, which means that it's out of PSE's
12	Betty Erdahl, but I don't have questions for Mr. Earl.	12 control, not that it's an extraordinary cost.
13	JUDGE BROWN: Is Ms. Erdahl available?	13 Q. And so your concern about this why is it
14	Are you ready?	14 specifically your concern in this case about earning the
15	THE WITNESS: I'm getting Zoom pulled up. I	15 return on O&M?
16	don't know if this is working. Is it?	16 A. Well, I don't think it's an extraordinary
17	JUDGE BROWN: You have to push the button.	17 circumstance. PSE had control over when it made the
18	THE WITNESS: Oh. Thought I did. That's	18 investment, when it filed its rate case. It actually
19	good. I'm just getting my camera on.	19 filed the rate case a month before the facility went
20	Okay. I'm ready.	20 into service, so why give the deferral in addition?
21		21 Another point that the Company made in its
22	BETTY ERDAHL, having been first duly sworn by the	22 direct case is that similar the Tacoma LNG facility
23	Judge, testified as follows:	23 is similar to EV investment, and it's not, according to
24	///	the law. We have RCWs that state for EV, the Commission
25	JUDGE BROWN: We'll proceed with your	25 may provide a return on investment. Under the Tacoma
	Page 122	Page 124
1	Page 122 questioning.	Page 124 1 LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name
1 2		
	questioning.	1 LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name
2	questioning. EXAMINATION	<ol> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> </ol>
2 3	questioning. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: <b>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</b> A. Good morning.	<ol> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> </ol>
2 3 4	questioning. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: <b>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</b> A. Good morning. <b>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</b>	<ol> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li><b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b></li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	questioning. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: <b>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</b> A. Good morning. <b>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</b>	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</li> <li>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li><b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b></li> <li><b>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</b></li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li><b>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</b></li> <li>A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li><b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b></li> <li><b>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</b></li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li><b>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</b></li> <li>A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually</li> <li>cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</li> <li>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</li> <li>A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually</li> <li>cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was</li> <li>all up for discussion in this case.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	questioning. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl. A. Good morning. Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now. So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free about recovering a return on O&M on deferral; correct? A. Yes. Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company? A. My understanding is that they are requesting a	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</li> <li>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</li> <li>A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually</li> <li>cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was</li> <li>all up for discussion in this case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</li> <li>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</li> <li>A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually</li> <li>cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was</li> <li>all up for discussion in this case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</li> <li>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</li> <li>A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually</li> <li>cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was</li> <li>all up for discussion in this case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</li> <li>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</li> <li>A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually</li> <li>cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was</li> <li>all up for discussion in this case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</li> <li>where in your testimony you described the revenue</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li><b>Q.</b> But the Commission granted deferral for these</li> <li>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Correct. And we approved that settlement?</li> <li>A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually</li> <li>cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was</li> <li>all up for discussion in this case.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Okay. Thank you for that.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> So to turn to another question, can you tell me</li> <li>where in your testimony you described the revenue</li> <li>requirement impact of the deferred return on the O&amp;M</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral THE COURT REPORTER: Can you restate the</li> </ul>	1LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name2is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that3the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the4Commission's practices, so (Pause.)5 <b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b> 6expenses, including the rate base; correct?7A. That was done in the settlement.8 <b>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</b> 9A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually10cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was11all up for discussion in this case.12 <b>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</b> 13A. Yeah.14 <b>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</b> 15where in your testimony you described the revenue16requirement impact of the deferred return on the O&M17expenses? Is that clarified and identified in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral THE COURT REPORTER: Can you restate the exhibit number, please?</li> </ul>	1       LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name         2       is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that         3       the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the         4       Commission's practices, so (Pause.)         5 <b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b> 6       expenses, including the rate base; correct?         7       A. That was done in the settlement.         8 <b>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</b> 9       A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually         10       cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was         11       all up for discussion in this case.         12 <b>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</b> 13       A. Yeah.         14 <b>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</b> 15       where in your testimony you described the revenue         16       requirement impact of the deferred return on the O&M         17       expenses? Is that clarified and identified in the         18       exhibit or in your testimony? It's specifically the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral THE COURT REPORTER: Can you restate the exhibit number, please?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: BAE-2, the deferral shows</li> </ul>	1LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name2is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that3the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the4Commission's practices, so (Pause.)5 <b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b> 6expenses, including the rate base; correct?7A. That was done in the settlement.8 <b>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</b> 9A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually10cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was11all up for discussion in this case.12 <b>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</b> 13A. Yeah.14 <b>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</b> 15where in your testimony you described the revenue16expenses? Is that clarified and identified in the18explose? Is that clarified and identified in the19revenue requirement impact.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral <ul> <li>THE COURT REPORTER: Can you restate the exhibit number, please?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: BAE-2, the deferral shows there is an O&amp;M deferral balance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name</li> <li>is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that</li> <li>the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the</li> <li>Commission's practices, so (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</li> <li>expenses, including the rate base; correct?</li> <li>A. That was done in the settlement.</li> <li>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</li> <li>A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually</li> <li>cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was</li> <li>all up for discussion in this case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</li> <li>where in your testimony you described the revenue</li> <li>requirement impact of the deferred return on the O&amp;M</li> <li>expenses? Is that clarified and identified in the</li> <li>exhibit or in your testimony? It's specifically the</li> <li>revenue requirement impact.</li> <li>A. Yes. BAE-2 shows a revenue requirement impact,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral THE COURT REPORTER: Can you restate the exhibit number, please?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: BAE-2, the deferral shows there is an O&amp;M deferral balance.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> </ul>	1       LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name         2       is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that         3       the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the         4       Commission's practices, so (Pause.)         5 <b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b> 6       expenses, including the rate base; correct?         7       A. That was done in the settlement.         8 <b>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</b> 9       A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually         10       cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was         11       all up for discussion in this case.         12 <b>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</b> 13       A. Yeah.         14 <b>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</b> where in your testimony you described the revenue         16       requirement impact of the deferred return on the O&M         17       expenses? Is that clarified and identified in the         18       exhibit or in your testimony? It's specifically the         19       revenue requirement impact.         20       A. Yes. BAE-2 shows a revenue requirement impact,         21       and in testimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral <ul> <li>THE COURT REPORTER: Can you restate the exhibit number, please?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: BAE-2, the deferral shows there is an O&amp;M deferral balance.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. And it's your understanding that with a</li> </ul></li></ul>	1       LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name         2       is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that         3       the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the         4       Commission's practices, so (Pause.)         5 <b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b> 6       expenses, including the rate base; correct?         7       A. That was done in the settlement.         8 <b>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</b> 9       A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually         10       cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was         11       all up for discussion in this case.         12 <b>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</b> 13       A. Yeah.         14 <b>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</b> where in your testimony you described the revenue         17       expenses? Is that clarified and identified in the         18       exhibit or in your testimony? It's specifically the         19       revenue requirement impact.         17       A. Yes. BAE-2 shows a revenue requirement impact,         18       on in testimony         29 <b>Q. Can you identify which line on BAE-2?</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral <ul> <li>THE COURT REPORTER: Can you restate the exhibit number, please?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: BAE-2, the deferral shows there is an O&amp;M deferral balance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. And it's your understanding that with a request to earn a return on the deferral balance at the</li> </ul>	1       LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name         2       is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that         3       the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the         4       Commission's practices, so (Pause.)         5 <b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b> 6       expenses, including the rate base; correct?         7       A. That was done in the settlement.         8 <b>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</b> 9       A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually         10       cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was         11       all up for discussion in this case.         12 <b>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</b> 13       A. Yeah.         14 <b>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</b> 15       where in your testimony you described the revenue         16       requirement impact of the deferred return on the O&M         17       expenses? Is that clarified and identified in the         18       exhibit or in your testimony? It's specifically the         19       revenue requirement impact.         20       A. Yes. BAE-2 shows a revenue requirement impact,         21       and in testimony         22       Q
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li><b>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</b></li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li><b>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</b></li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li><b>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</b></li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li><b>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</b></li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li><b>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral</b> THE COURT REPORTER: Can you restate the exhibit number, please?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: BAE-2, the deferral shows there is an O&amp;M deferral balance.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li><b>Q. Okay. And it's your understanding that with a request to earn a return on the deferral balance at the Company's authorized rate of return, that that would</b></li> </ul>	1       LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name         2       is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that         3       the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the         4       Commission's practices, so (Pause.)         5       Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these         6       expenses, including the rate base; correct?         7       A. That was done in the settlement.         8       Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?         9       A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually         10       cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was         11       all up for discussion in this case.         12       Q. Okay. Thank you for that.         13       A. Yeah.         14       Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me         15       where in your testimony you described the revenue         16       requirement impact of the deferred return on the O&M         17       expenses? Is that clarified and identified in the         18       exhibit or in your testimony? It's specifically the         19       revenue requirement impact.         16       A. Yes. BAE-2 shows a revenue requirement impact,         17       and in testimony         18       Q. Can yo
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>questioning.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Erdahl.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. It's actually slightly afternoon now.</li> <li>So you just heard the testimony of Ms. Free</li> <li>about recovering a return on O&amp;M on deferral; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was that your understanding of the request for the Company?</li> <li>A. My understanding is that they are requesting a return on the deferral.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the O&amp;M?</li> <li>A. I believe it does. Let me take a quick look.</li> <li>Q. According to Exhibit BAE-2, the deferral <ul> <li>THE COURT REPORTER: Can you restate the exhibit number, please?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: BAE-2, the deferral shows there is an O&amp;M deferral balance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. And it's your understanding that with a request to earn a return on the deferral balance at the</li> </ul>	1       LNG WAC I can't remember let's see what the name         2       is. Compressed natural gas. It actually states that         3       the Commission, that their intent is to not alter the         4       Commission's practices, so (Pause.)         5 <b>Q. But the Commission granted deferral for these</b> 6       expenses, including the rate base; correct?         7       A. That was done in the settlement.         8 <b>Q. Correct. And we approved that settlement?</b> 9       A. We approved the deferral, but not the actually         10       cost recovery or necessarily the return on. That was         11       all up for discussion in this case.         12 <b>Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</b> 13       A. Yeah.         14 <b>Q. So to turn to another question, can you tell me</b> 15       where in your testimony you described the revenue         16       requirement impact of the deferred return on the O&M         17       expenses? Is that clarified and identified in the         18       exhibit or in your testimony? It's specifically the         19       revenue requirement impact.         20       A. Yes. BAE-2 shows a revenue requirement impact,         21       and in testimony         22       Q

31 (Pages 121 to 124)

	Page 125		Page 127
1	difference is \$5 million from Staff's position versus	1	A. Correct.
2	the Company's.	2	Q. Thank you.
3	Q. Okay. But that's specifically for the O&M	3	JUDGE BROWN: Anything further? Anything
4	expense?	4	from the bench?
5	A. Oh, specifically for the O&M, well, actually,	5	Okay. Now, Ms. Erdahl, you may step down.
6	the difference shows as zero. I think we basically	6	The next witness is Dr. Ranajit Sahu for the
7	looked at their deferral in the revenue requirement		Tribe.
8	model. I would have to go back and take a look at that.	8	MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	All right. So in testimony, I've got to	9	So we're going to take Dr. Sahu at this time,
10	backtrack, page 2.	10	yes?
11	Q. And this is 1T?	11	JUDGE BROWN: Yes. That's correct.
12	A. Correct.	12	MR. THOMAS: Okay. Dr. Sahu, if you could
13	Q. Okay.	13	please come online.
14	A. So Staff recommends disallowing PSE from	14	THE WITNESS: I am. Can you guys hear me?
15	recovering a return on \$18 million, which was a return	15	JUDGE BROWN: We can hear you excuse me,
16	on investment that it deferred, disallowing point-7	16	we can hear you just fine.
17	million in deferred depreciation.	17	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	CHAIR DANNER: I'm sorry. Ms. Erdahl, what	18	JUDGE BROWN: Can I have
19	page? I'm not finding it.	19	MR. THOMAS: Yeah, sorry.
20	THE WITNESS: Starting on page 2, page 2 and	20	JUDGE BROWN: You've got to hold your
21	3, and then BAE-2 actually shows those amounts in Column	21	horses.
22	С.	22	
23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And maybe we	23	RANAJIT SAHU, having been first duly sworn by the
24	issue a follow-up bench request for clarification	24	Judge, testified as follows:
25	because it appears the BAE-2 doesn't show any return or	25	JUDGE BROWN: Please introduce your witness
	Page 126		Page 128
1	any difference between what the Company is requesting,	1	and confirm whether there are any changes to his
2	so if it's necessary for Staff to correct that exhibit,	2	testimony.
3	then that will be we'll prepare a bench request and	3	MR. THOMAS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
4	submit it. Thank you.	4	Good afternoon, Dr. Sahu.
5	THE WITNESS: Yup.	5	Do you have available to you your pre-filed
6	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And with that, I	6	testimony, rebuttal testimony, and corresponding
7	don't have any further questions.	7	exhibits? I think those are memorialized in RXS-1T
8	JUDGE BROWN: Ms. Erdahl, you may step down.	8	through RXS-34, and then RXS-35T through RXS-38. Do you
9	MR. ROBERSON: Your Honor, if I may, just a	9	have all of that available?
10	follow-up question just to clarify.	10	THE WITNESS: I do.
11	JUDGE BROWN: Go ahead and proceed.	11	MR. THOMAS: All right. Are there any
12	CROSS-EXAMINATION	12	changes to your testimony or exhibits as submitted?
13	BY MR. ROBERSON:	13	THE WITNESS: I am not aware.
14	Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Erdahl.	14	MR. THOMAS: Okay. All right. Then the
15	In your answer to Commissioner Rendahl there,	15	witness is available for cross-examination. Thank you.
16	you referred to a WAC and then you read a title, which	16	JUDGE BROWN: Sorry. Was there anything
17	was, "Compressed Natural Gas."	17	else?
18	Is it possible that's a statute?	18	MR. ROBERSON: I'm just asking for the go
		19	ahead to ask some questions.
19	A. Correct. It's a statute.		•
20	Q. Is that RCW 80.28.280?	20	MR. THOMAS: Yes.
20 21		20 21	MR. ROBERSON: Sorry.
20 21 22	Q. Is that RCW 80.28.280? THE COURT REPORTER: I need you to slow down and repeat that.	20 21 22	MR. ROBERSON: Sorry. CROSS EXAMINATION
20 21 22 23	Q. Is that RCW 80.28.280? THE COURT REPORTER: I need you to slow down	20 21 22 23	MR. ROBERSON: Sorry. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERSON:
20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Is that RCW 80.28.280?</li> <li>THE COURT REPORTER: I need you to slow down and repeat that.</li> <li>MR. ROBERSON: I apologize.</li> <li>BY MR. ROBERSON:</li> </ul>	20 21 22 23 24	MR. ROBERSON: Sorry. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERSON: <b>Q. Okay. Good afternoon Dr. Sahu.</b>
20 21 22 23	Q. Is that RCW 80.28.280? THE COURT REPORTER: I need you to slow down and repeat that. MR. ROBERSON: I apologize.	20 21 22 23	MR. ROBERSON: Sorry. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERSON:

32 (Pages 125 to 128)

	Page 129		Page 131
1	which is I believe RXS-35T?	1	where there's no liquefaction going on, that means
2	A. Yes, I do have it here.	2	there's no gas coming into the facility that that
3	MS. CARSON: Excuse me. Just a point of	3	thousand could leave the facility through that, is what
4	clarification.	4	I heard, and the vaporization capacity I think is
5	I don't believe Dr. Sahu submitted rebuttal	5	66,000, so I consider that small.
б	testimony.	6	Q. Okay. So in your alternative cost allocation,
7	MR. ROBERSON: Sorry.	7	you're basically not allocating for the boil-off gas?
8	THE WITNESS: Cross.	8	A. It would be a small amount and certainly not
9	MR. ROBERSON: Cross.	9	anywhere close to the allocations that I've seen so far
10	THE WITNESS: I have that number. Yes, I	10	by others.
11	apologize. I misspoke.	11	Q. Okay. And then speaking more generally to your
12	JUDGE BROWN: Understood. Proceed with the	12	testimony, you raise a number of issues dealing with
13	question.	13	externalities of the LNG plant but PSCAA has rejected
14	Thank you for the clarification.	14	those arguments; correct?
15	BY MR. ROBERSON:	15	A. Well, when you say that PSCAA, they're only
16	Q. If you can turn to page 9, starting on lines 7	16	focused on the air permitting aspects, is my
17	through 8.	17	understanding. The externalities I'm raising go beyond
18	A. Page 9, I'm just going to get there.	18	just what PSCAA was looking at in issuing their permit.
19	I am there. Please did you say lines 7	19	Q. Okay. So your contention is that the Commission
20	through 9?	20	should consider those externalities because in so far as
21	Q. Just beginning there, yeah.	21	they weren't considered in the permit, they weren't
22	You discuss an alternative allocation based on	22	considered; is that correct?
23	gas volumes.	23	A. If I can say, yes, the short answer is yes, and
24	I'm a little unclear how the boil-off gas	24	the reason is a permit only deals with a subset of
25	figures into this.	25	externalities at best. In other words, if full
	Page 130		Page 132
1	Did you consider boil-off gas when you were	1	compliance with the permit is even ensured, it only
2	doing these alternative cost allocations?	2	deals with certain air emissions and representations
3	A. I was told that boil-off gas is a very small	3	made by PSE to PSCAA in doing the application that was
4	amount of gas.	4	submitted. There are externalities that we haven't
5	And you're talking about boil-off gas that	5	heard in this proceeding that whether they deal with
6	happens every day when the facility is not liquefying,	6	accidental risk, whether they deal with issues
7	just to be just to be sure; is that right, Mr.	7	pertaining to bypass, whether they deal with
8	Roberson?	8	externalities pertaining to transport of LNG through
9	Q. That is correct.	9	trucks from from this facility to Gig Harbor.
10	A. Yes, my understanding is that that amount is	10	There's lots of externalities that affect the Tribe's
11	small. It's also my understanding the facility is	11	interest that go beyond what PSCAA was looking at at
12	designed in part to even handle some of the boil-off gas	12	best, and so externalities is are much broader than
13	in the cryogenic burners in the flare in addition to	13	just in the PSCAA proceeding.
14	just going back out in the pipeline or being recycled	14	MR. ROBERSON: Those are all my questions.
15	back or reliquefied, so there's multiple places for the	15	Thank you.
16	boil-off gas to go and that the amounts are small.	16	JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect?
17	Q. So I believe this morning it was maybe Mr.	17	MR. THOMAS: Yes. Just very briefly. Thank
18	Donahue said it was up to 1200 dekatherms a day?	18	you.
19	What do you consider small, I guess is my	19	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
20	question?	20	BY MR. THOMAS:
		21	Q. Dr. Sahu, do you recall whether the Puget Sound
21	A. Yeah, he mentioned I think a thousand		
22	dekatherms, if I'm not mistaken, if I heard him	22	Clean Air Agency made a determination on whether it had
22 23	dekatherms, if I'm not mistaken, if I heard him correctly, and that gas could be recycled. Of course,	22 23	Clean Air Agency made a determination on whether it had jurisdiction to look at issues of equity and disparate
22 23 24	dekatherms, if I'm not mistaken, if I heard him correctly, and that gas could be recycled. Of course, when there's liquefaction going on, it couldn't possibly	22 23 24	Clean Air Agency made a determination on whether it had jurisdiction to look at issues of equity and disparate impacts?
22 23	dekatherms, if I'm not mistaken, if I heard him correctly, and that gas could be recycled. Of course,	22 23	Clean Air Agency made a determination on whether it had jurisdiction to look at issues of equity and disparate

33 (Pages 129 to 132)

	Page 133		Page 135
1	jurisdiction, so that was not looked at as part of their	1	BY CHAIR DANNER:
2	proceeding their purview of granting the permit.	2	Q. This morning we had some questions about the
3	Q. Okay. And a little earlier, we heard testimony	3	quantifications of those emissions, and you've given the
4	regarding direct venting of waste gas, and I want to	4	number of minutes.
5	stay on Mr. Roberson's questions regarding externalities	5	Do you have any basis to make an estimate of or
6	for a moment.	6	calculation of the actual emissions?
7	Does the direct venting of waste gas and the	7	A. That's a great question. I have the minutes
8	permit violations that have been discussed today, do	8	that are reported. What I don't have are the
9	those disparately impact the Tribe and those located	9	composition of the waste gases. In other words, that
10	near the Tacoma LNG facility?	10	are I have not seen that reported, what was the
11	A. Yes. Because they're locational, they're local,	11	composition, how much of different hazardous
12	and I did hear that testimony. They were they	12	constituents were in that gas when those gases were
13	certainly disproportionately affect the local area which	13	direct vented. I can make assumptions, but I have not
14	is where the Tribe's interests are.	14	done so, about what that is based on design information
15	Q. Okay. And is the direct venting of waste gas,	15	that I have from previous proceedings, and it would be
16	is that a big deal, or is that not really a problem in	16	since the even if you achieve a destruction
17	your view?	17	efficiency of 99 percent that you heard here, that means
18	A. Well, when direct venting happens, as we heard	18	just a simple matter of arithmetic, every minute of
19	others testify, Mr. Roberts, that there's no destruction	19	waste gas venting is like a close to 100 minutes of
20	of the constituents in that waste gas and those	20	flare venting, and so that 99 percent means you're not
21	constituents are, therefore, directly remitted into the	21	getting 99 percent removal of destruction that the flare
22	air in that immediate vicinity, and so it is interesting	22	would have given you, and so it would be for each
23	to me. I heard him say that they have to do that for	23	minute, just roughly speaking, 100 minutes of flaring of
24	safety, implying that direct venting somehow is also not	24	that same composition would be the same as one minute of
25	unsafe. So, yes, direct venting of all those toxic air	25	venting. I have not done the calculation, though,
	Page 134		Page 136
1	pollutants is, itself, unsafe and, therefore, it has	1	because of the composition that has not been disclosed.
2	adverse impacts when it does occur.	2	Q. Okay. So that is not a calculation; that is an
3	Q. Okay. And are those impacts uniformly	3	assumption?
4	distributed throughout the State of Washington or not?	4	A. The assumption is that 99 percent is a
5	A. Those impacts would be felt in the immediate	5	destruction efficiency. That's the permanent condition.
6	vicinity or in the vicinity of the plant. It would not	6	That's not an assumption. The flare, when it operates,
7	be distributed throughout the State of Washington.	7	it's supposed to operate at that or higher level of
8	Q. Okay. And as you sit here today, do you have an	8	efficiency, and that's a requirement of the permit, and
9	understanding of just how much time Tacoma LNG, as	9	I'm saying the trade-off between venting and nonventing
10	reported by Puget Sound Energy, has spent direct venting	10	is about 100 times, but the exact how many pounds of
11	waste gas to the air shed?	11	Constituent X is emitted would require knowledge of the
	waste gas to the all sheet		
12	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE	12	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not
12 13	-	12 13	1 5
	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE		actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not
13	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe	13	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly.
13 14	<ul> <li>A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy</li> </ul>	13 14	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. <b>Q. All right. Thank you.</b> CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question. JUDGE BROWN: Any question?
13 14 15	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy of 400 minutes, I think 390-some minutes of waste gas	13 14 15	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. <b>Q. All right. Thank you.</b> CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question.
13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy of 400 minutes, I think 390-some minutes of waste gas venting. There's also some minutes of non-waste gas venting. Setting that aside, it was something in that range.	13 14 15 16	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. <b>Q. All right. Thank you.</b> CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question. JUDGE BROWN: Any question? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: One question from me. EXAMINATION
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy of 400 minutes, I think 390-some minutes of waste gas venting. There's also some minutes of non-waste gas venting. Setting that aside, it was something in that	13 14 15 16 17	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. <b>Q. All right. Thank you.</b> CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question. JUDGE BROWN: Any question? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: One question from me. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:
13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy of 400 minutes, I think 390-some minutes of waste gas venting. There's also some minutes of non-waste gas venting. Setting that aside, it was something in that range.</li> <li>MR. THOMAS: Thank you very much, Dr. Sahu. I don't have anything further.</li> </ul>	13 14 15 16 17 18	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. Q. All right. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question. JUDGE BROWN: Any question? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: One question from me. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. Thanks you, Dr. Sahu.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy of 400 minutes, I think 390-some minutes of waste gas venting. There's also some minutes of non-waste gas venting. Setting that aside, it was something in that range. MR. THOMAS: Thank you very much, Dr. Sahu.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. <b>Q. All right. Thank you.</b> CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question. JUDGE BROWN: Any question? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: One question from me. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy of 400 minutes, I think 390-some minutes of waste gas venting. There's also some minutes of non-waste gas venting. Setting that aside, it was something in that range. MR. THOMAS: Thank you very much, Dr. Sahu. I don't have anything further. JUDGE BROWN: Any questions from the bench for Dr. Sahu?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. Q. All right. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question. JUDGE BROWN: Any question? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: One question from me. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. Thanks you, Dr. Sahu. So at page 36 of your direct testimony A. Okay. Let me just go to that one. Page 36,
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy of 400 minutes, I think 390-some minutes of waste gas venting. There's also some minutes of non-waste gas venting. Setting that aside, it was something in that range. MR. THOMAS: Thank you very much, Dr. Sahu. I don't have anything further. JUDGE BROWN: Any questions from the bench for Dr. Sahu?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. Q. All right. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question. JUDGE BROWN: Any question? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: One question from me. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. Thanks you, Dr. Sahu. So at page 36 of your direct testimony A. Okay. Let me just go to that one. Page 36, okay, I'm almost there.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy of 400 minutes, I think 390-some minutes of waste gas venting. There's also some minutes of non-waste gas venting. Setting that aside, it was something in that range. MR. THOMAS: Thank you very much, Dr. Sahu. I don't have anything further. JUDGE BROWN: Any questions from the bench for Dr. Sahu?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. Q. All right. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question. JUDGE BROWN: Any question? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: One question from me. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. Thanks you, Dr. Sahu. So at page 36 of your direct testimony A. Okay. Let me just go to that one. Page 36, okay, I'm almost there. Q. Page 8, you cite to an exhibit, your Exhibit 33
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Again, going by the reported numbers that PSE has disclosed thus far, and they go through I believe the first quarter of 2023, it was something slightly shy of 400 minutes, I think 390-some minutes of waste gas venting. There's also some minutes of non-waste gas venting. Setting that aside, it was something in that range. MR. THOMAS: Thank you very much, Dr. Sahu. I don't have anything further. JUDGE BROWN: Any questions from the bench for Dr. Sahu?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actual contaminates that have been vented. That has not been disclosed by PSE that I know of publicly. Q. All right. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: That's my only question. JUDGE BROWN: Any question? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: One question from me. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Q. Thanks you, Dr. Sahu. So at page 36 of your direct testimony A. Okay. Let me just go to that one. Page 36, okay, I'm almost there.

34 (Pages 133 to 136)

Evidentiary Hearing - 11/6/2023

	Page 137		Page 139
1	A. Yes.	1	And are there any questions from the parties at
2	Q. And to say that in your testimony here that PSE	2	this point?
3	has announced plans to transport LNG by rail, are you	3	CHAIR DANNER: So, Your Honor, just looking
4	did you listen to the testimony earlier of Mr. Donahue,	4	at my notes from the public comment hearing, I would say
5	l believe it was, who	5	that Public Counsel is correct that they will submit
6	A. Yes.	6	that public comment exhibit on the 29th, and today,
7	Q said so does that is there a	7	close of business is the deadline for written comments,
8	distinction between the announced capabilities of the	8	written public comments in this proceeding.
9	plant and, as you state, the plans; in other words, are	9	JUDGE BROWN: Thank you.
10	you comforted that there are at this point, based on	10	Is there anything else we need to address today?
11	the testimony that we heard, that there's no plans to	11	Okay. Thank you to all the parties, witnesses,
12	ship LNG by rail?	12	representatives. We are adjourned. We are now off the
13	A. I did hear Mr. Roberts' testimony, and I think	13	record.
14	that's what he said. I was going by what has been	14	(Proceedings concluded at 12:28 p.m.)
15	announced as an option. I've heard, as you have seen in	15	
16	this proceedings, plans, for example, not to vent and	16	
17	those have come to pass, and so I'm aware of plans	17	
18	versus reality, and I say that with some experience	18	
19	here.	19	
20	Q. All right. Thank you.	20	
21	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further from	21	
22	me. Thanks.	22	
23	JUDGE BROWN: Seeing that there are no	23	
24 25	further questions, that concludes the examinations of	24 25	
25	our witnesses today.	25	
	Page 138		Page 140
1	But before we adjourn, there's some housekeeping	1	CERTIFICATE
2	I would like to go over.	2	
3	For the public comment exhibit, how long does	3	STATE OF WASHINGTON
4	Public Counsel need to prepare the Public Counsel	4	COUNTY OF KING
5	exhibit?	5	
б	MS. GAFKEN: Judge Brown, we set the date	6	I, Laura L. Ohman, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
7	for that at the public comment hearing that was held	7	in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify
8	last week, and I understand that Staff required a bit of	8	that the foregoing evidentiary hearing on
9	time because there's staffing issues and just they	9	November 6, 2023, is true and accurate to the best of my
10	the amount of work that's before the Commission at this	10	knowledge, skill and ability.
11	time. I don't have a date right at my fingerprints, but	11	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
12	it was towards the end of the month. I think we settled	12	and seal this 20th day of November, 2023.
13	on the 29th, November 29th for that filing to come in.	13	
14 15	I do have a question about what bench exhibit	14 15	ROTCA
15 16	number it should be given?	16	
16 17	JUDGE BROWN: Bench Exhibit No. 1 once it's	17	Constant Colore - Stand
18	completed and submitted. MS. GAFKEN: Great. We will submit that	18	LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186
19	under Bench Exhibit No. 1. Thank you.	19	ENDINE. OHIMAN, NEW, OUX 5100
20	JUDGE BROWN: Great.	20	My commission expires:
21	With regard to briefing, we have the initial	21	MARCH 2024
22	post-hearing briefs due on December 8th, 2023. These	22	
23	briefs may be up to 50 pages in length. We also have	23	
24	reply briefs due December 21st, and these briefs may be	24	
25	up to 20 pages in length.	25	

35 (Pages 137 to 140)

	•	•		
A	49:23 85:14 135:6	afternoon 15:17	90:1,20 91:2,2	analyze 43:1
<b>a.m</b> 12:2,6 92:22,22	136:12	122:6 126:14	95:5 101:23	102:24
<b>AAG</b> 13:14 23:5	add 19:13,22 80:20	128:4,24	allocating 131:7	Anderson 2:3 4:22
abandoned 28:18	81:2,2	AFuller@omwla	<b>allocation</b> 5:21 6:2	14:20 22:15
ability 86:22 96:22	added 9:17	3:13	6:18 7:22 26:15	<b>Andrew</b> 3:9 14:14
140:10	adding 80:19	agencies 25:24 26:2	32:18 37:5 67:7	23:19 98:10
<b>able</b> 13:17 31:13	addition 28:15 88:1	agency 6:24 8:2	68:21,22 69:14	<b>Ann</b> 3:16
	123:20 130:13	10:4 25:22 28:10	73:6,21 77:14	announced 137:3,8
71:9 114:8,14,18	additional 18:13	29:13 46:14 48:10	78:1 79:12 80:17	137:15
115:2,12 117:21	19:7 35:11,13	48:16,25 54:9	80:18,19,22 83:17	announces 10:2
<b>absence</b> 40:21	36:22 79:6 80:16	63:8 115:7 132:22	85:12,15 88:2	<b>annual</b> 7:6 95:14
absent 77:17	80:20 81:2,3	ago 32:1	90:1,9 91:12,18	answer 30:10 32:13
absorb 31:15	<b>Additionally</b> 35:14	agree 59:20 76:23	91:23 129:22	37:14 41:7 43:7
<b>absurd</b> 36:14	address 15:5 19:2	agreeable 63:24	131:6	52:12 57:13 98:16
acceptable 34:11	25:18 26:5 29:14	agreement 4:19	<b>allocations</b> 66:14	102:1 103:2
34:14	30:12 38:8 41:9	88:9 90:5,9	85:1 130:2 131:9	102:11103:2
accepted 102:2,14	60:13 139:10	<b>agrees</b> 42:1	<b>allow</b> 15:8 23:24	113:4 118:6
accessible 84:21	addressed 30:8	ahead 23:2 86:4	58:25 113:4	126:15 131:23
accidental 132:6	33:23 37:25 42:6	103:6 126:11	<b>allowed</b> 24:12,25	<b>answered</b> 106:21
accord 77:20	60:20 84:1	128:19	27:10 29:16 30:19	answering 82:9
account 15:15 42:9	addresses 59:18	<b>air</b> 6:24 8:2,23,24	123:7	anyway 86:11
63:6 87:14 100:19		9:2 10:4 25:20,22		
accounted 107:17	adjacent 9:13	,	<b>allowing</b> 31:2 <b>allows</b> 31:4 37:4	<b>apologies</b> 14:13 18:7 58:23 81:7
accounting 100:22	adjourn 138:1	25:24 28:11 29:13		
116:24 120:12	adjourned 139:12	39:25 46:13,14	alter 124:3	<b>apologize</b> 18:3
accounts 112:3	adjudication 14:1	47:4,12,13 48:8	<b>alternative</b> 26:20	20:14 21:6 68:10
116:25	15:18	48:10,13,13,16,20	87:8,11 129:22	68:11 126:23
accrue 24:17 28:8	administrative	48:25 49:2,16	130:2 131:6	129:11
accurate 53:8 84:8	1:12 12:8	50:15 51:3 63:8	alternatives 26:18	appeal 107:18
117:2 140:9	admission 19:17,25	69:4 87:18 88:2,3	29:22	appealed 50:5
<b>achieve</b> 135:16	20:8,13 21:9,13	105:8 106:12	ambiguous 56:4	appeals 10:4
achieved 57:20	admit 15:5	114:7 115:7	<b>amended</b> 99:6	104:21 106:4
<b>achieves</b> 46:22	<b>admitted</b> 21:16	131:16 132:2,22	100:9	108:6,17 109:5
acknowledged	22:4 45:23	133:22,25 134:11	amicus 10:5 109:3	<b>appearance</b> 9:9,10
25:15 42:5	advantage 41:8	<b>al</b> 10:4,4	109:12,14,18	13:11,19 14:2,7
Acknowledgement	adverse 134:2	<b>albeit</b> 61:6	119:17	23:7
4:24	Advocates 10:3	alerting 17:25	amount 31:18 35:6	appearances 12:17
Act 107:10 114:7	<b>AE-4</b> 6:20	allegations 26:3	36:6 47:3 61:9	13:10 22:10
114:12,23	<b>AE-5</b> 6:21	55:16	62:25 80:6 83:3	appearing 2:16 3:2
acted 24:21	<b>AE-6</b> 6:23	alleged 18:18	95:4 111:3,4	3:8 13:22 16:3
action 28:3 60:16	<b>AE-7</b> 6:24	<b>Alliance</b> 3:2 14:2	124:24 130:4,10	23:10,13
actions 33:18 60:19	affect 70:22,23	allocate 71:11	131:8 138:10	<b>appears</b> 54:3 63:18
active 100:10	132:10 133:13	80:25 81:21	<b>amounts</b> 101:10,14	74:4 125:25
activities 40:7	affiliate 69:23	allocated 26:16	125:21 130:16	Appendix 76:20
actual 17:17 32:24	70:18 88:22,23	30:2 70:1,2 76:24	<b>analysis</b> 33:17 35:1	77:9
35:15 39:1 49:20	90:7	79:13,15 82:20	41:14,17 43:20	application 5:22
	1	1	1	

				•
8:21 132:3	asking 17:10 20:15	100:3,20 101:4,20	122:19 124:20,22	89:4 90:18 99:25
applied 66:19	54:3 59:13 80:24	112:11 113:10	125:21,25	99:25 110:23
apply 27:16 41:22	103:8 105:6,16,21	114:15,24 115:9	BAE-3 6:18	122:15 129:1,5
43:19	105:21 106:23	117:4	BAE-87:2	130:17 134:13
appreciate 13:25	107:25 110:21	attorneys' 117:5	BAE-97:3	137:5
15:1,21 76:8	111:18 113:9	audio 12:24 22:19	<b>balance</b> 122:20,23	Bellevue 2:6
approach 78:4	115:19 116:7	audit 37:2 44:3,3	balancing 35:19	bench 15:25 62:13
appropriate 26:8	118:12 123:5	authorize 24:23	<b>base</b> 31:8,14 32:23	63:17 65:8 76:12
26:13 58:4 60:16	128:18	authorized 120:16	124:6	89:14 92:14 94:13
78:3 95:3 100:12	asks 54:6	122:24	based 25:12 31:17	118:23 119:20,23
100:23 101:1,8,9	aspects 131:16	available 27:18,21	31:20 32:8,14,24	121:6,9 125:24
101:14 102:16	Assessment 9:19	40:18 41:6 45:16	34:23 35:18 70:25	126:3 127:4
101.14 102.10	<b>assign</b> 71:20 96:4	65:4 66:11 74:24	71:3 72:18 77:12	120.3 127.4 134:21 138:14,16
111:22 112:10	0	76:4 88:15 94:4	85:2 119:4 129:22	134.21 138.14,10
	assigned 100:22			
appropriately	<b>assignment</b> 66:8,11	98:3 105:18	135:14 137:10	<b>benefit</b> 25:17 27:24
25:12 101:3,22,23	95:15 96:19	121:13 128:5,9,15	<b>bases</b> 32:22	29:6 40:7
119:12	assigns 66:25	Avenue 2:19 3:11	<b>basically</b> 31:5	<b>benefits</b> 24:16 28:8
appropriateness	assist 41:4	<b>average</b> 66:12	32:19 82:24 85:19	28:16 35:4,19
102:3,24 107:16	assistant 2:11,17	75:19	119:3 124:23	40:8,9
113:2	13:22 23:9	averages 84:7	125:6 131:7	benefitting 28:4
<b>approval</b> 8:2 73:23	associated 36:25	<b>avoid</b> 28:13	<b>basing</b> 119:6	Benzene 8:23
approved 30:18	38:1 39:12 40:1	award 103:12	<b>basis</b> 15:19 35:8	<b>best</b> 36:7 73:25
33:14 95:12 124:8	55:18	<b>aware</b> 42:8 49:25	40:20 49:17 84:9	100:4 105:3
124:9	assuming 31:19	50:2,4,7 51:1,6	119:6 135:5	131:25 132:12
approving 36:20	82:17	57:19 60:1 73:15	<b>BC</b> 28:3	140:9
approximately	assumption 136:3,4	92:3 102:11,17	bearing 13:25	Betty 11:17 121:9
15:14 95:18	136:6	117:8 118:5	15:22	121:12,22
arbitrarily 32:21	assumptions	128:13 137:17	<b>beat</b> 104:19	<b>beyond</b> 26:21 116:8
<b>area</b> 9:22 24:17	135:13	<b>AWEC</b> 14:2,5	bedrock 31:21	131:17 132:11
28:7 133:13	Atrium 93:16	16:22 17:1,23	<b>began</b> 27:20 65:21	<b>bias</b> 29:21
areas 8:17 24:16	attached 50:19	20:25 21:1,8	beginning 12:17	bidirectional 30:1
argue 36:15 69:11	104:21	23:11,14 37:17,22	20:15 22:10 65:18	71:23 73:12,14,17
argued 71:1	attachment 7:8,14	38:5	129:21	73:22 74:2 77:15
argues 25:11	7:18,20 8:8 9:17	AWEC's 17:7	begins 53:2 65:7	80:13 81:4 95:16
arguing 87:17	22:7 77:5,6		behalf 10:11,12	<b>big</b> 71:4 133:16
argument 31:20	Attachments 5:15	<u> </u>	13:22 14:5 16:19	<b>bigger</b> 81:17
57:12	attention 76:18	<b>back</b> 21:25 47:23	23:10,14 39:2	<b>billed</b> 114:15,24
arguments 104:20	attorney 2:11,11,17	63:4 71:13 81:6	42:11	115:9
104:25 131:14	2:18 10:5 13:22	82:13 84:5,14	<b>belief</b> 43:4	<b>bills</b> 102:23 111:14
arithmetic 135:18	16:4 23:5,9 102:7	92:23 112:9 125:8	<b>believe</b> 16:22 17:15	111:20,21,23
asbestos 28:19	109:19 111:5,8	130:14,15,25	17:23 44:1 46:7	<b>bit</b> 45:24 62:2
<b>aside</b> 134:17	114:19 115:3,13	backtrack 125:10	51:18 56:17 58:24	90:17 99:4 111:18
<b>asked</b> 35:10 103:18	attorney/client	BAE-107:5	60:10 63:5 66:16	114:11 138:8
111:9,12,17 114:6	103:2	<b>BAE-11</b> 7:6	71:22 73:3 74:10	<b>Blair</b> 29:2
116:9	attorneys 99:24	<b>BAE-12</b> 7:8	77:18,22 80:21	blow-off 63:2
	······································	BAE-2 6:17 122:16		
			l	l

<b>board</b> 4:8,16,17 5:2	105:14,18,23	Byronstarkey@p	94:3 97:9,15,20	132:2
5:4,5 24:23 25:23	108:1 112:15,19	2:8	97:24 98:2 103:1	certainly 14:23
28:10 29:5 35:7	113:4,21,25 116:1		103:24 105:11	18:1 21:3 52:9
35:10 50:14	116:13,16 118:15	C	107:15 112:13	61:23 89:7 131:8
105:10	118:23 119:25	C 2:1,4 3:1 125:22	115:21 116:14,18	133:13
<b>boil-off</b> 63:6,8	120:4 121:3,5,13	140:1,1	117:19,20 118:22	certification 16:20
74:10,13,20,25	121:17,25 126:8	calculation 77:20	119:22 129:3	16:21 17:4,21
75:7 76:3 84:2,5	126:11 127:3,11	80:17 135:6,25	case 10:9 12:13	18:4
84:14 85:11 86:8	127:15,18,20,25	136:2	17:12,21 18:25	certifications 17:12
129:24 130:1,3,5	128:16 129:12	calendar 67:20	19:3,16 24:20	Certified 140:6
130:12,16 131:7	132:16 134:21	<b>call</b> 16:11 46:1	26:5 27:15 30:17	certify 140:7
<b>bottom</b> 51:14 53:18	136:16 137:23	called 109:24	31:9 32:1 33:7,8	<b>Chair</b> 3:16 11:12
86:15	138:6,16,20 139:9	calls 118:11	33:10,11,14,22,23	11:13,16,20 24:2
Box 2:12	<b>buffer</b> 28:23	camera 103:13	33:23 36:1,20	89:8,18 91:16,20
Braemar 5:7	<b>build</b> 24:10 25:6	121:19	37:24 38:3 53:5	94:14,16 118:24
break 15:16,16	33:16,19,22 34:11	Canadian 83:18	71:4 76:19 78:4	119:1,14,24 120:2
48:23 56:6 63:24	34:15 71:8,9	Cap-Ex 5:21	81:16 89:1,5,6,11	120:5,6 121:3
89:14 92:19,19,21	81:15,15 86:1,10	capabilities 137:8	92:4 94:23 96:1,3	125:18 135:1
breaks 16:13	117:3	capable 91:14	103:14 105:10	136:15 139:3
Bridge 27:2	<b>building</b> 31:24 81:9	capacity 7:7 24:13	107:13 114:16,20	challenge 24:25
<b>brief</b> 10:5 15:3,8,15	87:8	27:19,21,23 28:5	114:23,25 115:8	30:22 50:15 51:3
22:10 23:25 30:16	buildings 28:18,21	69:6 74:15 75:23	115:10,23 116:6	62:2
37:21 46:7 72:23	<b>built</b> 28:17 67:24	75:25 76:1,2	116:22 117:12,15	challenged 50:4
109:18 119:17	69:6,8 71:5 78:13	78:14 79:6 80:7	117:21 120:15,20	<b>chance</b> 54:17
briefing 36:24 38:9	82:19 83:8 88:4	131:4	123:14,18,19,22	change 85:17
138:21	<b>bunch</b> 98:18	capital 35:5 117:8	124:11	changes 6:11 25:17
briefly 41:14	<b>burden</b> 39:13 43:21	captioned 12:13	cases 31:7 71:2	25:18 44:22 64:8
132:17	43:24	carefully 43:20	104:7 115:18	97:24 128:1,12
<b>briefs</b> 109:3,12,15	burdens 39:6	carried 48:15	116:22 123:8	characteristic
138:22,23,24,24	<b>burners</b> 130:13	<b>carry</b> 13:9 36:14	categories 67:1	73:17
<b>bring</b> 62:3,4 65:8	business 139:7	118:2	causation 69:2 71:1	characterization
90:15	<b>button</b> 121:17	cars 9:20	76:25 77:18 81:8	56:19 57:11
bringing 61:9	<b>buying</b> 75:20	Carson 2:3 11:3,7	81:14 82:14 85:14	characterized 67:8
British 87:9	<b>bypass</b> 48:18 49:6	11:15 12:19,20	85:18	characterizing
broad 39:9 66:25	49:8,13,21,24	14:19,24 20:3	caused 39:22	59:16
broader 132:12	51:4 52:22 53:1	22:12,13 24:2	<b>causes</b> 60:14,20	<b>charge</b> 100:21
brought 62:8 74:3	54:23 56:16 57:21	44:20,23 45:2,7	61:11 78:13	101:7 117:7
119:10	57:22,25 58:1,3,8	45:11,15 47:15	<b>CB&amp;I</b> 5:9	<b>charged</b> 28:10
<b>Brown</b> 1:13,13	58:9,10,19 59:6,9	52:6 54:11 56:3	<b>CBNI</b> 56:17	29:13 99:11,13
12:8 13:14 23:4	59:11 60:2,21	56:18 57:5 58:22 59:15 61:18 64:7	CCR 1:25 140:18	100:18,19 101:3
23:13 24:4 37:20	132:7		<b>CEM</b> 7:25	101:10,14,22
38:15 92:23 93:3	bypasses 54:8	64:9,16,20,24 65:3 72:14 76:10	<b>Center</b> 13:6,8	107:5 111:25
93:10 94:5,12	bypassing 58:6		centered 36:17	116:25 117:5
97:1,8 98:4,7	<b>Byron</b> 2:4 14:20	77:2,5 89:3,4,12 91:16 92:25 93:5	<b>Central</b> 8:17	118:1,2,8 119:12
103:5,15,22 104:4	22:15	93:11,17,21,25	<b>certain</b> 78:23 99:18	charges 99:17
		73.11,17,21,23		

				ÿ
<b>chase</b> 54:19	119:2 121:2	37:1,4,9 38:18,19	<b>common</b> 103:12	40:24 41:9 43:9
chat 13:7 16:12	<b>Cleve</b> 3:4	39:5 40:19 41:15	communities 9:13	59:6 63:7 104:1
22:18	<b>close</b> 14:12 131:9	41:21,25 42:2	28:9 36:11 39:8	concise 18:15
Chicago 27:2	135:19 139:7	43:12,18 45:13	39:14,23	conclude 37:9
chipping 28:18	closed 63:3 75:11	49:23 65:1 66:24	community 28:16	concluded 24:21
choice 75:8	closely 118:8	71:23 73:23 74:3	107:13	139:14
chooses 88:14	closer 65:8	88:16 97:25	company 19:8 20:2	concludes 44:6
chosen 34:4	closing 29:9	102:23,24 103:25	24:1 25:5 26:11	76:7 137:24
<b>circle</b> 71:13	<b>clouds</b> 39:10	115:19 116:7,21	34:24 63:22 79:4	conclusion 8:11
circulated 15:12	Coie 2:4 12:20	123:6,24 124:3,5	79:13 92:11 94:22	71:6
19:20	14:21 22:13	131:19 138:10	117:9,24 122:11	conclusions 5:3
circumstance 71:18	<b>cold</b> 28:3	140:20	123:5,21 124:25	40:20
123:11,17	colleague 14:15	Commission's	126:1	condition 46:19
circumstances 31:4	23:21	30:24 36:18,19	company's 19:7	47:3 136:5
<b>cite</b> 36:22 136:24	Columbia 87:9	40:15,25 41:4,7	34:20 42:15 78:1	conditions 48:12
<b>claim</b> 59:9 68:20	<b>column</b> 110:10	66:3 71:19 124:4	78:4 94:20 95:17	54:9 56:1
86:14	125:21	commissioned 2:9	122:24 125:2	conducted 26:17
<b>claimed</b> 61:20	<b>come</b> 36:14 43:8	13:11,14	compare 84:25	confer 18:20
110:7 111:3	50:1,24 61:11	<b>Commissioner</b> 3:16	compared 81:18	conferring 18:22
claiming 99:21	81:20 111:23	3:17 11:7,10,10	<b>Comparison</b> 6:2,17	confidential 4:19
<b>claims</b> 35:23	127:13 137:17	11:11,11,17,21	7:15	7:9 103:9,20
clarification 57:5	138:13	22:6 24:3 37:19	Complainant 1:6	<b>confirm</b> 44:21 64:8
119:19 125:24	comes 43:2 75:10	37:20 62:16 63:14	complete 27:14	89:12 128:1
129:4,14	comfortable 82:18	76:13,15 77:4,8	53:25 54:1	confirmation 89:10
clarified 124:17	comforted 137:10	78:25,25 79:3	completed 138:17	confirmed 35:13
clarify 120:14,19	coming 31:15 48:4	82:12 88:19 89:3	compliance 5:12	confused 91:4
126:10	62:25 63:6 78:10	89:13,16 121:11	54:6 95:12 97:14	confusion 91:21
clarity 47:21	78:16 80:3 84:14	122:3,21 125:23	105:8 132:1	<b>connect</b> 75:12
class 16:20,21 17:4	112:9 131:2	126:6,15 136:17	compliant 55:2	81:25
18:3 96:20,21,21	commenced 92:21	136:19 137:21	component 90:10	connection 112:7
96:24	comment 7:19	commissioners	composition 25:19	114:12
<b>classes</b> 96:6,8,9,11	43:25 109:7 138:3	3:15 12:10 15:7	135:9,11,24 136:1	<b>consider</b> 25:4 27:11
96:24	138:7 139:4,6	19:15 21:21 22:1	compound 56:4	36:9 42:16 85:16
classification 67:7	<b>comments</b> 139:7,8	22:3,10,12 23:4	compounds 46:23	130:1,19 131:5,20
classified 49:13	commercial 13:4	23:18 30:18 38:15	Compressed 124:2	consideration
<b>clean</b> 6:24 8:2 10:4	27:20	42:8,24 44:1	126:17	30:24 81:23 88:1
25:22 28:11 46:14	commission 1:3,5	commissions 71:15	computers 14:11	considered 40:9
48:10,16,25 63:7	4:23 12:9 15:18	<b>commit</b> 60:21	concept 34:1	85:16 131:21,22
107:10 114:7,23	16:23 17:5 24:3	102:22 103:18,21	<b>concern</b> 18:13	considering 43:11
115:7,24 132:22	24:21,24 25:3,3,4	103:24	123:13,14	considers 25:3
cleaned 28:22	25:9,12,15,25	commitment	concerned 56:25	consistent 28:12
Cleaner 10:3	26:14 27:11,15,22	103:20	58:18	69:13,15 78:23
<b>clear</b> 16:1 33:16	31:3,18 32:6,15	commitments 51:6	concerning 12:14	consolidate 83:12
36:17 54:5 74:19	33:8,14,24 34:10	74:23	107:9	<b>Consolidated</b> 8:6,8
102:5 115:21	34:13 36:9,15	committing 103:10	<b>concerns</b> 38:4,16	8:19
	-	-	-	-

				0
Constituent 136:11	<b>contract</b> 27:1 85:18	<b>cost</b> 6:2 26:14,22	88:21 98:23,25	cross-examining
constituents 133:20	85:19 88:7,8,11	29:24,25 30:20,22	99:13,15,23	94:7
133:21 135:12	88:12,15	32:2 35:5,20 37:2	103:23 110:4,17	cryogenic 130:13
constitute 45:7	contracting 83:20	38:1 42:13 66:14	111:15,21 112:6	<b>current</b> 120:21
64:21 93:21 97:20	83:22	66:19,22,25 69:2	117:17 121:10	currently 95:13,16
constitutes 106:25	contractually 72:2	69:8,14,18 71:1,3	138:4,4 139:5	120:16
110:6	control 5:4,5 25:23	71:11 76:24,25	<b>counsel's</b> 18:10	Curriculum 7:10
construct 35:16	26:21 28:10 50:14	77:18 78:9,10	33:17 37:6,13	curtailed 28:4
constructed 43:15	123:12,17	79:22 80:22 81:8	55:22	customary 29:23
constructing 24:22	controls 31:6,7	81:14,19,21 82:7	<b>count</b> 84:23	customer 27:22
construction 6:25	37:3 54:7	82:14 83:14,21,22	County 8:17 140:4	31:14 32:14,22,23
8:13,20 24:24	cooperates 104:16	85:12,14,15,17	<b>couple</b> 37:21 53:6	81:16 85:20 95:14
25:1 26:10,12,14	<b>copy</b> 19:22 21:18	87:3,5,7 88:2	63:2 66:16 74:9	customers 24:14
27:1,6,13 33:25	65:15 128:25	90:19 96:5,6,21	83:25 98:15 123:8	25:17 27:24 28:2
consult 64:14	<b>core</b> 104:20,25	110:6 123:12	course 18:19 27:10	28:4 30:5 32:10
117:13	106:4,19,23 107:1	124:10 130:2	36:12 130:23	75:20,22 79:13
consultant 64:13	107:6	131:6	court 10:4 15:25	80:9,20 81:3 82:4
70:6	corporate 69:23	costly 29:22	21:19 64:11 68:7	83:2,4 101:23
consultants 61:9	70:14,18	<b>costs</b> 12:16 18:14	93:2,13 97:11	<b>cut</b> 14:24 54:18
62:9 99:16,18,24	<b>correct</b> 17:16 46:19	19:1,9,10 24:10	102:10 109:4	
consulted 106:16	46:24 48:13,14,20	24:11 25:1 26:7	122:17 126:21	D
consulting 111:7	49:3,4,7,9 50:17	26:12,16,24 32:7	<b>create</b> 95:20	<b>D</b> 5:15 6:9
<b>Consumers</b> 3:2	50:18,21,22 52:23	33:10 35:4 36:25	created 39:6 42:9	D-o-n-a-h-u-e
14:3	52:24 55:21 56:9	37:12 40:3,5 41:5	creation 90:7	64:13
<b>cont'd</b> 11:11,11	58:13 59:8 65:22	43:11,21,25 44:3	credentials 40:22	daily 62:22 84:9
contained 28:18	65:23 67:1,4,7,14	66:3 70:1,17,18	credibility 40:23	<b>Danner</b> 3:16 11:12
54:24	67:16,25 68:15,22	70:21 80:20 81:3	creosote 29:3	11:13,16,20 24:2
contaminates	69:24 70:2 72:1	90:10 99:5,7,12	creosote-treated	38:15 89:8,18
136:12	73:8,12,15,20	99:19,22,23,23	29:1,6	91:16,20 94:14,16
contamination	79:9,17 80:10,24	100:1,18 102:4	criteria 34:17	118:24 119:1,14
29:8	98:23,24 99:7	107:4 109:8,10,25	cross 19:21 20:16	119:24 120:2,5,6
contention 131:19	101:7 106:9 107:7	110:9,22 111:5,6	20:20 45:19,21,25	125:18 135:1
<b>context</b> 39:5 42:6	108:10 110:1	112:6 115:7,20	46:3,8 51:7,8 65:6	136:15 139:3
91:15	111:15,16 114:21	116:7,21,24	72:13,16,19,22	<b>dark</b> 39:10
continue 24:16	115:4,5,15 117:16	117:14 119:12	94:11 98:6 128:22	<b>data</b> 6:5 8:3,5,7,18
27:4 28:8 33:24	122:8 124:6,8	120:12	129:8,9	9:23,24 10:7,14
58:19 59:10 62:4	125:12 126:2,19	counsel 2:15,18	<b>Cross-Answering</b>	10:15 34:23 35:19
63:22 105:6	127:1,11 130:9	5:11,16 6:5,7 7:8	10:12	<b>date</b> 1:24 29:20,20
continued 3:1 5:1	131:14,22 139:5	8:5,7,18 9:23,24	cross-examination	34:9 91:11 138:6
6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1	corrections 64:24	10:7 13:23 20:11	11:6,9,9,15,18,19	138:11
10:1 34:15 35:16	93:25	20:12 23:10 25:11	15:10,14 45:17	<b>David</b> 3:16
41:23 82:11	correctly 111:25	33:5,6 35:9 41:20	52:7 65:4,11 73:1	Davison 3:4
continues 29:15	130:23	45:19,20 51:2,17	94:4 98:3,12	<b>day</b> 7:15 25:10,13
continuing 38:6	corresponding	55:15 57:12 72:15	105:17 113:3	34:4,10,14,16,17
43:3 59:7	128:6	72:18 85:1 87:17	126:12 128:15	34:18,21,24 35:5
				35:8,11,14,18,20
	1	I	I	I

35:21 61:19 62:23	124:16 125:16,17	47:2,11,12 48:3	62:6	120:11 129:22
62:24 63:5 69:7	<b>definitely</b> 118:4,10	56:1,11 57:1,3,20	<b>direct</b> 4:2,6,22 5:18	discussed 21:16
75:7,22 81:10	degrees 34:17	58:6 133:19	6:8 26:9 45:8	31:25 41:16 66:6
82:18 84:7,16	dekatherms 75:19	135:16,21 136:5	50:11 64:21 66:8	66:16 84:4 94:20
85:4,20,21 86:8	84:7 85:3 130:18	detail 36:23 85:11	66:10 69:14 93:22	133:8
130:6,18 140:12	130:22	detailed 104:1	94:19 95:15 96:18	discusses 40:5
day-to-day 74:25	<b>delays</b> 26:24	118:4	97:21 123:22	55:19
days 28:1 69:12	delivers 75:19	details 26:10	133:4,7,15,18,24	discussing 55:16
74:14,21 75:1	delta 95:21	106:14,14,22,25	133:25 134:10	65:21
130:25	demand 35:15 86:5	107:4,19,21	135:13 136:21	discussion 54:8
deadline 139:7	demands 36:4	108:19 109:16,20	directed 44:3	74:9 88:23 91:22
<b>deal</b> 74:1 132:5,6,7	demolished 28:20	116:10 118:5	directing 76:18	124:11
133:16	demonstrates	determination	direction 30:7	disheartened 40:14
<b>dealing</b> 60:7,8	26:11 37:7	16:23 31:25 32:11	71:17 77:17 85:23	<b>Dismiss</b> 9:14
131:12	denied 18:16 41:18	132:22	87:22	dismissed 40:24
deals 131:24 132:2	118:15	determinations	directions 72:7	55:22
<b>dealt</b> 71:23	department 9:12	26:1 119:4	83:20,21	disparate 132:23
<b>debate</b> 65:24	112:4 117:13	determine 32:15	directly 15:25	disparately 133:9
decades 36:14	119:8	41:21 85:2 88:21	19:13 48:19 49:15	Disparities 9:12
<b>December</b> 138:22	departments	101:4	66:6 96:4 117:7	disproportionally
138:24	116:23 117:2	determined 28:11	118:2 119:9	39:13
<b>decide</b> 96:10	depending 71:18	determines 43:18	133:21	disproportionate
decided 32:21	<b>Deposition</b> 9:8,9	determining 42:10	director 5:12 54:6	39:6
<b>decision</b> 4:18 5:4,6	Depositions 9:10	102:3,15	97:13 116:19	disproportionately
24:10,23 25:6	depreciation 31:19	developed 19:2	directors 4:8,16	133:13
29:22 32:9 33:15	125:17	34:20,22,25 38:25	35:8,10	<b>dispute</b> 18:17,23
33:18,21,22 34:11	described 55:21	41:11	directors' 24:23	112:5
34:15 35:2 36:18	124:15	developing 24:22	disabling 60:21	disregard 35:15
36:19 40:15 80:25	describing 10:8	42:3,4	<b>disallow</b> 32:6 33:10	distinct 56:7
<b>decisions</b> 25:5,13	description 51:14	development 36:12	37:11	distinction 137:8
33:12,24 42:11	descriptions 104:2	61:7	disallowed 37:1	distributed 134:4,7
50:19,24 102:18	<b>design</b> 6:10,12	<b>device</b> 53:3,4	disallowing 125:14	distribution 5:21
decking 29:3	25:10,13 34:4,9	difference 72:4	125:16	6:18 29:25 65:24
decline 25:9	34:10,14,16,17,18	85:25 95:21	disappointing	65:25 66:1 71:20
<b>defenses</b> 106:5,19	34:21,24 35:5,8	124:23,25 125:1,6	40:17	72:8 73:16 74:14
106:24 107:1,6	35:11,14,18,20,21	126:1	discharge 28:25	74:21 75:1,13,18
<b>defer</b> 32:1	38:1 57:17 61:10	differences 32:20	disclose 103:8	76:4,24 79:7,8
<b>deferral</b> 122:8,13	69:15 135:14	different 47:19	disclosed 110:23	81:1 82:3 84:5,6
122:16,19,20,23	designed 28:13	80:14 83:10 88:4	134:13 136:1,13	90:2
123:20 124:5,9	62:1 69:3 130:12	90:24 91:18	<b>discovery</b> 5:14,16	distributions 31:16
125:7	despite 25:11 41:1	104:22,23 105:1,2	6:7 18:17,18,23	<b>Div</b> 10:4
<b>deferred</b> 29:17,21	destroy 48:3	135:11	35:9 38:3 53:16	diversion 60:4
29:24 30:25 31:2	destroyed 48:7	differently 103:16	<b>discuss</b> 35:7 36:23	Division 2:12
31:18,20 120:12	destroying 58:12	diffuse 28:24	36:23 41:14 66:14	<b>Docet</b> 26:15
120:15,20 123:7	destruction 46:22	diligently 60:13	66:18 67:12	docket 1:6 4:21
L				

				i ugo i n
9:20 12:13 17:3,8	109:7 127:6,9,12	effectively 58:12	36:18 42:7 44:4	59:9,11 60:2,4
17:9,11,16,17,18	128:4,24 129:5	78:12	entered 17:11	87:15
17:19 35:13 45:5	132:21 134:19,22	Effects 8:22,24 9:2	entire 34:2	evidence 15:5,6
50:16,16 64:18	136:20	efficiency 47:2,6,8	entirely 75:11	39:21,24 43:1
89:5 90:6 93:19	<b>Draft</b> 9:17	47:11 57:1,3,17	entries 118:18,21	89:9
97:17,18 120:13	draw 78:20	57:20 58:6 62:1	entry 17:19 110:16	evidentiary 1:10
<b>Dockets</b> 8:6,8,19	driven 49:9	135:17 136:5,8	environment 61:2	12:12 38:7 140:8
<b>document</b> 10:8	<b>driver</b> 69:9,19 71:3	effort 18:22	environmental 8:9	exact 106:14
46:16 51:19 52:18	drop 13:7	<b>EIS</b> 26:19	9:4,12,19 26:1,25	136:10
53:23 54:1 55:14	dropped 16:11	<b>either</b> 96:6	27:12 112:11	exactly 99:19
59:13,14 76:20	22:18	electric 123:9	113:10	110:20 119:16
77:24 108:23	drove 85:24	electricity 72:8	<b>EPA</b> 8:22,24 9:2	examination 11:1,7
documents 51:7,8	dual 43:14 68:1	else's 92:4	equally 82:17	11:7,10,10,11,11
103:3 119:4	due 26:24 63:2	<b>Email</b> 9:16	equate 18:21	11:12,13,15,16,17
doing 35:1 80:23	138:22,24	embodied 88:7	equation 78:9 87:8	11:20,20,21 44:10
91:14 100:21	duly 44:17 64:3	emergency 56:16	equipment 25:18	46:8 61:17 62:15
117:10 130:2	93:7 97:5 121:22	58:19 59:6	32:17 90:20	63:23 76:14 79:2
132:3	127:23	emission 54:7	equities 36:8	82:11 88:18 89:17
<b>Dold</b> 54:3	duration 58:20	emission 34.7 emissions 28:12	equity 27:12 36:10	94:15 116:17
<b>dollar</b> 70:21,21	59:10,12 60:5	40:1 49:20,24	36:17 132:23	118:25 122:2
dollars 32:8	durations 59:7	132:2 135:3,6	equivalent 79:23	128:22 132:19
<b>Donahue</b> 5:20 11:8	duty 18:19,19	emitted 136:11	Erdahl 11:17 121:9	134:25 136:18
63:21,25 64:3,9	uuty 10.17,17	employee 70:9	121:12,13,22	examinations
64:12 65:4,7,13	Ε	92:10	121:12,13,22	137:24
68:11 72:11,19	<b>E</b> 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:22	employees 99:1	126:8,14 127:5	example 54:8
73:3 76:8,12,17	5:15 140:1,1	employs 98:22	erosion 29:19	137:16
79:4 89:19 92:15	e-mail 19:19 22:8	enacted 27:17	essentially 18:17	exceeded 47:7
130:18 137:4	e-mailed 22:5	enclose 46:21	77:19 87:14 117:1	62:22 63:1 74:15
<b>Donahue's</b> 63:23	Earl 37:7,14 121:10	enclosed 47:25	<b>establish</b> 34:6	exception 21:17
DOILING 5 05.25	121:12	encourage 54:15	47:23	exception 21:17 exceptional 31:3
9:20	Earl's 30:25 68:24	59:21	estimate 15:13	excerpt 4:8,11,12
doubt 74:2	109:7	energy 1:8 2:2 3:2	135:5	4:14 5:8,10,12 8:2
<b>Doumit</b> 3:17 11:10	<b>Earle</b> 7:10	8:4 12:14,21 14:3	estimated 35:6	8:4,10,12 9:8
11:11,21 22:6	earlier 19:8 31:20	14:22 22:14 33:8	95:14	10:10 51:16 53:13
24:3 37:20 38:15	61:7,7 101:20	34:8 45:1 72:1	et 10:3,4	53:19
76:13,15 77:4,8	105:19 111:18	98:22 134:10	<b>EV</b> 123:9,23,24	excerpted 51:20
78:25 82:12 89:16	133:3 137:4	<b>Energy's</b> 5:14,16	evaluate 33:24	excerpts 8:21 9:5
136:17,19 137:21	early 15:17	6:4,6	evaluating 34:19	excess 39:25 95:4
Dr 6:20,22,23 7:2,4	<b>earn</b> 122:23	enforcement 55:20	36:10	exclusive 86:23
7:5,8,11,12,13,14	earning 123:4,14	engaged 41:15	evenly 32:21	87:15
7:16,17,18,20	earnings 29:19	Engineering 9:6	event 37:3 58:1	exclusively 64:15
37:6,13 38:23,25	ease 9:17	<b>ensure</b> 46:21 47:6	60:6 62:5	excuse 31:13 38:14
39:4,8 40:4,17,21	economic 35:1	47:12	events 49:13,14,21	74:22 77:2 127:15
40:23 41:3,6 43:6	Economics 93:16	ensured 132:1	49:24 55:2 57:21	129:3
58:17,18 59:6,9	<b>effect</b> 27:9	ensuring 28:11	57:22 58:19 59:6	excused 63:20
	effective 29:20		57.22 00.19 09.0	
	l	I	I	I

	•			
92:16	expressed 38:16	32:5,8 36:16 40:1	<b>field</b> 62:9	121:22 127:23
<b>Exh</b> 9:8	Extended 9:6	43:13,22 44:4	figure 69:22 98:19	134:14
<b>exhibit</b> 4:1 5:1 6:1	extensive 38:25	69:5 81:22 87:24	figures 129:25	<b>five</b> 90:9
7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1	extent 87:17	91:2 102:12	file 18:11 37:22	flame 57:24 61:2,12
19:20 21:18 45:3	<b>external</b> 62:8 100:2	factor 85:14	88:16	flare 46:21 47:7,25
50:12 51:10,14	109:25 110:6,8,9	factored 77:25	filed 16:21,24 17:4	48:2,18 49:6,8,10
52:1,6,8 53:12,13	110:21	85:12	17:5,7,7,20,22	49:12 51:4 52:22
55:8,10,10 58:17	externalities 39:12	factors 26:21,22	19:4 38:3 88:20	54:23 56:2,11,15
64:17 91:17 93:18	39:13,15 131:13	27:11	88:25 89:5,5,6,10	56:15 57:20,21,22
97:16 110:23	131:17,20,25	failure 18:17,18,20	95:12 108:6,17	57:23,24 58:2,5,6
122:16,18 124:18	132:4,8,10,12	fair 68:17 70:16,25	109:18 123:18,19	58:7,8,10,11,12
126:2 136:24,24	133:5	71:10 98:20,21	124:25	58:21 60:2,4,21
138:3,5,14,16,19	<b>extra</b> 82:6 85:25	111:2,2,14 112:24	filing 88:23 95:12	61:10,12,19 62:1
139:6	extraordinary	113:2 114:9,20	138:13	62:9 130:13
exhibits 19:18,21	123:10,12,16	115:14 117:12	fill 28:17 90:16	135:20,21 136:6
19:22 20:1,4,8,9		fairly 18:15	final 8:9 9:4,19	flaring 135:23
20:13,16,21 21:9	F	<b>fall</b> 39:7	18:25 19:8,15	flipped 55:7 108:11
21:13,16 22:4	<b>F</b> 5:20 64:12 140:1	falls 39:8	24:20 27:23 29:9	flow 69:6 71:16
30:9 35:12 45:7,9	<b>F-r-e-e</b> 97:13	false 26:3	32:18 40:15,25	84:10 87:21
45:22 50:20 54:12	facilities 48:13,18	familiar 46:12,15	76:21	<b>flows</b> 72:1
64:20,22 93:21,23	96:4	107:8 114:2	finally 40:3 75:6	focus 33:11
94:1 97:20,22	facility 9:13 12:15	far 131:9,20 134:13	financials 117:1	focused 62:4,5
128:7,12	24:11,13,22 25:7	fast 112:18	<b>find</b> 33:8 38:4	131:16
expanded 41:22	26:11,19 27:6,13	fault 68:9	finding 35:25	folks 117:23
79:8	27:17 28:2,7,8	favor 29:22	125:19	follow-up 79:1
expected 53:1	29:17 30:20 31:12	<b>feature</b> 58:9 61:1,3	Findings 5:2 8:11	98:18 125:24
94:21 96:8	31:16 33:9,10,13	features 40:6	<b>fine</b> 14:18,18 91:21	126:10
expense 29:18	33:16,21 34:1,6,7	February 24:14	98:17 127:16	followed 101:3,6,16
125:4	35:24 36:1,3,11	27:19,20 29:18	fingerprints 138:11	119:11
expenses 37:2	36:13,13,21 37:1	31:13	Fire 5:7	following 15:11
120:16,20,24	38:2 39:12,20,21	<b>Fed</b> 9:3	Fire-Damaged 9:6	42:17 44:2 59:2
123:5 124:6,17	40:12 41:11,24	fee 100:16,25	<b>firm</b> 74:23 87:23	72:12
experience 137:18	43:15 46:14 47:5	101:17	88:13 114:3	follows 44:18 64:4
expert 37:13 99:16	48:1,5 49:7,15,20	feed 25:19,20	first 14:1 15:18,23	93:8 97:6 121:23
100:17 111:6	49:24 50:6,16	<b>feel</b> 16:4,12	18:3 20:2 24:1,8	127:24
expertise 25:24	51:5 53:2,7 54:23	fees 7:21 100:11	25:10 30:24 32:10	for-profit 40:10
<b>experts</b> 62:3,9	55:18 57:4,25	102:3,9,15,25	34:3,9 39:9 42:3	42:16 43:16
111:7	58:20 60:3,24,25	103:13 104:7,11	44:12,17 46:12	forecasts 4:9 27:4
expires 140:20	62:22 67:18,24	107:16 111:5,8	54:4 55:25 56:9	foregoing 140:8
<b>explain</b> 69:22 79:19	73:11,19 89:24	112:23 113:2	64:3 74:4,11	<b>form</b> 56:3
85:11 95:3 99:11	90:10,11 91:13	114:11 117:22	76:18,19 79:21	forth 26:10 41:23
explained 41:20	112:7 123:19,22	<b>feet</b> 28:20	82:15 83:21 92:3	47:2
explanation 43:2	130:6,11 131:2,3	felt 38:5 77:20	93:7 97:5 102:11	Fortunately 71:8
<b>explore</b> 113:3	132:9 133:10	134:5	104:9 106:12	forums 104:22
Export 9:6	facility's 49:2	<b>ferry</b> 29:2,4	110:2 114:14	105:1 106:5
	fact 5:2 8:11 25:17			
	I	I	I	1

<b>forward</b> 36:14	<b>function</b> 65:21 68:1	75:18,20,20 76:3	103:6 117:7 125:8	120:10 135:7
117:22	81:4 91:18	78:7,15,15 79:24	126:11 128:18	138:18,20
found 29:5 34:10	functionality 73:12	79:24 80:4 81:9	130:16,25 131:17	greater 36:23
34:13	81:2	82:2,15,16 83:2	132:11 134:13	green 28:23
foundation 47:15	functionalization	84:5 85:12,18,19	136:22 138:2	grew 35:6
47:23 96:17	6:2 66:9,20,22	86:8 88:24 124:2	goes 58:21 75:11,17	ground 28:17 46:21
<b>four</b> 24:7 30:23	67:4,10 71:14	126:17 129:23,24	80:9,10 112:22	47:25 48:2
87:5 90:9	73:6.21	130:1,3,4,5,12,16	going 13:4 14:12	grounds 106:13
<b>four-mile</b> 6:3,18	functionalize 66:2	130:23 131:2,7	18:14 21:15 41:13	guess 17:18 26:1
29:25 32:19 37:6	71:15 72:7	133:4,7,15,20	45:21 47:18 50:8	64:13 80:12 83:4
65:22 73:6,10	functionalized 78:4	133.4,7,13,20	53:12 57:10 59:15	84:23 85:1,4
,	79:23			,
77:15 78:2 84:12		135:12,19	62:19 63:10 67:12	100:9 130:19
fourth 24:15 28:6	functionalizes	gases 48:19 58:5,7	73:4 80:17 81:14	guessing 100:6
Frank 5:11 51:16	66:25	58:13 135:9,12	81:15,21,24 82:2	<b>guidance</b> 77:14
55:16 56:9,25	functionally 83:13	gasprojects 10:2	84:24 85:23 90:6	<b>guys</b> 127:14
57:6 58:18,23	<b>functions</b> 71:7,14	gears 41:13 50:8	98:18 105:11	Н
59:5	71:16,21	general 2:11,11,17	127:9 129:18	
free 11:14 16:4,12	<b>fund</b> 17:22	10:5 13:22 23:9	130:14,24 131:1	habitat 29:7
97:2,3,5,10,12,15	<b>funds</b> 43:17	24:20 26:5 27:15	134:12 137:14	half 32:8 70:11
98:3,6,14 104:9	<b>further</b> 35:7 41:25	30:17 33:8,11	going-in 80:1,2	81:4,4
106:2 108:8	62:11 63:16 79:15	90:8,13 94:23	good 12:5,19 13:13	halt 22:19
110:20 114:2,14	88:17 92:12,13	101:19 115:23	14:4,9 22:12 23:3	hand 32:22,23
116:11,19 122:7	118:22 119:25	117:3	23:8,12,17,18	44:15 61:11 64:1
Free's 19:5,23	121:4 126:7 127:3	General's 109:19	24:2 30:15 33:6	97:3 140:11
<b>front</b> 46:17 51:11	134:20 137:21,24	General's 2:18	37:19 38:14 62:17	handle 130:12
51:13 59:14 65:16	future 30:21 60:22	generally 66:24	62:18 64:9 65:13	handled 32:3
94:25 95:1		71:19 102:13	65:14 73:3 86:2	handy 111:1
frustration 41:1	G	131:11	89:19 92:25 94:17	114:10,17 116:10
fuel 91:7	Gafken 2:17 11:4	generate 43:16	94:18 119:2	happen 118:13
fuelling 68:14	12:22 13:5,17,18	getting 12:24 22:18	121:19 122:4,5	happened 61:6
full 29:16 31:15	13:21,22 20:11,12	63:1 89:20 104:22	126:14 128:4,24	happening 112:17
80:6 131:25	20:19,22 22:18,22	105:2 121:15,19	governing 66:3	happens 75:8 130:6
Fuller 3:9 11:5,6,9	22:23,24 23:6,8,9	135:21	grant 17:22 47:18	133:18
14:9,14,17 16:18	33:6 45:20 72:17	Gig 90:23 132:9	47:22 56:5 57:10	happy 119:22
17:6,13 18:6	138:6,18	give 13:19 23:7	104:4	Harbor 3:4 90:23
21:12 23:17,19	gallons 62:21,23	30:14 37:17 38:11	granted 19:4 52:10	132:9
38:13 42:22,23	63:5	43:12 108:21,24	54:14 58:24	hard 92:6
44:9 46:5,7,9	gas 4:9 12:15 25:19	110:19 123:20	105:24 108:2	harm 28:13
47:17,19,24 52:13	25:20 27:21 31:15	given 57:12 135:3	124:5	harmful 40:2
52:14 54:15,18,20	33:9 35:24 36:6	135:22 138:15	granting 133:2	harms 36:20,21
56:8,22,24 57:7	37:7 49:15 56:14	giving 15:2	granularity 66:19	55:17
57:14,18 58:25	57:25 58:10 61:2	<b>go</b> 16:16 21:22 23:2	<b>GRC</b> 27:23 32:4	hauled 90:23
59:3,4,21,25	62:25 63:2,6,7,8	24:1 31:6 75:14	95:11,20 96:12,14	hazardous 8:23,24
72:23 73:2 98:10	69:6 71:6 74:10	80:16 81:20 82:13	96:21	9:2 47:4,12 48:8
fully 75:23	74:13,16,20,24,25			135:11
iuny 15.25	75:2,3,7,10,14,14	83:9,9,20 86:4	great 15:20 77:11	head 46:16 60:6
	///////////////////////////////////////	l	l	

				ÿ
104:13	history 73:24	38:10,14 41:16,20	improved 24:15	<b>INDEX</b> 4:1 5:1 6:1
health 8:22,24 9:2	Hogan 10:11	42:20 44:8,20	28:6	7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1
9:12,12 26:2	hold 43:20 127:20	45:18 46:1,6	imprudent 34:3,5	11:1
27:12 28:14	<b>home</b> 70:14	47:17,21 52:9	34:16 35:22 37:11	Indian 9:21
hear 13:2,3,5,17	honestly 72:9	54:14 56:5 57:10	impudent 33:9	Indians 10:13
14:10,18 16:2	Honor 12:19 14:19	58:24 59:20 61:15	impugned 40:24	14:15 23:21
20:6,11,14,25	16:18 21:1 38:13	62:12 63:16 64:6	in-house 98:22,25	indicate 21:15
21:6,11 22:22,23	45:20 46:5 54:11	65:5 72:12,15,21	99:13,15,23 100:1	54:21 55:1 109:9
23:11,16 33:4	72:17 76:13 91:16	76:9,11 92:13,18	100:1	indicated 23:24
54:13 127:14,15	97:9 98:9 103:4,7	human 28:13	in-service 29:19	25:25 45:19 46:3
127:16 133:12	103:18 105:15,20	hundred 81:10	inability 29:19	54:4 65:5 72:16
137:13	107:22 112:16	hybrid 14:1 15:19	inappropriate	72:22 109:7
heard 18:4 92:3,5	113:24 115:24	hydrocarbons	101:1 102:16	inequable 34:7
102:20 122:7	116:15 117:17	25:20	<b>inbound</b> 30:7 84:13	39:22
130:22 131:4	120:3 126:9 127:8	Hylebos 28:25 29:4	incentive 70:17	inequities 38:17
132:5 133:3,18,23	127:17 128:3	hypothesizes 56:14	123:8	42:3,4,5,9
135:17 137:11,15	139:3	<b>JT</b>	inch 79:8 82:5	inferring 69:20
hearing 1:10 12:12	hook 90:15,16	<u> </u>	<b>inches</b> 80:6	information 4:15
12:23 15:3,16,20	hope 41:8 42:2 43:6	<b>idea</b> 70:22 86:24	incidents 48:15	8:3 41:10 114:17
16:3,9,17,23 18:2	53:3,5	identification 45:3	60:14,15	135:14
21:20 22:2 28:10	Hopefully 104:15	64:17 93:18 97:16	<b>include</b> 26:22 37:4	informed 102:13
41:7 42:18 55:16	hopes 104:22 105:2	identified 60:15,19	63:8 87:8 111:4,6	initial 33:15,18,22
55:17 92:15 103:9	horses 127:21	62:20 124:17	122:25	34:11,14 138:21
138:7 139:4 140:8	<b>hot</b> 61:2	identify 45:22	included 19:20	initiate 8:15
Hearings 4:17 5:2,4	hour 69:7	60:13 124:22	96:20	inject 74:13,20
5:5 25:23 29:5	hourly 114:19	<b>ignore</b> 36:16	includes 20:20	injected 75:1
50:14 105:10	115:3,13	ignoring 69:18	36:18 122:14	<b>inquire</b> 16:19,25
heating 34:17	hours 15:14 30:5	<b>II</b> 1:13 10:4 12:8	including 19:21	inquiry 40:21 41:4
heavy 25:20	61:23 67:19,20	imagine 17:1 70:24	20:16 21:17 22:4	inside 57:24
held 15:19 138:7	69:7 87:19,19	immediate 133:22	24:17 28:16 47:11	Inslee 10:2
help 19:1 43:7 61:9	88:5 109:24 110:2	134:5	124:6	installed 28:23
61:10,10 117:2	110:15	impact 8:10 9:4	inconsistent 34:8	instance 18:21
118:21	housekeeping	26:25 36:10,13	incorporate 35:4	117:4
helpful 89:15	16:15 138:1	124:16,19,20	<b>increased</b> 26:21,23	instituted 119:11
helps 22:25	Howard 12:5,7,22	133:9	increment 87:4	insufficient 74:16
hereunto 140:11	12:25 13:13,16,20	impacted 8:17	incremental 32:6	75:2 76:1
high 47:11 62:1	13:24 14:6,17,23	39:14	32:16	Integrated 4:11,14
107:17	15:1 17:3,10,25	impacts 6:15 38:17	incurred 24:10	integrity 113:22
higher 87:22 136:7	18:8 20:5,10,18	39:1,22 41:11	29:24 40:5 42:14	<b>intended</b> 47:3,6
highlight 24:8	20:20,24 21:3,7	132:24 134:2,3,5	43:22 44:5 112:7	intent 17:22 47:10
highlighting 9:17	21:10,14,25 22:8	implicated 38:5	112:23 114:12	47:16 63:5 124:3
highly 39:14	22:17,20,25 23:3	implying 133:24	115:20	intention 101:15
hired 90:8	23:6,11,12,15,17	important 27:3,8	independent 44:2	<b>inter-</b> 75:3
historic 36:20,21	23:23 24:3 30:13	30:3 39:5 48:6	independently	interest 27:9 36:10
42:2	33:4 37:16,20	83:7	66:13	38:20,21 41:22
	,	impression 74:5		,
	I	Ι	I	I

	1		1	
42:7,15 43:23	31:11,14,22,24	Judge 12:5,22,25	justification 36:1	laptop 104:16
44:5 132:11	32:18 33:21 34:9	13:13,14,16,20,24	123:4	large 32:7
interested 17:2	59:22 60:23 61:3	14:6,17,23 15:1	justified 31:4	largely 40:24
interesting 133:22	62:6,19 63:11	17:3,10,25 18:8	justifies 35:25	larger 78:10 81:21
interests 42:16	69:18 74:10 89:1	20:5,10,18,20,24	justify 29:20	82:21 85:4 86:1
133:14	116:6 125:24	21:3,7,10,14,25		86:11 87:7
internal 62:8 84:17	issued 10:17 16:23	22:8,17,20,25	K	Larry 4:22
99:5,7,12,13,22	17:14,14,24 26:14	23:6,11,15,17,23	keep 16:7 18:14	Laura 1:25 140:6
109:24 110:2,4,15	39:19 46:13 48:11	24:3,4 30:13 33:4	84:17 95:19	140:18
110:17,17 117:5	48:17 49:1,6,8,12	37:16,20,20 38:10	kind 32:19,20	law 1:12 5:3 8:11
internally 101:4,6	50:6 54:25	38:14 41:16,20	66:13,18,25 70:14	12:8 114:3 123:10
interpretation 58:4	issues 8:11 15:22	42:20 44:8,18,20	96:17	123:24
69:2	16:13 19:16 25:8	45:18 46:1,6	<b>KING</b> 140:4	lead 18:11
interpreted 39:20	25:21,21,25 26:4	47:17,21 52:9	knew 82:1,1	leading 117:18
interrupted 88:14	29:14 30:8,12,23	54:14 56:5 57:10	know 13:1 22:21	<b>leads</b> 36:8
intersection 84:11	32:2 36:22 38:4,5	58:24 59:20 61:15	52:16 53:25 60:5	<b>learn</b> 41:10
interstate 74:23	38:8,8 61:11	62:12 63:16 64:4	66:9 71:6,22 72:6	<b>leave</b> 131:3
75:23,25 76:1,2	131:12 132:6,23	64:6 65:5 72:12	72:9 73:24 81:24	leaves 33:20
83:18	138:9	72:15,21 76:9,11	82:2 85:13 86:23	leaving 79:10
intervened 39:17	issuing 131:18	92:13,18,23 93:3	88:8,24 89:15,20	led 28:18
introduce 14:20		93:8,10 94:5,12	90:22 96:5,10,20	left 78:11
44:21 64:7 127:25	J	97:1,6,8 98:4,7	98:16 100:5,18,20	legal 7:21 18:14,25
<b>invest</b> 32:9 35:16	<b>J</b> 2:3 3:3 9:16 10:10	103:5,15,22 104:4	102:7,8,8,8	19:9,10 26:23
investigation 19:7	<b>J-o-h-n</b> 93:15	105:14,18,23	104:17 105:10	27:16 36:24,25
32:11	James 1:13 12:8	108:1 112:15,19	106:14,15 107:14	37:2 38:8 43:25
investing 33:25	January 67:19	113:4,21,25 116:1	108:22 109:16	44:3 99:5,7,12,22
investment 31:1	<b>JDT-18</b> 93:19	116:13,16 118:15	112:2,22,22,25	100:1,2,11,16,17
32:15,16 33:12	<b>JDT-1T</b> 6:8 93:19	118:23 119:25	113:1 116:25	100:25 101:5,17
34:3 37:10,10	94:19	120:4 121:5,13,17	117:1,9,10,24	101:21 102:3,9,15
123:7,18,23,25	<b>JDT-2</b> 6:9	121:23,25 126:8	118:3 119:16,18	102:23 103:13
125:16	<b>JDT-3</b> 6:10	126:11 127:3,11	121:16 136:13	104:2,11 107:16
investments 25:5	<b>JDT-4</b> 6:11	127:15,18,20,24	knowing 73:19	109:24,25 110:2,6
40:10	<b>JDT-5</b> 6:12	127:25 128:16	knowledge 38:25	110:8,15,17,22
<b>invoice</b> 100:7	<b>JDT-6</b> 6:13	129:12 132:16	57:15 74:1 90:21	112:6,23 115:7,20
<b>invoices</b> 103:2	<b>JDT-7</b> 6:15 93:19	134:21 136:16	100:4 104:13	116:6 117:13,13
118:8	<b>JDT-8T</b> 6:16	137:23 138:6,16	112:5,8,14 118:13	117:22,23 119:8
<b>involved</b> 73:8 119:9	<b>Jeff</b> 2:10 13:14 23:4	138:20 139:9	136:11 140:10	length 138:23,25
<b>Iron</b> 27:2	Jeff.roberson@a	judges 1:12 12:8	<b>knows</b> 118:14	let's 12:17 17:16
<b>IRP</b> 4:13 27:6,6,7	2:14	23:3,12	L	19:17 21:22,25
34:20,22,23,25	<b>John</b> 6:9 11:13	Judgment 9:15	$\frac{L}{L 1:25 140:6,18}$	24:1,19 63:22
<b>IRPs</b> 25:14 27:3	92:24 93:7,15	<b>July</b> 17:7,7,20,23	labelled 55:11	71:13 89:10 92:18
irrelevant 35:16	join 15:7	27:10	LACEY 12:1	92:19 93:3 100:8
issue 16:10,16 18:1	<b>joined</b> 12:7 22:1	jurisdiction 132:23	lanes 90:15	104:7,14,14 106:1
19:1,2,9,11 25:16	<b>joining</b> 12:10 21:21	133:1	language 18:24	108:4,20 109:22
26:3 30:1 31:10	Joshua 5:11 51:16	jurisdictions 71:2	19:8 108:13	110:13 114:11,22
	55:15		17.0 100.15	
	•	-	•	-

115:6 124:1	liquid 12:15	69:23 70:2 75:10	loss 57:23	matter 12:9 17:15
Letter 4:24 8:15	<b>Lisa</b> 2:17 13:21	78:14,22 79:14	lost 34:12 78:8	39:17 50:11 76:5
letting 13:1 22:21	23:9	80:1 83:4 89:21	lot 62:7 118:3,4	86:10 87:24 99:22
level 36:5 57:16	Lisa.Gafken@at	89:24 90:3,10,16	lots 132:10	101:19 110:22
66:18 67:3 96:11	2:21	90:23,25 91:2,9	lower 36:5 67:5	135:18
107:18 108:5	list 19:20 21:18	92:1,2 94:22 95:5	83:14	matters 16:15
136:7	104:9	95:13,20 100:11	lowest 68:21	101:5,21
levels 67:5,9	listed 14:25 53:24	101:5,6,21 107:9	lunch 15:16	Matthew 5:8 9:8
<b>Lewis</b> 9:16	listen 103:5 137:4	107:12 112:7		51:21
<b>lieu</b> 75:20	listening 16:6	123:22 124:1	M	maximum 7:7
<b>life</b> 34:2	litigate 32:3	131:13 132:8	<b>ma'am</b> 63:12	84:25
lifetime 53:7	litigated 96:7 105:9	133:10 134:9	magnitude 29:18	<b>mean</b> 83:7 87:6
likelihood 51:4	litigation 26:23	137:3,12	maintaining 34:24	101:8 103:17
60:16	104:10 107:9,23	LNG's 48:12 70:20	35:4	means 123:11
limit 47:3 62:21,23	107:24 109:4	79:15 105:8	maintenance	131:1 135:17,20
62:24 63:9 67:21	111:5,6 114:8,13	load 4:9 27:4	120:15	measured 84:17
67:22 69:1 88:3,3	114:23 115:18	loading 89:25	<b>major</b> 30:23 90:9	measurements 84:8
limitation 69:4	116:9	90:10,12,13,14,20	majority 33:20	mechanism 38:1
77:17 78:17	little 21:5 40:7	local 133:11,13	making 31:3 33:21	mechanisms 29:24
limited 15:9 19:6	45:24 65:8 72:19	located 133:9	36:7,18,19 78:10	meet 75:4 103:4
33:11,18 67:16,20	91:10 92:6 99:4,9	location 71:8 80:4	102:18 117:1	112:18
69:3	111:18 114:11	locational 133:11	119:3	meeting 18:22
limits 32:25 55:20	129:24 133:3	locations 83:10	malfunctioning	56:11
78:18	<b>LLP</b> 2:4	long 38:16 58:20	57:23	members 39:2
line 42:21 65:19	LNG 5:7,23 6:3,17	59:7,10 69:3	malfunctions 49:10	40:13 43:6
67:11,13 86:15	8:4,16,21 9:5,6,13	70:10 73:24 138:3	Management	memorialized
108:4,13,24	9:17,19 10:8,17	longer 57:24 92:10	114:12	128:7
124:22	12:15 24:11,13,15	longest 61:22	managing 93:16	memory 90:19
lines 52:4,15 53:24	25:7 26:4,11,16	look 18:1 51:9	mandate 36:17	mention 16:12
55:11 59:22 68:20	26:19 27:5,13,18	53:13 55:5,9 66:3	map 8:17 9:13,21	mentioned 130:21
77:23 104:15,20	28:2,7,11,15,17	66:6,9 96:5 100:8	March 9:11 140:21	metaphorical 39:10
106:3 108:21	29:17 30:6,19,20	104:14 106:1	marine 68:14 90:12	<b>meter</b> 84:10
129:16,19	32:22 33:16,25	108:20,21 109:22	91:6,7,7	metered 84:16
liquefaction 7:6	34:3,19 35:3,17	110:13 118:7	marked 45:3 50:12	metering 72:5
25:18 76:3 77:25	36:5,7,11,13,21	120:7 122:15	51:9 64:17 93:18	meters 84:11,12
78:17 81:1,9	37:1,4,10,24 38:2	125:8 132:23	97:16	methods 6:2 102:3
85:22 90:12	38:17,23 39:1,7	looked 78:11 79:21	market 91:10	102:14
130:24 131:1	39:10,20 40:12,16	81:13 100:7 125:7	112:11 113:9,18	Michael 1:13 12:7
liquefaction 76:2	41:24 42:10 43:3	133:1	markets 91:9	microphone 12:23
liquefied 33:9 63:1	43:13,16 46:14	looking 51:18 55:9	material 70:24	13:9 15:25 23:1
63:3 75:16 83:2	48:1,18 49:2,7,15	70:25 110:5	materially 70:23	47:22 65:8
84:18	49:20 50:6,15	131:18 132:11	materials 28:21	microphones 16:7
liquefy 78:22	51:4 54:22 55:18	139:3	29:6 35:11,14	mid-morning 63:24
<b>liquefying</b> 75:13,17	55:25 57:4 60:3	looks 53:17	50:9	92:19
130:6	62:22 68:6,14	<b>loser</b> 71:12	<b>math</b> 85:17 <b>Matrix</b> 7:19	midmorning 15:15
			IVIALITIX / 19	

				9
million 32:8 83:11	14:4,5 21:1,4,6,8	<b>needed</b> 32:12,14	50:5	occurred 31:23
95:18,22 125:1,15	23:12,13 37:18	34:7 71:4 78:14	<b>notified</b> 60:14	55:24 57:9 60:2
125:17	<b>motion</b> 9:14 18:10	78:22 79:25 81:12	November 1:24	occurrence 60:17
millions 95:15	18:11,16 19:3	81:17,17,19,20	12:1,6 138:13	occurrences 61:6
Milt 3:17	<b>motions</b> 15:4 16:16	82:2,17,21 88:4	140:9,12	occurring 60:22
mind 21:4 86:24	18:9,12 19:12	95:20	<b>NOVs</b> 10:17 49:6	76:3
minimum 46:22	41:18	needs 61:5 74:16	54:25 60:15	occurs 75:7
minor 28:12	move 45:22 54:15	75:5 83:7 85:4	NThomas@omw	ocean 29:2,4
minute 21:23 69:7	56:22 83:25 98:15	negative 39:11,13	3:13	October 17:15
135:18,23,24	102:1 104:5 108:4	Net 72:5	<b>number</b> 17:3,9,16	19:24
minutes 15:9 61:21	109:21	Nevada 7:25	17:17,19 30:18	offense 91:6
61:21,22,24	<b>multiple</b> 28:18 67:9	never 53:3,5 74:1	48:11,14,17 49:1	offered 20:17
134:15,15,16	73:13 83:19	92:4 102:20	52:2 55:6 61:5	<b>Office</b> 2:11,18
135:4,7,19,23	106:13 116:23	new 27:8 74:10	122:18 129:10	109:19
misaligned 35:21	130:15	96:19	131:12 135:4	<b>Ogden</b> 3:10 23:19
missing 51:21	Murphy 3:10 23:20	News-Record 9:7	138:15	23:21
misspoke 18:6	23:22	Nicholas 3:10	numbers 50:2	<b>oh</b> 17:10 51:18
129:11	<b>muted</b> 16:7 42:21	23:21 98:10	51:22 108:24	69:11 77:6 121:18
mistaken 130:22		Nick 14:15	134:12	125:5
model 125:8	N	<b>NOC</b> 8:11,13,14	numerous 71:2	<b>Ohman</b> 1:25 140:6
modifications	N 2:1 3:1	nominal 79:22 87:5		140:18
31:23 32:4	name 12:7 13:21	<b>non</b> 83:14	0	okay 21:8 22:23
<b>modify</b> 32:16	22:13 23:4,8,13	non-confidential	<b>O&amp;M</b> 4:19 116:25	49:19 50:3,8 51:1
moment 15:4 18:5	23:19 44:23,24	10:10	117:5 120:20,24	51:8,20 52:3,5
21:22 53:12 85:10	64:10,11 90:6	non-evidentiary	122:8,14,20,25	53:15,21 56:22
110:19 133:6	93:1,2,12,13	38:8	123:15 124:16	60:10 63:10,13
Monday 12:5	97:10,11,12 124:1	non-waste 134:16	125:3,5	65:10 66:2,18
monetary 29:12	nation 36:8	nonboil 75:3	<b>o0o-</b> 12:3	67:11,18,24 68:17
87:2,3	natural 12:15	nonregulated	object 54:11 56:3	69:20,23 70:16
monitor 38:6	27:21 33:9 124:2	101:24	56:18 59:15 103:3	71:13,25 72:10,12
<b>month</b> 111:14	126:17	nonventing 136:9	105:11 107:15	73:10,19 75:24
123:19 138:12	<b>nature</b> 107:18	normal 53:2	115:23 117:17	77:11,19,23 78:11
morning 12:5,19	<b>NE</b> 2:5	Northern 87:9	<b>objection</b> 47:15,18	78:19 79:12,19
13:13 14:4,9	<b>near</b> 133:10	Nos 45:3 64:17	47:22 52:6,9 57:5	80:5,21 81:6,14
19:22 22:12 23:3	<b>nearby</b> 36:11 39:14	93:19 97:17	57:11 58:22 103:1	82:9 83:16,24
23:8,12,17,18	necessarily 101:9	note 13:7 22:2,17	104:4 105:14,24	84:15,19 86:2,12
24:2,8 30:11,15	124:10	Notebook 8:22,24	108:2 112:13,18	88:17 89:1,13
33:6 37:19 38:14	<b>necessary</b> 18:2 36:4	9:2	113:23 115:21	90:24 91:8,12,21
46:11 62:17,18	38:9 52:12 80:16	noted 30:25 56:10	118:11,15	92:6,9,13 93:12
64:9 65:13,14	126:2	notes 41:25 56:9	objections 15:5	94:10 95:2,24
73:3 89:19 92:25	need 26:18 27:4	139:4	20:2,3 112:17	96:13,16 98:22
94:17,18 119:2	38:5 53:5 68:7	notice 6:24 8:13,20	<b>observe</b> 16:11	99:4,15 100:3,5,8
122:4,5 130:17	69:5 71:6,9 81:6	17:22 49:5 89:9,9	observing 42:20	100:23 101:17,25
135:2	81:10,17 82:15	noticed 37:22	occasion 56:2	102:14,20,22
Moser 3:3 11:4	85:20,24 126:21	notices 48:11 49:1	occur 56:2 57:22	104:14,18,19,20
	138:4 139:10		134:2	
	l de la constante de	1	1	1

			1	
104:25 105:5	60:24,25 62:2	ownership 88:9	particularly 40:8	82:6,20,20 86:1
106:8,11,23 107:8	120:15		40:17 104:3	87:4 90:19 91:3
107:12 108:4,13	operations 27:20	P	parties 13:10 15:8	135:17,20,21
108:16,20 109:2	40:11 53:2	<b>P</b> 2:1,1 3:1,1	15:12,13 16:7	136:4
109:14,17,21,21	operator 46:21	<b>P.C</b> 3:4	19:19,25 22:9	percentage 85:3
109:24 110:2,5,9	opinion 77:13	<b>p.m</b> 139:14	24:25 25:8,16	Perfect 13:21 20:22
110:12,18,18,25	118:1	<b>P.O</b> 2:12	30:21 32:20 36:15	performative 36:7
111:17 112:9,16	opponent 104:3	P19-087C 5:9,11	38:5 76:19,23	performed 111:15
113:13,15 114:6	opportunity 15:8	5:13	83:19,22 86:6	112:1
114:18 115:2,12	23:25 24:5 30:11	P19087C 50:16	94:6 96:6 102:9	period 60:1 85:7
116:11 119:14	41:8 96:4,10	page 11:1 51:13,15	139:1,11	109:8
121:2,20 122:22	opposite 83:20	51:25 52:1,1,2,2,5	partner 93:16	periods 58:8,11
121.2,20 122.22	opposition 10:2	53:18,22,23,24	parts 56:7 71:25	<b>Perkins</b> 2:4 12:20
	39:16 43:3	54:5 55:6,7,7,10	73:13 96:18	
125:3,13,23 127:5		55:11 65:18 67:11		14:21 22:13,15
127:12 128:14,24	option 137:15	67:12 68:20 84:3	party 16:5 23:24	permanent 136:5
131:6,11,19 133:3	options 66:11	86:15,16 91:17	81:22 102:15	permissible 54:22
133:15 134:3,8	order 5:3 8:2,11	94:20 100:9,10	103:12 104:3	permit 9:19 29:11
136:2,22,23	9:14 15:11 17:12	104:14 106:2	pass 137:17	32:25 39:25 46:13
139:11	18:25 19:9,16	104.14 100.2	Pause 21:24 111:11	46:19 47:16 48:13
old 90:5	24:21 25:2 26:15	108.4,11,13,20	124:4	48:13 49:2 50:15
Olympia 2:13	27:23 37:2 40:15		pay 69:12 95:17,22	51:3 54:9,24 55:1
once 52:16 53:1	40:25 41:17,20,25	120:8 125:10,19	payable 112:4	55:3,20,25 58:20
63:4 138:16	44:12 76:21	125:20,20 129:16	<b>payers</b> 35:20	63:11 67:16 69:4
ones 117:10,24	orders 119:13	129:18 136:21,22	<b>PC</b> 7:11,12,13,14	87:18 88:3,3
<b>ongoing</b> 39:16	organic 46:23	136:24	7:16,18,20	106:12 107:9
41:17 42:2 107:18	original 80:18	pages 9:9,10	<b>PCHB</b> 5:9,11,13	115:7 131:18,21
<b>online</b> 13:1,9 15:20	originally 81:23	138:23,25	9:15 10:9 25:23	131:24 132:1
16:1,6 31:12	outcome 96:7	paid 95:23 111:24	50:16,23 51:2	133:2,8 136:8
127:13	outcomes 35:15	114:19 115:3,13	55:16,23 57:8	permits 39:19
<b>open</b> 49:9	95:19	paint 28:19	114:23 115:8	54:22
<b>opening</b> 5:10 11:2	outdated 25:11	<b>Pamela</b> 2:3 14:20	<b>peak</b> 4:9 36:2,4	permitting 26:24
15:9,15 23:25	34:23 35:19	22:14	66:12 67:13,24	131:16
24:6 30:14 37:17	outgoing 30:4	paragraph 24:20	68:4 84:25 85:4	perpetuate 36:19
38:11 44:7,9	<b>outlet</b> 75:12	76:23 77:23 84:4	86:5,17 87:15	perpetuates 36:21
51:16 56:19 59:16	outside 58:11 61:9	84:4	89:21	person 15:19,21,24
59:17	62:3 111:15,21	paraphrase 56:21	penalties 29:12	persuaded 18:24
opens 58:1 59:11	112:6,13 114:15	parcels 90:11	people 66:15,17	19:4
operate 48:1 56:17	114:24 115:9,17	part 21:19 35:12	99:23 118:20	pertaining 132:7,8
87:20 136:7	over-water 29:3	43:15 63:8 80:1,2	percent 27:13	peruses 52:18 54:1
operates 136:6	overbroad 115:21	82:8 87:7 88:9	28:21 35:6 37:8	55:14 108:23
<b>operating</b> 58:2,5,10	overrule 113:22	106:16 107:13	46:22 47:8,11	petition 16:21 17:1
58:14,21 88:9	overseeing 117:25	130:12 133:1	56:1,11 57:1,16	17:4,18,20,21
123:5	Overview.docx	Partial 9:15	58:7 78:8,13,15	120:12
operation 25:1	9:17	partially 77:25	78:16 79:13,14,21	petitions 16:24
26:12 47:7 48:4	<b>owner</b> 46:20	participating 42:18	79:23,24 80:1,2,3	<b>PGA</b> 29:24
		participation 38:21	, -· , , <del>-</del>	
	I		1	I

	-	-	-	1 age 100
<b>Ph.D</b> 7:24	137:3,9,11,16,17	81:1,25 87:6	presenting 39:4	proceeding 12:14
<b>PHCB</b> 114:8	<b>plant</b> 8:16 27:19	90:18	presents 43:5 60:23	19:11 24:9,19
PHMSA-2019-01	31:5,24 60:24	<b>portions</b> 16:9 18:10	61:3	25:1,2 30:21,22
9:20	61:1 67:23 71:7,7	28:22 41:18	president 45:1	32:2 37:23 38:7
phonetic 54:3	75:12,17,18 78:11	Portland 3:5	presiding 12:9	38:20,22 40:4,19
physical 69:6	78:18,24 79:10	pose 59:1,22	presume 77:16	41:2,15 42:14
physics 75:9	81:11,12 84:11,17	posed 57:14	pretrial 19:18	43:1 50:20 64:22
<b>piece</b> 31:5 106:2	85:18,19 88:11	poses 40:12 107:12	20:13 30:9 45:8	88:20 104:3 132:5
pieces 104:10	91:19 92:2 131:13	<b>position</b> 59:23	97:21	132:13 133:2
115:17 116:8	134:6 137:9	125:1	pretty 111:9	139:8
<b>Pierce</b> 8:17	planted 28:22	<b>possible</b> 66:8 68:21	prevailed 106:3,13	proceedings 21:24
<b>piles</b> 29:1	please 13:20 15:24	119:19,20 126:18	108:5	50:13,23 106:15
pipe 37:6,8 65:22	16:11 44:14,21,23	possibly 130:24	prevent 60:22	119:9 135:15
65:24,25 66:1	46:6 47:23 48:22	post 24:11 26:7	118:17	137:16 139:14
69:3,5,8 71:4,9	52:15 57:13 63:25	post-2016 33:12	previous 38:24	process 43:18 73:8
73:16 78:10,12,14	64:10 65:18 68:8	post-hearing	40:18 53:18	75:15 111:23
79:22,22 80:14,15	79:19 93:1,12	138:22	135:15	117:7
80:22 81:9,9,12	94:8 97:3,10	post-September	primarily 45:21	produced 10:9
81:13,15,17,18,21	98:17 104:17	37:11 41:5	63:2	production 62:21
81.13,15,17,18,21	106:18 108:21	<b>posting</b> 118:18	primary 60:24 69:8	62:23 67:1
84:12 85:24,24	113:5 116:1,16	potential 39:1	<b>principle</b> 32:24	<b>Professional</b> 4:3,7
86:1,11 87:19	122:18 127:13,25	55:17,19	76:25 82:13 83:23	5:19 6:9
88:2,4,12	122.18 127.13,23	<b>pounds</b> 136:10	<b>principles</b> 31:21	<b>profitability</b> 70:20
<b>pipeline</b> 6:3,19	PLLC 3:10	practices 124:4	71:1	<b>profits</b> 43:16
7:22 28:3 29:22	PLLC 3:10 PLNG 30:2 75:14	practices 124:4 pre-file 26:9	<b>prior</b> 28:25 38:22	progress 4:13 27:7
29:25 30:1,4,7	80:3 85:21 88:10	pre-filed 19:20 20:1	41:2 80:22	profibit 54:9
32:19 62:25 63:6	88:12 90:3,17,20	20:4,9 21:15	<b>priorities</b> 66:7	project 10:9 26:22
67:22 71:24 73:7	<b>point</b> 26:7 27:18	64:21 93:22 128:5	privileged 103:3,9	32:12 34:2 38:18
73:11,22 74:2,14	28:6 91:17 108:1	pre-liquefaction	103:19	39:1,7,11,16
73:11,22 74:2,14 74:16,17,23 75:3	123:21 129:3	31:23 32:4,17		40:16 42:10 43:4
76:16 77:15 78:2	123:21 129:3	75:15	<b>probably</b> 63:22 112:2	
				43:5,14 61:7,8
78:5,7 79:6,7 81:5	-	pre-submitted 41:9		75:9,10,21 81:25
87:6,9 95:16	pointed 31:12 Pointing 34:0	pre-Tacoma 36:5	<b>problem</b> 18:8 42:23	99:18 100:11,19
130:14,25	<b>Pointing</b> 34:9	pre-trial 22:3	46:1 51:23 133:16	101:6,7,22 117:6
<b>pipelines</b> 69:16	points 24:7 29:9	<b>Prefiled</b> 4:21	procedurally 101:9	117:8 118:1
83:9,12,18,18	83:25	prepare 118:21	<b>procedure</b> 111:19	projects 5:21 35:6
pipes 81:24	policies 34:8	126:3 138:4	procedures 101:3,7	100:22 116:25
Pjanderson@per	pollutant 48:8	prepared 30:10	101:13,15 118:17	proof 43:24
2:7	pollutants 8:23,24	60:20	119:11	proper 24:8
places 130:15	9:2 47:4,13 134:1	present 37:14	<b>proceed</b> 46:6 65:10	<b>properly</b> 26:16
<b>plan</b> 4:11,14 90:13	<b>Pollution</b> 5:4 25:23	39:24 40:18 50:23	93:10 94:9 97:8	30:2
94:10 96:14	28:9 50:14	presentation 4:8	98:4,8 116:16	<b>proposal</b> 94:20
planning 25:12	portion 38:7 40:15	15:11 44:13	118:15 121:25	95:17
34:18	52:11 54:17 79:5	presented 4:15	126:11 129:12	proposed 6:11,12
<b>plans</b> 26:4 28:3	79:6,14 80:5 81:1	35:12 73:22,25	proceeded 26:13	8:16 37:5 78:1

				1 age 100
85:12	18:24 19:4 20:3	137:2	79:14,14 80:1,9	44:2 47:9,19 52:8
proposing 96:19	22:11,16 24:10,15	<b>PSE's</b> 12:14 18:10	91:9 94:22 95:5	52:20,25 54:13
protracted 26:22	24:21 25:12,14,17	18:11 24:7 26:21	95:12,20 98:22	56:4,6 57:8,14
provide 15:8 18:2	26:4,13,15,16,17	27:3 28:15 29:18	115:6 132:21	58:17 59:1,1,23
21:18 22:9 24:5	27:21 28:2,6,17	29:21 30:2,8,10	134:10	73:5 74:4,12
27:21 38:24 40:7	28:20 29:1,9,14	30:17 31:14 32:9	<b>Puget's</b> 33:12,15,18	76:22 77:12,20
60:25 77:14	29:16,23 30:2,3	32:23,25 40:10	33:20,24 34:3,4,5	79:1 80:12 81:7
101:13 103:13,25	30:20 31:1,4,6,12	41:5,18 42:10	34:11,12,14,15,23	82:10 84:24 85:10
118:13 123:25	31:16,23 32:13,20	43:16,25 51:2	35:21 36:1,2,5,12	86:12 88:6 91:5
124:23	39:24 40:3,6	53:15 67:12 68:2	36:25 37:5,10	94:14 98:17
provided 15:11	42:13 43:11,20	71:25 73:20 74:14	<b>pull</b> 17:8,17 116:20	100:23 102:6
28:2,15 35:10	44:2,13 48:11	79:12 80:10 84:5	pulled 78:8 121:15	103:10 105:4
41:3 77:24 97:25	49:1,19,23 50:4	86:8 98:25 100:10	purpose 41:3 43:14	105:10 105:4
107:25 113:1	51:17 55:15 56:10	120:11,16,20	48:1	112:25 113:6,13
<b>provides</b> 27:24	60:13,20 62:6	120.11,10,20	<b>purposes</b> 68:2 78:6	112.25 115.0,15
28:24 32:24 39:5	64:14,15 65:24	PSE02708467-PS		116:2 119:14
28:24 32:24 39:5 providing 6:3	66:15,17 67:18,21	10:9	<b>pursuant</b> 107:10 <b>purview</b> 25:21	121:11 124:14
18:13 40:10	68:22 69:24 70:1		133:2	121:11 124:14 126:10 129:13
102:22 103:11,18	70:4,16 72:7	<b>public</b> 2:15,18 5:16 6:5,7 7:8,19 8:5,7	<b>push</b> 87:20,23	120:10 129:13
102.22 103.11,18	,		121:17	
	73:15,22 74:1,13	8:18 9:23,24 10:7		136:15,16,17 138:14
<b>proving</b> 43:21	74:16,20,21 75:12	13:23 18:10 20:11	<b>put</b> 22:6 32:12	
prudence 25:4	75:14,18,20 78:15	20:12 23:10 25:10	57:25 61:1 78:7	questioned 52:22
32:11 34:1 35:25	78:16,22 79:13	27:9 33:5,6,17	78:15,15 80:4	questioning 18:4
37:25 40:16 41:5	80:2,3 82:17 83:2	35:9 36:10 37:6	82:15 89:11	122:1
41:14,17 43:20	84:8 85:22,22	37:13 38:21 41:19	117:22	<b>questions</b> 16:15
prudent 24:12	88:10,11,12,14	41:22 42:7,15	<b>putting</b> 79:24	30:11 33:2 37:15
26:13,19 32:9,17	89:21 90:17 91:3	43:19,23 44:5	89:25 <b>P</b> 2-8 0-21	40:19,22 41:7
prudently 24:21	95:4 97:14 99:1,5	45:19,20 72:15,18	<b>Puyallup</b> 3:8 9:21	43:7 50:9 52:12
29:23 42:11 43:22	99:12,13,21	85:1 87:17 121:10	10:13 14:7,14	54:6,16 60:11
<b>PSCAA</b> 5:12 8:17	100:20 101:23	138:3,4,4,7 139:4	21:11,12 23:20	61:14 62:13 63:17
10:17 25:22 26:18	102:22,23,25	139:5,6,8	38:11 46:3 98:7	68:18 72:11 74:9
28:9 29:10,12	103:18,24,25	<b>publicly</b> 136:13	Q	76:7,12,16 89:20
50:1,15 54:6	104:10 106:3	<b>Puget</b> 1:8 2:2 5:14	Qualifications 4:3	92:12,13 94:13
57:17 60:5,7,8	107:17 108:5	5:16,23 6:4,6,24	4:7 5:19 6:9	98:15 105:6,12
131:13,15,18	109:3,11,15,17	8:2,4 10:4 12:13	<b>qualities</b> 25:24	107:25 116:12
132:3,11,13	110:4,17,21	12:21 14:21 22:14	quality 25:21 29:7	118:22,23 119:25
<b>PSCAA's</b> 49:17	111:14,20,21	25:22 26:16 30:6	29:13 105:8	121:4,5,9,12
<b>PSE</b> 4:8,9,11,12,14	112:5,23 114:6,15	32:22 33:7 34:19		126:7 128:19
4:16 5:9,11 6:20	114:19,25 115:3	34:20 35:3,7,10	quantifications 135:3	132:14 133:5
6:21,23 7:2,3,5,8	115:10,13,18,20	35:13,14,23 36:6		134:21 135:2
7:11,12,13,14,16	116:7,23 117:14	37:4 43:16 46:14	quantified 49:19,23	137:24 139:1
7:17,18,20 8:5,7	118:7,17 119:11	48:10,16,25,25	<b>quantity</b> 75:4	quick 17:9,16 73:5
8:18,20 9:16,23	120:14,19 123:17	50:13 63:7 68:6	78:23	74:9,12 100:8
9:24 10:7,9,11,14	125:14 132:3	68:14 69:23 70:2	<b>quarter</b> 134:14	108:21 122:15
10:15 12:18 18:13	134:12 136:13	70:20 78:14,22	<b>question</b> 32:13	<b>quickly</b> 55:13 74:8
			42:17,24 43:8	
I			•	

				-
98:16 115:7	ratepayers' 75:4	128:6,25 129:5	recycling 28:21	related 6:3 16:23
quite 15:16 20:14	rates 6:14 12:16	recall 132:21	redirect 11:7,15,20	18:12 45:8 49:12
61:6 69:2 90:17	24:13 26:9 33:10	received 107:10	61:16,17 72:12,14	49:12 59:12 64:22
quote 46:20 104:20	37:4,12 95:11	111:14	76:9,10 116:13,17	80:1 88:23 97:21
106:5,19 108:5	113:9	recirculated 63:4	132:16,19	99:23 100:11
100.5,17 100.5	<b>RCW</b> 27:9 41:23	recognize 71:16,21	reduce 31:18 62:5	101:21 104:8
R	126:20,25	80:14	70:20	relates 35:3
<b>R</b> 2:1 3:1 140:1	<b>RCWs</b> 123:24	recognized 38:19	reduced 60:16	relative 40:9
<b>R-o-b-e-r-t-s</b> 44:25	read 51:7,13 52:4	recognizing 32:25	reevaluation 26:17	release 53:4
rail 9:20,20 26:4	52:16,18 53:19,24	81:4	refer 39:11 58:25	released 47:4,13
92:1,2 136:25	55:12,14 68:24	recollection 91:5,15	59:21	49:20 58:8
137:3,12	79:20 109:2	132:25	<b>reference</b> 9:18 77:2	releases 28:19
<b>raise</b> 44:14 64:1	126:16	recommendation	referenced 85:13	48:19 49:14
97:3 131:12	reading 52:8 53:8	8:15 33:17	107:23	relevant 42:7 66:4
<b>raised</b> 31:22 36:12	54:12 100:13	recommended	referred 50:12 99:5	reliance 34:4,16
38:4 119:15,16	106:8	124:24	126:16	35:21
<b>raises</b> 30:23 31:10	reads 108:5	recommends 33:7	referring 39:11	relied 18:24 19:8
32:18	ready 33:1 37:14	125:14	59:17 74:18 75:7	
raising 131:17	63:25 87:20,20	record 13:6,8,8	87:16 106:19	reliquefied 130:15 reliquefies 63:4
<b>Ranajit</b> 7:24 9:11	,			-
11:19 38:23 127:6	108:22 121:14,20	14:25 16:1 21:20	108:18 115:22	relitigate 25:9,16
127:23	real 40:13 43:9	21:22,25 42:3,4	reflecting 19:6	<b>relitigated</b> 26:6
range 65:9 134:18	74:12	44:24 45:23,24	<b>reflects</b> 110:16	rely 117:2 118:19
<b>Rankings</b> 9:13	reality 69:3 70:24	54:12 56:20,21	reframe 59:3	remained 26:19
<b>ranks</b> 70:12	137:18	92:20,23 93:13	<b>refusal</b> 103:20	remaining 80:6
rare 31:4	really 17:9 55:12	97:10 105:7	<b>Reg</b> 9:3	<b>remains</b> 20:23
rate 6:10,12,15	86:10 100:17	113:22 118:20	regard 138:21	remanded 106:12
18:25 24:20 26:5	119:5 133:16	119:21 139:13	regarding 16:20	remarks 37:21
	reason 42:17,19	recordkeeping 37:3	38:22 39:6 40:3	remediated 28:20
27:15 29:20 30:17	58:3 61:4 85:17	records 84:21 85:2	40:16 43:25 51:3	remember 27:3,8
31:3,7,8,8 32:1	131:24	recoup 40:4 42:14	52:22 103:10	30:3 90:6 124:1
33:8,11,14,23	reasonability 119:3	recover 29:16,23	133:4,5	<b>remind</b> 16:6
35:20 37:24,25	reasonable 24:12	30:20 94:21 95:4	regardless 75:25	<b>remitted</b> 133:21
38:1 69:15 88:25	26:8,12 43:2 44:4	95:21	<b>regular</b> 117:5	removal 29:5
94:23 95:20 96:1	70:25 71:10	recovered 26:8	regulated 30:4	135:21
96:3,6,20 112:11	100:12,16 101:8,9	43:21 94:22 95:16	32:10,14	<b>removed</b> 29:1,3
113:18 114:19	101:18,18 112:10	95:24	regulating 29:13	removing 25:19
115:3,13 116:22	113:2	recovering 122:8	regulatory 97:14	29:7 60:21
120:16,21,23	reasonableness	125:15	reimburse 102:25	<b>Rendahl</b> 3:16 11:7
122:24 123:18,19	24:9 25:4 112:24	recovery 12:16	110:21	11:10,11,17 24:3
124:6	119:3,7	29:20 31:2 32:2	reimbursed 102:23	37:19 38:15 62:16
ratepayer 74:16	<b>rebuttal</b> 4:5,20	38:1 116:22	reimbursement	63:14 79:1,3
ratepayers 40:8	18:11,14 45:8	120:11 124:10,24	102:9 104:11	88:19 89:3,13
42:12 43:12,22	60:12 64:21 65:15	rectify 42:2	114:7	121:11 122:3,21
74:24 91:3 102:25	74:11 84:3 86:14	recycled 84:18	reject 31:19 37:5,9	125:23 126:6,15
110:21 115:19,22	93:22 97:21 120:7	130:14,23	rejected 131:13	<b>renew</b> 58:22
116:5,8			-	
	I	l	I	1

[				ÿ
repeat 46:15 47:9	requesting 43:12	101:21 112:17	reviewing 110:18	<b>risks</b> 43:5 107:12
74:17 113:5	120:22,23 122:12	<b>response</b> 5:14,16	119:6	<b>Rives</b> 114:3
126:22	126:1	6:5,6,20,21,23 7:2	reviews 118:20	<b>RJR-10</b> 45:4
repeated 104:21	requests 16:13	7:3,5,8,9,23 8:3,5	revise 19:3	<b>RJR-10C</b> 4:19
105:1	103:25 120:14,19	8:7,18 9:23,24	revised 18:12 19:24	<b>RJR-11T</b> 4:20 45:4
repeatedly 39:25	require 27:11 36:9	10:7,14,15 17:1,2	20:21 22:4	RJR-12 4:21
repeating 21:4	56:10 98:18	18:21 48:12 50:14	revision 19:5,23	<b>RJR-13</b> 4:23
106:4	136:11	52:25 53:2,15	21:17	<b>RJR-14</b> 5:2
rephrase 48:21	required 26:18	54:7 109:6,9	revisions 19:5	<b>RJR-15</b> 5:4 50:20
116:1 117:19	36:2 86:5 138:8	responses 18:18	45:11	RJR-16 5:5 50:21
reply 138:24	requirement 4:4	responsible 115:19	right 13:6,10 15:2	<b>RJR-17</b> 5:7 45:4
<b>report</b> 4:13 27:7	6:17 26:24 37:25	116:8,24 117:25	16:17 20:5 21:14	<b>RJR-18X</b> 5:8 51:10
35:1	47:2 57:1 96:23	restate 122:17	22:1,9,20,22,23	51:19
reported 1:25	116:20 124:16,19	result 69:20	23:6,23 30:3,6,6	RJR-19X 5:10
48:16 60:5 100:1	124:20 125:7	resulted 29:11	30:13 33:4 44:8	53:12 55:10
134:10,12 135:8	136:8	48:19 49:14	44:15 45:18 52:20	<b>RJR-1T</b> 4:6 45:3
135:10	requirements 28:13	resulting 96:5	53:22 54:18 61:15	50:12 91:17
<b>reporter</b> 16:1 21:19	97:14	results 68:21	62:12 63:16,25	<b>RJR-2</b> 4:7
64:11 68:7 93:2	requires 46:20	resume 7:24 92:20	64:1 65:5 67:13	RJR-20X 5:12
93:14 97:11	58:20	retained 38:23	72:5,15,21 73:15	53:13,17 55:5
122:17 126:21	requiring 36:9 56:1	<b>retiree</b> 64:14	76:11 77:1 80:4,8	<b>RJR-21X</b> 5:14
140:6	research 66:14	retroactively 27:16	80:12 82:25 83:24	<b>RJR-22X</b> 5:16
reporting 57:16	Reservation 9:21	return 29:16,21	84:2 86:15,16,21	<b>RJR-3</b> 4:8
represent 22:14	<b>reserve</b> 16:13	31:1,2,19,20	86:24 87:15,19,23	<b>RJR-4</b> 4:9
23:20 59:5	reserving 86:6	120:15,16,20,21	87:23,25 88:6,10	<b>RJR-5</b> 4:11
representation	residence 24:17	120:23 122:8,13	88:13 92:12,15	<b>RJR-6</b> 4:12
57:7 59:8,14	<b>resist</b> 44:2	122:23,24 123:4,7	94:5 95:8 96:13	<b>RJR-7</b> 4:14
110:8 119:10	resolve 18:23 40:22	123:15,25 124:10	96:25 97:3 99:2,9	<b>RJR-8C</b> 4:15
representations	62:6	124:16 125:15,15	100:8,13,15	<b>RJR-9</b> 4:17
51:1 132:2	resolved 63:11	125:25	101:11 102:7,22	<b>RLE-10</b> 7:18
representatives	<b>resource</b> 4:11,14	returned 31:2	104:14 105:5	<b>RLE-11</b> 7:19
139:12	24:14 27:5,5,19	revaporized 83:2	106:1,1 107:8	<b>RLE-12</b> 7:20
represented 78:9	27:25 28:5 87:11	<b>revenue</b> 4:4 6:17	108:16,20 110:5	110:23
representing 12:20	resources 36:6 62:7	37:25 94:21 95:4	110:13,15 112:9	<b>RLE-13</b> 7:21
14:14,21 22:16	<b>Resp</b> 7:11,12,13,14	95:11,14,19 96:11	113:20 114:11,22	<b>RLE-14</b> 7:22
114:20	7:16,17,18,20	96:22,23 97:13	115:6,17 116:3,5	<b>RLE-1CT</b> 7:9
request 5:14,16 6:5	respect 99:7 107:24	116:19 124:15,19	116:11 119:24	<b>RLE-2</b> 7:10
6:7 8:4,6,8,19	Respectfully 79:18	124:20 125:7	120:5 121:7 125:9	<b>RLE-3</b> 7:11
9:23,25 10:7,14	respond 38:6	revenues 96:8,9	128:11,14 130:7	<b>RLE-4</b> 7:12
10:16 16:20 17:22	112:19 119:22	review 5:7 8:16	136:14 137:20	<b>RLE-5</b> 7:13
53:16 89:14	responded 90:25	24:25 38:2 41:24	138:11	<b>RLE-6</b> 7:14
119:20,23 122:10	109:3,11,15,17	52:11,15 54:17	<b>rights</b> 78:23 86:7,9	<b>RLE-7</b> 7:15
122:23 125:24	119:17	73:23 103:11,13	86:13	<b>RLE-8</b> 7:16
126:3	Respondent 1:9	111:20,21,23	<b>ripe</b> 31:24	<b>RLE-9</b> 7:17
requested 118:5	responding 101:5	112:1	<b>risk</b> 132:6	roadmap 15:3
L				

				8
<b>Roberson</b> 2:10 11:3	71:19	<b>RXS-9</b> 8:13	31:10,25 34:5	91:9,10 96:6
11:9,18,19 13:13	<b>ruling</b> 15:4 17:24		39:18 56:13	serves 42:7
13:14 20:7 22:17	103:6 105:15	S	section 52:15	service 5:23 6:3
23:2,3,4 30:15	rulings 18:2,15	<b>S</b> 2:1 3:1	107:10	28:2 30:4 31:6
65:7,10,12 68:9	19:11	<b>S-u-s-a-n</b> 97:13	see 15:21 17:10,16	66:4 96:5,22
68:13 72:10 89:20	<b>run</b> 62:1	safe 57:24 60:25	51:20 77:1 94:24	123:20
90:25 91:23 94:10	RXS-10 8:15	safety 5:7 43:19	96:17,22 100:13	Services 4:19 5:7
98:5 126:9,13,23	<b>RXS-11</b> 8:17	53:3,4 56:16 58:9	104:23 106:6	set 41:23 47:2
126:24 128:18,21	RXS-12 8:18	60:23 61:1,3	108:8 109:1 124:1	68:18 96:7 138:6
128:23 129:7,9,15	<b>RXS-13</b> 8:20	107:12 133:24	Seeing 137:23	140:11
130:8 132:14	RXS-14 8:22	Sahu 7:24 9:11	seek 25:8,16 102:9	sets 26:10
<b>Roberson's</b> 133:5	RXS-15 8:24	11:19 38:23,25	103:19	setting 96:17
<b>Robert</b> 7:10 37:7	<b>RXS-16</b> 9:2	40:4,17 41:3,6	seeking 102:25	134:17
37:13 121:10	<b>RXS-10</b> 9:2 <b>RXS-17</b> 9:3	58:18,18 59:9	104:10 114:6	settled 138:12
<b>Roberts</b> 11:6 26:9	RXS-17 9.3 RXS-18 9:4	61:19 127:6,9,12	seeks 40:4 42:14	settlement 30:19,19
27:14 44:13,14,17	<b>RXS-17</b> 7:23 128:7	127:23 128:4,24	68:21 102:15	38:23 76:19 77:3
44:25 45:16 46:10	<b>RXS-11</b> 7:23 128:7 <b>RXS-2</b> 7:24	129:5 132:21	103:12,20	77:13,13,21,24
47:20,25 48:6	RXS-209:8	134:19,22 136:20	seen 66:22 131:9	80:18 90:5 95:10
49:11 52:15 57:8	<b>RXS-20</b> 9.8 <b>RXS-21</b> 9:9	Sahu's 39:4,8,18	135:10 137:15	96:7 124:7,8
57:19 59:13 60:1	<b>RXS-21</b> 9.9 <b>RXS-22</b> 9:10	40:22,23 42:6	<b>SEF-1T</b> 4:2 97:17	settlements 30:18
61:13 62:14,17	<b>RXS-22</b> 9:10 <b>RXS-23</b> 9:12	43:6 59:6	SEF-11 4.2 97.17 SEF-2 4:3	32:1
	<b>RXS-23</b> 9:12 <b>RXS-24</b> 9:8,14	salaried 98:25	SEF-24.5 SEF-34:497:17	settles 31:7
63:19 105:13,18	,	sale 88:24		
118:3 133:19 Babarta' 105:21	<b>RXS-25</b> 9:16	sale 00.21 salmon 29:7	<b>SEF-4T</b> 4:5 120:7 <b>SEF-4TR</b> 97:17	<b>settling</b> 76:19,23
<b>Roberts'</b> 105:21	<b>RXS-26</b> 9:19	samon 29.7 save 45:24 72:19		shaver 67:25 68:4
106:9 107:19 137:13	<b>RXS-27</b> 9:21 <b>RXS-28</b> 9:23	saw 16:22 61:22	segment 6:3 73:16 SEIS 8:3	<b>shaving</b> 36:2,4
		saving 49:25 82:23		67:13 84:25 85:4
<b>Rocky's</b> 75:21 <b>role</b> 16:9 92:1	<b>RXS-29</b> 9:24 <b>RXS-3</b> 8:2	82:24 83:6 87:10	self-reported 29:10 48:15 60:7	86:17 87:15 89:21 SHB 4:18 5:2
		101:11 119:5		
116:19 <b>Ron</b> 7:24 26:9	<b>RXS-30</b> 10:2 <b>RXS-31</b> 10:3	136:9	semi 90:15 Senior 2:11	105:10 114:15 <b>shed</b> 47:14 48:20
	<b>RXS-31</b> 10.3 <b>RXS-32</b> 10:7	says 59:17 87:18		
107:19 118:3 <b>Ronald</b> 11:6 44:13		89:21 109:13	sense 69:13 85:6	49:16 134:11 Sharaa 2:2 12:20
	<b>RXS-33</b> 10:8	Scarson@perkin	sent 22:8 51:7 56:16	Sheree 2:3 12:20
44:17,25	<b>RXS-34</b> 10:10	2:7		22:13
room 14:12 15:20	128:8	SCF-4T 19:23	sentence 58:25	shift 41:13 50:8
16:4 22:2	<b>RXS-35T</b> 10:12	21:17 22:5	separate 71:7 83:13	53:11 70:17
<b>root</b> 60:14,20 61:11	128:8 129:1	schedule 6:10,11,12	90:7 111:5	<b>shifted</b> 70:21
rose 70:12	<b>RXS-36</b> 10:14	6:13 88:25 94:23	separated 82:6	<b>ship</b> 137:12
roughly 135:23	<b>RXS-37</b> 10:15	95:5,18	separately 83:20	<b>Shoreline</b> 105:9
rounds 108:6,17	<b>RXS-38</b> 10:17	<b>scope</b> 19:6 24:9,19	<b>September</b> 4:16	114:12
routed 56:14,15	128:8	41:14,16 42:9	24:24 25:6 33:15	<b>Shorelines</b> 4:17 5:2
<b>RPR</b> 1:25 140:18	<b>RXS-4</b> 8:3	score 92:11	33:19 34:12,15	29:5
<b>RS</b> 5:23	<b>RXS-5</b> 8:5	score 92.11 seal 140:12	40:6	<b>short</b> 58:11 59:11
<b>rule</b> 5:22 19:15	<b>RXS-6</b> 8:7	Seattle 2:20 3:12	serious 18:19	65:9 131:23
37:10 112:20	<b>RXS-7</b> 8:9	second 17:17 22:19	serve 8:15 42:15	Shorthand 140:6
<b>rules</b> 18:22 66:3	<b>RXS-8</b> 8:11	24:11 25:25 26:7	74:16 75:22 83:4	<b>shortly</b> 12:11
		27.11 23.23 20.7		

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
<b>show</b> 27:4 36:3	sole 67:13 86:16	<b>specific</b> 17:19 40:3	standards 25:10	still-pending 109:4
45:21 125:25	somebody 92:4	88:8 107:23	41:22 43:19 105:9	stipulate 19:25
showing 19:23	112:3	specifically 19:1,9	stands 56:21 80:13	20:7,13 21:8 77:3
<b>shows</b> 38:25 122:19	Sommer 3:3 14:4	19:10 25:19 32:12	stark 32:20	stipulates 21:2,13
124:20 125:6,21	23:13	35:9 92:1 99:11	Starkey 2:4 14:20	stipulation 20:23
Shutdown 9:6	sorry 14:11 34:12	104:25 123:14	22:15	37:24 77:21
<b>shy</b> 134:14	34:22 42:20,22	124:18 125:3,5	start 12:17 15:2	<b>Stobart</b> 5:9 9:8
side 82:21 101:24	48:23 51:18,21	speculate 98:17	24:19 61:8	51:19 52:21 56:16
<b>sides</b> 90:3	53:17 54:5 59:8	111:11 118:14	start-up 62:2	<b>Stoel</b> 114:3
signatories 37:23	60:14 74:19 75:3	speculating 98:19	started 31:24	<b>stop</b> 33:3 58:21
significant 43:13	77:7,9 86:4 87:12	100:6	starting 67:11	storage 67:1 75:21
90:18	87:12 91:4 93:5	speculation 118:12	125:20 129:16	90:12
significantly 36:5	94:8 102:5 105:6	<b>spell</b> 44:24 64:10	starts 52:5	storm 28:19,23
similar 17:21 53:18	108:23 111:12	93:2,13 97:11	state 10:5 44:23,24	Street 2:5
72:18 111:17	112:3 120:4,17,23	spent 134:10	64:10 93:1,12	stretch 61:23
123:22,23	125:18 127:19	<b>split</b> 32:21 77:25	97:10 100:10	<b>strike</b> 18:10,16
<b>simple</b> 77:12	128:16,21 129:7	78:3 79:16 80:13	123:24 134:4,7	41:18
135:18	sort 83:5	80:14 81:3	137:9 140:3,7	Strom 2:3 12:20
simply 35:25 36:15	<b>Sound</b> 1:8 2:2 5:14	spread 37:25 67:5	State's 34:8	22:13
104:21 105:1,16	5:16 6:4,6,24 8:2	82:3 83:21,22	stated 25:3 27:22	strong 43:3
107:24 112:22	8:4 10:4 12:14,21	<b>square</b> 28:20	34:24 36:1 69:4	sub 71:16,21
simultaneously	14:21 22:14 25:22	stability 61:12	101:20	subject 30:21 88:22
83:14	33:7 46:14 48:10	<b>stack</b> 48:4	statement 5:10	91:25
sincere 43:4	48:16,25,25 63:7	staff 2:9 6:20,21,23	8:10 9:4 23:25	<b>submit</b> 126:4
sincerely 41:8	98:22 115:7	7:2,3,5,17 10:14	24:6 26:25 30:14	138:18 139:5
single 100:7	132:21 134:10	10:15 13:12,15	37:17 38:12 44:7	submitted 41:13,19
singular 73:16	<b>sounded</b> 105:23	20:6,7 23:5 30:14	51:16 55:15 56:12	45:12 50:9 64:25
<b>sit</b> 16:4 134:8	sounds 63:11,24	30:23 31:10,17,22	56:13,20 59:16,18	116:21 119:4
site 9:6 24:16 28:6	84:6	32:3,12,18,23	77:12	128:12 129:5
28:22 29:1	source 28:12 29:7	62:20 65:5 68:20	statements 11:2	132:4 138:17
sites 28:17	39:15	73:3 84:25 87:10	15:9,15 20:15	submitting 117:14
size 81:12 85:24	sources 28:24 74:23	87:16 88:23 94:8	44:9 107:24	subsequent 24:25
Sjm@dvclaw.com	South 3:4	98:4,5 121:9	states 52:25 54:7	25:14 63:7
3:6	<b>SP</b> 9:19	125:14 126:2	88:13 124:2	subsequently 40:23
<b>skill</b> 140:10	<b>spans</b> 34:2	138:8	stating 25:12	subset 131:24
skipping 53:11	<b>spare</b> 70:17	Staff's 33:1 69:1	<b>station</b> 68:14	substantial 38:20
slash 46:21	speak 15:24 19:14	72:13 87:13	status 16:25	40:9
slightly 122:6	47:16 59:19 60:8	124:24 125:1	statute 126:18,19	succinct 32:13
134:14	60:9 68:7 92:11	staffing 84:1 138:9	statutory 28:13	sufficient 75:4 76:1
slow 126:21	speaking 12:23	standard 25:13,14	36:17	suggesting 19:10
<b>Slyke</b> 5:12 53:14,20	16:8,9 43:24 51:8	27:9,16 34:4,10	stay 62:4,5 133:5	Suite 2:5,19 3:5,11
54:4,21 55:1	131:11 135:23	34:14,16,17,19,21	step 32:10 81:6	Sumas' 75:20
small 43:15 130:3	speaks 39:9 52:6	34:25 35:5,9,11	121:7 126:8 127:5	summarizing 10:17
130:11,16,19	<b>Special</b> 9:19	35:15,18,20,22	<b>Steven</b> 5:12 53:14	Summary 9:15
131:5,8	specialized 26:1	57:17 88:25	53:19	superior 30:3 84:2
131.3,0	specialized 20.1	J1.11 00.4J	55.17	superior 50.5 04.2
			l	l

				<u> </u>
86:13	110:6,7,13,14,15	target 96:9,23	39:18 40:20,23	62:12 63:13,19
supersedes 30:6	110:16	targets 95:11,19	41:3,4,10,12,19	64:6 65:3 72:11
supplement 18:18	tables 110:18	tariff 72:5 95:25	42:6 43:6 44:22	72:14,17,20 74:7
18:19	<b>Tacoma</b> 6:3,17 8:4	96:20	45:8 50:10,11,20	76:7,10 78:19
supplemental 5:14	8:15,21 9:5,13	tariff-mandated	51:21 52:21 53:14	83:24 88:17 89:16
5:16 6:14 8:9,15	10:3,8,17 12:15	88:24	53:19 54:17 55:22	91:23 92:12,15,17
26:18,25 53:15	24:11,13,15 25:6	<b>Taylor</b> 6:9 11:13	56:19 57:6,11	93:11 94:3 96:25
supply 45:1 75:2	26:19 27:5,13,18	92:24,25 93:7,12	58:23 59:24 60:12	97:1,9 98:2,9,14
support 35:1	28:2,7,11,15,17	93:15,17 94:3,11	60:12 63:19 64:8	103:7 106:11
supported 106:17	29:17 33:9,16	94:17	64:21 65:15 68:24	109:1 110:12
**	,	<b>technical</b> 5:7 15:22		
<b>supposed</b> 31:6 32:3	34:3,19 35:3,17		73:18 74:11 79:20	113:20,23,24,25
136:7	36:7,11,13,20,25	16:10,13	84:3 86:15 87:13	115:16 116:3,11
sure 12:22 14:25	37:4,24 38:2,17	tell 92:1 100:15,25	92:4,16 93:22	116:14 118:24
42:21 79:21 82:9	38:22 39:1,7,10	106:18 109:14	94:1,19,24 97:21	119:24 121:3
85:7 95:6 99:19	39:20 40:12,16	110:20 111:3	99:6,9 100:9,24	124:12 126:4
101:25 103:17	41:24 42:9 43:3	112:11 113:9,18	101:2,12 104:15	127:2,8,17 128:3
111:10,21,24	43:13 46:14 48:1	114:8,14,18,24	105:5,16,21,22	128:15 129:14
117:1 119:12	48:12,18 49:2,7	115:2,5,9,13,15	106:2,8,16,20	132:15,17 134:19
120:18 130:7	49:15,20 50:6,15	116:20 117:21	107:20,25 108:10	136:14 137:20
surface 29:6	51:4 54:22 55:18	124:14	108:12,18 109:3,6	138:19 139:9,11
surprise 40:14	55:25 57:4 60:3	ten 15:9 69:12,21	109:7,11 112:10	<b>Thanks</b> 76:16
surrounding 9:22	87:9 100:11 105:8	tend 65:9	112:14 113:1	88:17 136:20
24:16 28:9,16	107:9,12 112:7	<b>term</b> 74:22	117:3,22 118:3,4	137:22
39:8,23 107:13	123:22,25 133:10	terminal 29:2,4	118:21 119:16	theoretical 43:10
Susan 11:14 19:5	134:9	<b>terms</b> 46:13 66:7	120:7 122:7	thermal 48:3
19:23 97:2,5,12	<b>take</b> 33:2 41:8 42:8	83:5 101:10	124:15,18,21	thing 16:18
Sustained 112:15	51:9 53:13 55:5	117:13	125:9 128:2,6,6	things 71:20 73:4
swear 44:15 64:1	63:23 71:6 78:7	testified 27:14	128:12,25 129:6	91:25 111:6 117:4
93:3	81:9,11,16 82:16	44:18 64:4 73:10	131:12 133:3,12	think 31:11 42:25
switching 123:3	85:18,19 87:14	93:8 97:6 107:3	136:21 137:2,4,11	60:23 61:22 67:8
sworn 44:17 64:3	89:9,9 92:18,19	121:23 127:24	137:13	68:19 69:1 75:6
93:7 97:5 121:22	100:8 106:1	testifies 56:25	Texas 9:6	77:10 83:1,8 85:9
127:23	108:20 122:15	58:18 107:16,18	thank 12:25 13:16	85:9 86:13,23
system 28:23 34:18	125:8 127:9	testify 133:19	13:20,24 14:6,17	88:21 89:5,8
71:25 72:8 73:17	taken 1:24 60:15	<b>testimony</b> 4:2,5,6	15:1 17:25 20:5	90:13 91:4 96:3
73:20 74:2,14,21	60:19	4:20,22 5:8,12,18	20:10,22,24 21:1	100:20 101:2,13
75:1,11,13 76:4	talk 99:4 104:7	5:24 6:8,16 7:9,23	21:10,14 22:20	101:20 102:13
76:24 80:4 82:1	114:11,22 115:6	10:11,12 18:11,12	23:15,23 24:5	106:21 109:7
84:5,6,14 90:2	talked 71:14	18:13,21 19:3,4,6	30:11,13 37:15,16	111:9,10 123:16
118:18	talking 85:7 89:24	19:18,21,23 20:1	37:18 38:10 44:6	125:6 128:7
Systemic 42:4	90:4 91:12,13,23	20:4,8,9,14,21	44:8 45:15,18	130:21 131:4
	99:19 116:5 130:5	21:9,13,15 22:3	46:10,18,25 48:9	132:25 134:15
<u> </u>	tank 9:20 63:3	24:7 26:9 30:9,25	50:3 52:13 53:10	137:13 138:12
<b>T</b> 140:1,1	75:10 82:16,16	32:23 37:23 38:2	54:2 56:7,22	third 24:13 27:18
<b>T-a-y-l-o-r</b> 93:16	tanker 90:16	38:24,24 39:4,8	58:16 61:13 62:11	31:22 34:7
table 10:17 109:22				
	I	I	I	

				1 490 102
<b>Thomas</b> 3:10 11:15	76:2 90:22 136:10	1:5 2:12 89:22	<b>twice</b> 111:13	130:10,11 131:17
11:20 14:15 23:21	timing 27:1 31:6	91:1	<b>two</b> 10:2 14:11 15:4	134:9
98:9,10,13 103:4	<b>tiny</b> 36:6	treat 96:1,13	18:9 21:23 32:22	understood 46:18
103:7,17 104:5,6	<b>title</b> 44:24 45:1	treated 29:3 75:16	55:19,20 56:6	75:6 76:6 105:20
105:15,20,25	64:10,13 93:1,13	treatment 28:24	60:10,11 71:14	129:12
107:22 108:3	97:10 126:16	41:2 75:15	78:6 81:24 83:8	uniformly 134:3
112:16,21 113:7	<b>to/from</b> 6:3	tremendous 61:8	83:11,11,21 84:12	<b>unique</b> 43:14 65:25
113:24 114:1	today 12:12 15:3	<b>tribe</b> 3:8 10:13 14:8	90:14,14,21	73:11,19
115:24 116:3,4	15:14 18:2 21:20	14:15 16:19 17:20	109:11,14 119:17	<b>unit</b> 2:18 48:3
117:17 118:11	23:20,25 37:15	21:11,12 23:16,20	<b>type</b> 100:17 101:13	unreasonable
119:15 127:8,12	38:19 41:1 43:7	24:18 26:23 28:17	types 55:23	100:16 101:18
127:19 128:3,11	63:20 80:23 133:8	38:11,16,19,23	typically 83:17	unsafe 133:25
128:14,20 132:17	134:8 137:25	39:2,3,4,7,14,22	123:6	134:1
132:20 134:19	139:6,10	39:24 40:2,13,14		updated 27:4 34:21
thought 18:3 34:13	told 130:3	41:2,13,19 42:1,1	U	43:19
82:1 91:22 121:18	Toluene 8:24	42:18 43:5 46:3	<b>UE-050664</b> 4:23	<b>upgrade</b> 5:21 37:6
thousand 75:19	<b>Tom</b> 114:2	55:17 56:10,13,25	UE-220066 8:6,8	upgraded 37:8
84:7 85:3 86:8	tool 31:3	62:20 72:21 84:1	8:19	upgrades 31:16
130:21 131:3	top 46:16 52:1	98:8 106:13	<b>UG-151662</b> 76:20	76:24
<b>threat</b> 40:13	53:23 55:7 60:6	107:19 108:7,17	<b>UG-151663</b> 4:21	upsets 54:9
<b>three</b> 15:14 39:9	63:3 86:16 104:13	127:7 133:9	7:19 26:15	<b>urges</b> 31:18
84:10,12 90:21	120:23	<b>tribe's</b> 17:1,6 39:15	<b>UG-210111</b> 89:6	<b>usage</b> 86:6
108:6,17 109:3	topic 39:18 123:3	40:24 43:3,9	UG-220067 8:6,8	<b>use</b> 16:8 30:4,6
115:17 116:8	topics 39:9	132:10 133:14	8:19	31:11,21 32:24
<b>thrown</b> 62:7	<b>total</b> 60:1,6 78:9	tribunal 103:14	<b>UG-230393</b> 1:6	34:5 35:23 36:2,7
<b>tie</b> 82:3	96:22 110:24	troubleshoot 61:10	12:13	48:18 49:6 52:22
<b>tied</b> 82:7	totaling 29:12	<b>truck</b> 68:16 89:22	ultimate 33:25	67:13,21 69:11
<b>time</b> 12:6 18:20	Totally 98:21	90:10,13,14,15,20	ultimately 66:10	77:18 78:18,23
27:12,22 29:19	touch 73:5	91:1,7,10	67:3 87:6 106:3	80:11,18 83:1,5
30:5 44:6 45:24	touched 41:12 73:4	trucking 89:24	unacceptable 43:5	83:12,23 85:5
46:10 48:21 57:23	touches 39:18	truckloads 90:23	<b>unburned</b> 48:19	86:7,9,10,16
58:2,11,15 60:2	<b>toxic</b> 47:4,12	trucks 89:25 132:9	49:14	87:15 89:24
68:8 72:20 74:11	133:25	<b>true</b> 71:23 74:1	unchanged 20:23	useful 24:15 27:25
76:8 85:7 86:6	track 84:18,20	109:17 140:9	<b>unclear</b> 21:5 99:10	31:11,21
87:22,25 98:18	tracker 6:10,17	<b>try</b> 14:12 15:24	129:24	<b>uses</b> 35:14 37:7
99:14 100:21	30:21	98:15	uncontrolled 28:19	49:12 67:18 75:18
104:12 106:3	trade-off 136:9	trying 19:14,14	underlying 35:8	79:25,25 80:15
109:8 110:15,16	Traditionally 31:1	47:10	<b>understand</b> 79:12	83:13
114:7,15,25	<b>train</b> 34:12	<b>turn</b> 15:10 19:17	81:6 82:22 102:2	usually 59:12 61:21
115:10 116:12	transcript 59:5	20:2 22:25 44:10	102:6 108:1,16	66:19
117:5,7 121:8	transmission 67:2	51:25 55:6 65:18	138:8	UTC 9:16 53:16
127:9 134:9 138:9	71:20	67:11 124:14	understanding	103:11,14,19
138:11	transport 5:22 9:19	129:16	43:8 47:1 66:8,11	<b>UTC's</b> 103:11
<b>times</b> 36:12 49:8	26:4 132:8 137:3	turning 18:9 35:23	75:9 79:4 89:23	utilities 1:3,4 2:12
53:6 61:5 63:2	transportation 1:3	36:8 53:22,22	101:10,25 117:3	71:15
			122:10,12,22	
L				

r				1 uge 100
utility 37:7	137:18	36:8,16 105:9	<b>WFD-5T</b> 5:24	51:2 99:16 111:7
utilization 68:25	vice 45:1 70:3	109:18 112:12	64:18 84:3	137:25 139:11
utilize 54:22 75:23	vicinity 133:22	113:10 134:4,7	<b>WFD-6</b> 6:2 64:18	wondering 99:22
<b>utilized</b> 61:4,5	134:6,6	140:3,7	<b>WFD-7</b> 6:4	Wood 114:2
66:12	<b>video</b> 16:8	wasn't 106:12	WFD-8 6:6	Woods's 114:7
	view 62:24 133:17	121:2	WHEREOF	word 100:23
V	violate 55:25	waste 48:19 49:15	140:11	103:15
<b>v</b> 1:7 10:4 12:13	violated 39:25 57:2	58:5,7,13 133:4,7	William 5:20 11:8	words 101:8 131:25
value 87:2,2,3,7,7	57:3	133:15,20 134:11	63:21 64:3,12	135:9 137:9
valve 54:23 58:1	<b>violation</b> 48:11	134:15 135:9,19	winner 71:11	work 23:19 28:15
valves 53:4	49:2 50:5 55:20	water 28:19,23,24	winter 28:1 34:6	39:2 61:9 62:3,9
Van 3:4 5:12 53:14	55:21 56:10 57:9	29:6 107:10	35:24	70:4 83:13 100:21
53:19 54:4,21	violations 29:11	114:23	wishes 58:25	101:14 104:2
55:1	40:1 48:12,17	Waterway 28:25	wishes 56.25 wit 40:1	111:15 117:11,23
vaporization 7:15	49:1,5,11,14,17	29:2,4	withdraw 85:22	117:25 118:19
34:5 35:23 36:3	55:23 60:22 133:8	way 3:4 19:2 32:24	withdrawal 82:7,21	119:13 138:10
67:21,22 69:1	<b>Vitae</b> 7:10	62:24 67:9 69:22	withdrawing 75:21	worked 50:1 60:13
78:17 79:11 80:11	<b>VOCs</b> 48:3,7 56:1	71:11 79:20 85:20	witness 16:3 37:6	70:8 94:12 109:25
81:17,25 82:7	56:11	87:21,23 103:15	37:13 44:12,21,25	110:2,16 114:15
84:13 90:12 131:4	<b>volatile</b> 46:23	ways 72:1 102:17	45:6,10,14 46:4	114:25 115:10
vaporize 31:13	<b>volume</b> 31:15 84:25	we'll 15:3,9 18:1	47:16 52:11,18	working 13:6,8
35:24 67:18,19	86:5	53:11 89:14 92:20	54:1,16 55:14	62:6 101:4 117:6
87:18 88:14	<b>volumes</b> 84:24 85:5	121:25 126:3	57:13,15 59:17,19	117:9 119:8
vaporized 36:6	129:23	we're 13:9 14:12	59:22,23 63:21	121:16
Vaporizer 7:6	127.25	53:12 60:8 71:8	64:7,12,19,23	Worksheet 8:14
vaporizing 82:18	W	75:17 80:23 85:7	65:2 68:12 72:16	world 102:8
<b>vari-</b> 29:10	WA 2:6,13,20 3:12	89:24 91:25	72:18 77:6 92:17	worries 68:12
variations 29:10	WAC 66:4,4 124:1	119:22 127:9	92:24 93:15,20,24	worst 40:21
various 9:9 96:18	126:16	we've 14:11 62:7,8	94:2,7 97:2,12,19	worth 86:19,20,21
106:5 116:25	waive 45:21,24	74:3	97:23 98:1,11	86:25
vast 33:20	72:19 98:5	weather 28:3 35:15	103:2,8 105:3,12	wouldn't 70:20
vegetation 28:22	waiving 94:11	week 19:19 138:8	105:13,16,19,22	114:8,18
vehicles 123:9	Wallace 3:10 23:20	weight 43:13	107:15,20,22	wrap 43:25
<b>vent</b> 137:16	23:22	weights 42:13	107:13,20,22	written 109:6 139:7
<b>vented</b> 135:13	want 19:13 22:19	well-founded 43:9	113:5 117:18	139:8
136:12	24:8 33:16 42:21	went 66:2 123:19	118:12,13,16	wrong 55:8 74:22
venting 133:4,7,15	61:1 65:8 78:8	weren't 91:12	121:15,18 122:19	79:5
133:18,24,25	83:25 89:23 90:18	131:21,21	125:20 126:5	<b>WUTC</b> 3:15 5:14
134:10,16,17	90:19 99:4 100:6	Western 3:2 14:3	127:6,14,17,25	6:20,21,23 7:2,3,5
135:19,20,25	103:22 111:10	112:12 113:10	127:0,14,17,25	8:6,8,19 10:14,15
136:9	119:2 133:4	WFD-1T 5:18	129:8,10 140:11	12:13
Verizon 13:4	wanted 14:20,24	64:17	witness's 44:22	12.13
<b>versa</b> 70:3	wants 102:23	WFD-2 5:19	105:16 112:14	X
<b>versus</b> 35:4,20	Washington 1:2,4	WFD-3 5:21	witnesses 15:10	<b>X</b> 51:22 136:11
81:19 100:16	2:18 9:12,12 10:2	WFD-4 5:22 64:18	30:10 33:1 44:11	<b>XS-19</b> 9:6
101:1,18 125:1	10:4,5 12:1 29:14	VVI 10-7 J.22 U4.10	50.10 55.1 44.11	Xylene 9:2
,			l	

Y	5:24	96:18	<b>2018</b> 26:17 113:15	<b>29</b> 9:25 76:23
yeah 48:24 51:24	<b>10/31/2023</b> 5:8,10	<b>141D</b> 6:11	<b>2019</b> 4:12 27:6	<b>29th</b> 138:13,13
70:13,15 74:6	5:12,14,16 6:4,6	141LNG 6:10	113:17	139:6
75:24 77:4 78:21	<b>10/6/2023</b> 10:15,17	<b>141N</b> 6:13	<b>2020</b> 27:15	
85:9 94:14 95:2,6	<b>10/6/23</b> 4:5,20,21	<b>15</b> 46:19 47:3 78:8	<b>2021</b> 4:14 9:11	3
95:9 99:21 111:2	5:2,4 10:12,14	82:6 85:25 91:17	25:15 27:7,10	<b>3</b> 51:25 81:10 120:8
111:12 112:21	<b>10/6/23Docket</b> 4:23	<b>15-minute</b> 92:19	<b>2022</b> 24:14,20 26:5	125:21
118:16,24 124:13	10/6/23Pollution	<b>15-percent</b> 87:4	27:19,20,23 29:18	3/26/2021 9:15
127:19 129:21	5:5	<b>16</b> 65:19 79:8 81:19	31:14 33:8,11	3/29/2019 8:10
130:21	10/6/23Tacoma 5:7	81:20 82:5 91:17	<b>2023</b> 1:24 10:17	<b>30</b> 11:3 64:14 70:8
year 4:10 67:20	<b>100</b> 27:13 78:16	<b>16-002</b> 4:18 5:2	12:1 17:7,8,21,23	70:9
69:12 87:19	80:3 135:19,23	105:10 114:16	28:1 48:10 50:6	<b>30(b)(6)</b> 10:11
113:18	136:10	<b>16-120C</b> 114:23	134:14 138:22	<b>31</b> 35:6 70:11
years 30:5 64:14	<b>10885</b> 2:5	<b>16-inch</b> 81:18	140:9,12	<b>3186</b> 1:25 140:18
70:8,9,11	<b>11</b> 52:4,16 68:20	<b>17</b> 52:4,16	<b>2024</b> 140:21	<b>31st</b> 17:15 19:24
<b>Yup</b> 113:8 126:5	108:21,25	<b>1750</b> 3:4	<b>2025</b> 34:21	<b>32</b> 5:14 10:16 53:16
<b>1 up</b> 113.0 120.3	<b>11/9/2015</b> 9:5	<b>1783</b> 55:11	<b>2041</b> 52:2	<b>33</b> 11:4 136:24
Z	<b>11:02</b> 92:22	<b>18</b> 53:25 84:4	<b>20534</b> 9:19	<b>350,000</b> 28:20
<b>zero</b> 58:7 125:6	<b>11:17</b> 92:20	104:15 125:15	<b>206-447-7000</b> 3:12	<b>3500</b> 3:11
<b>Zoom</b> 2:16 3:2,8	<b>11:21</b> 92:22	<b>1861</b> 53:24 55:7	<b>206.464.6595</b> 2:20	<b>36</b> 136:21,22
15:20 121:15	<b>11386</b> 6:25 8:2,14	<b>19</b> 108:4,13,20	<b>20th</b> 140:12	<b>360.664.1186</b> 2:13
	<b>11447</b> 5:6	<b>19-087c</b> 9:15 10:9	<b>21</b> 67:12	<b>37</b> 7:13 11:4
0	<b>11448</b> 5:4	115:8	<b>21,000</b> 81:10	<b>373</b> 8:19
<b>017</b> 7:4	<b>116</b> 11:15	<b>19,000</b> 85:20	<b>210915</b> 120:13	<b>378</b> 8:8
<b>018</b> 7:2	<b>119</b> 11:16	<b>19th</b> 17:8,23	<b>21st</b> 138:24	<b>38</b> 11:5
<b>020</b> 6:22	<b>12</b> 10:17 68:20 82:4	<b>1T</b> 125:11	<b>22</b> 24:24 25:6 85:25	<b>39</b> 6:7
<b>023</b> 7:8	83:11 104:15,20		<b>22,000</b> 82:18	<b>390-some</b> 134:15
<b>024</b> 6:20	106:3	2	<b>220066</b> 17:11	<b>391</b> 8:6
<b>026</b> 7:5	12-inch 78:12 79:7	<b>2</b> 51:25 108:4,14	<b>22nd</b> 33:15,19 40:6	
<b>029</b> 6:23	79:22,22 80:5	110:13,15 125:10	<b>23</b> 7:18 83:11 100:9	4
<b>031</b> 10:14	81:13,15,19,20	125:20,20	100:10 112:10	<b>4</b> 8:11 9:11 41:17
	82:14,19,23 87:5	<b>2,000</b> 85:21	<b>230393</b> 17:18	41:20,25 51:25
1	<b>12/10/2019</b> 8:2	<b>2/10/2015</b> 9:3	<b>24</b> 7:16 11:3 61:23	65:18 80:6 81:10
<b>1</b> 27:10 51:25	12/5/2019 9:20	<b>2/18/2021</b> 9:8	<b>240</b> 30:5 67:19,20	<b>4/10/2019</b> 9:17
109:22 110:14	12:28 139:14	<b>20</b> 55:12 90:22	69:7 87:18,19	<b>4/15/2019</b> 8:16
138:16,19	<b>1200</b> 130:18	109:22 138:25	88:5	<b>40</b> 7:14
<b>1.1</b> 95:18,22	<b>122</b> 11:17	<b>200,000</b> 94:21 96:1	<b>240-hour</b> 68:25	<b>400</b> 134:15
<b>1.3</b> 95:14,22	<b>126</b> 11:18	<b>2000</b> 2:19	<b>2410</b> 18:25 40:15	<b>401</b> 107:10
<b>1/7/2021</b> 10:11	<b>128</b> 11:19	<b>2005</b> 34:20,22,25	40:25	<b>40128</b> 2:12
<b>10</b> 53:24 76:21	<b>13</b> 106:3	<b>2016</b> 4:16 24:11,11	<b>25.6</b> 37:8	<b>41</b> 61:22,24
78:15 80:2 104:15	<b>132</b> 11:20	24:24 25:6 26:7	<b>250,000</b> 62:21,23	<b>42</b> 7:12
104:20	<b>135</b> 11:20	33:15,19 34:12,15	62:24 63:5	<b>425.635.1422</b> 2:6
10/06/2023Rebut	<b>136</b> 11:21	37:11 40:6 41:5	<b>26</b> 7:17,20 77:24	<b>450</b> 3:5
6:16	<b>14</b> 84:4	112:12 113:11	<b>28</b> 9:23	<b>46</b> 5:17 10:7 11:6
<b>10/06/23</b> 6:2	<b>141-D</b> 95:17,18,22	<b>2017</b> 4:11 25:14	<b>28th</b> 17:7,21	<b>46,000</b> 29:12
10/06/23Rebuttal	, ,	27:6 113:13		<b>480.85.060</b> 66:5
	I	I	I	I

				1 490 100
<b>4a</b> 8:11	140:9	7:13,14,15,16,17		
<b>4b</b> 8:11	<b>6/20/2022</b> 9:7	7:18,19,20,21,22		
<b>4c</b> 8:11	<b>61</b> 11:7	7:23,24 8:2,3,5,7		
<b>4d</b> 8:11	<b>62</b> 11:7	8:9,11,13,15,17		
<b>4e</b> 8:12	<b>65</b> 11:9	8:18,20,22,24 9:2		
<b>4f</b> 8:12	<b>66</b> 85:25	9:3,4,6,8,9,10,12		
<b>4g</b> 8:12	<b>66,000</b> 85:22 86:9	9:14,16,19,21,23		
<b>4h</b> 8:12	131:5	9:24 10:2,3,7,8,10		
<b>4i</b> 8:12	<b>6th</b> 12:6	<b>9:01</b> 12:2,6		
<b>4j</b> 8:12	<b>0</b> (11)2.0	<b>90</b> 78:13 79:25		
<b>4k</b> 8:12	7	90:19 91:3		
<b>40</b> 8:12	<b>7</b> 51:25 53:22 55:6	<b>90/10</b> 77:25 78:3		
<b>4p</b> 8:12	84:4 129:16,19	79:15		
<b>4th</b> 2:5	<b>7/1/2022</b> 10:6	<b>901</b> 3:11		
<b>4u</b> 8:12	700 2:5	<b>9283</b> 4:18		
<b>TU</b> 0.12	<b>73</b> 11:9	<b>9203</b> 4.18 <b>94</b> 11:13		
5	<b>7347</b> 9:3	<b>94</b> 11.15 <b>95</b> 47:8		
<b>5</b> 7:11 9:11 51:25	<b>76</b> 11:10	<b>97201</b> 3:5		
55:11 67:11 86:16	<b>79</b> 11:10	<b>98</b> 11:15		
94:20 125:1		<b>98004-5579</b> 2:6		
5/22/2017 8:21	8	<b>98104-3188</b> 2:20		
<b>5/25/2018</b> 8:4	<b>8</b> 8:12 108:21,25	<b>98164</b> 3:12		
<b>5/25/23</b> 4:2,3,4,6,7	129:17 136:24	<b>98504</b> 2:13		
4:8,9,11,12,14,15	<b>80</b> 9:3	<b>99</b> 46:22 47:11 56:1		
4:17,19 5:18,19	<b>80.28.280</b> 126:20	56:11 57:1,16		
5:21,22 6:8,9,10	126:25	135:17,20,21		
6:11,12,15	80.28.425 27:9	136:4		
5/25/23Calculation	<b>80.28.425(1)</b> 41:23	150.4		
6:13	<b>800</b> 2:19			
5/8/2019 10:2	<b>807T</b> 94:23 95:7,13			
<b>50</b> 79:13,14,21,23	95:15,23			
79:24 82:20,20	<b>808T</b> 95:5,7,20			
87:4 138:23	96:4,9,19,19			
<b>50/50</b> 80:14,25	<b>82</b> 11:11			
82:13,14,24 83:5	<b>83</b> 28:21			
83:17	<b>87T</b> 5:23			
<b>503.241.7242</b> 3:6	<b>88</b> 11:11			
<b>51</b> 6:5	<b>88T</b> 6:12			
<b>52</b> 24:20	<b>89</b> 11:12			
<b>56938-8</b> 10:5	<b>8th</b> 138:22			
<b>5th</b> 2:19 3:11	9			
6	<b>9</b> 52:1 129:16,18,20			
<b>6</b> 1:24 5:22 8:12	<b>9/8/23</b> 6:17,18,20			
12:1 51:25 55:10	6:21,23,24 7:2,3,5			
68:20 84:3 86:16	7:6,8,9,10,11,12			
00.200 - 00.10			1	