1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7 8	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES	AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
9	CITY OF KENT,	DOCKET NO LE 010770
10	Petitioner,	DOCKET NO. UE-010778 (Consolidated)
11	V.	
12	PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,	
13	Respondent.	
14	CITY OF AUBURN, CITY OF	DOCKET NO. UE-010911
15	BREMERTON, CITY OF DES MOINES, CITY OF FEDERAL WAY, CITY OF	(Consolidated)
16 17	LAKEWOOD, CITY OF REDMOND, CITY OF RENTON, CITY OF SEATAC, AND CITY OF TUKWILA,	
18	Petitioners,	
19	V.	DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT IN SUPPORT OF CITIES'
20	PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,	MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION
21	Respondent.	
22		
23	Thomas W. Gut, declares as follows:	
24	1. I am currently employed as the Assis	tant Engineering Manager for the City of
25		
26	SeaTac. I have held this position for approximately 2	2 years. Previously, I held the position as
	DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT IN SUPPORT OF CITIES' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION - 1	

1	Project Engineer II for the City of SeaTac for approximately 4 years. The main difference between
2	these two positions is that supervisory responsibilities are an additional function of the Assistant
3	Engineering Manager position. I am a registered Civil Engineer in the State of Washington.
4	2. I primarily serve as the project manager on numerous capital improvement projects.
5 6	My duties as project manager include:
7	• Manage engineering consultants hired by the City to develop plans for street
8	improvement projects.
9	• Supervise technicians and engineers assigned to various street improvement
10	projects in the City's Engineering Division.
11	• Coordinate utility work necessary to be incorporated into City street improvement
12	projects.
13 14	• Manage construction contracts for the City's street improvement projects.
15	3. I have been responsible for several street improvement projects that required Puget
16	Sound Energy ("PSE") to relocate its facilities or to place its overhead system underground under
17	Schedule 71. These completed projects include:
18	• South 176 <sup>th</sup> Street Phase II (34 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South to Military Road South)
19 20	• South 188 <sup>th</sup> Street (Airport Tunnel to International Boulevard)
20 21	• Des Moines Memorial Drive South (South 188 <sup>th</sup> Street to South 194 <sup>th</sup> Street)
21	(substantially completed June 2001)
23	• South 170 <sup>th</sup> Street Phase I (International Boulevard to 37 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South)
24	While the city has completed the following projects, I was not directly involved with them.
25	• South 176 <sup>th</sup> Street Phase I (International Boulevard to 34 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South)
26	
	DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT IN SUPPORT OF CITIES' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION - 2

1	• International Boulevard Phase I (South 170 <sup>th</sup> Street to South 188 <sup>th</sup> Street)	
2	• International Boulevard Phase II (South 188 <sup>th</sup> Street to South 200 <sup>th</sup> Street)	
3	• 24 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South / 28 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South (South 188 <sup>th</sup> Street to South 200 <sup>th</sup> Street).	
4		
5	4. All of the above projects involved underground conversion of PSE's facilities under	
6	Schedule 70. The City's share of the total costs of underground conversion on these projects was	
7	30 %. In all of the these projects, the majority of PSE's poles that were removed during the	
8	underground conversion would have been located in the new sidewalk and outside the widened	
9	roadway. As part of the underground conversion, PSE removed these poles and placed the wires and	
10	other equipment underground.	
11	5. The City will be undertaking several other street improvement projects that require	
12		
13	conversion of PSE's overhead facilities to underground. These include:	
14	South 170 <sup>th</sup> Street Phase II, 37 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South to Military Road South bid – May, 2001.	
15	International Boulevard Phase III (South 152 <sup>nd</sup> Street to South 170 <sup>th</sup> Street). International Boulevard Phase IV (South 200 <sup>th</sup> Street to South 216 <sup>th</sup> Street).	
16	6. The City is currently engaged in Phase II of a street improvement project at South	
17	170 <sup>th</sup> Street between 37 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South and Military Road South ("170 <sup>th</sup> Street Project"). Phase II	
18	of the 170 <sup>th</sup> Street Project consists of widening South 170 <sup>th</sup> Street and adding curbs, gutters,	
19	sidewalks, a flashing beacon at 40 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South, street illumination, and storm drainage facilities.	
20	sidewarks, a hasning beacon at 40° Avenue South, sireet intriniation, and storm trainage facilities.	
21	The project requires conversion of all utilities to underground, including PSE's overhead electric	
22	facilities. The City issued its Notice to Proceed to the contractor on the 170 <sup>th</sup> Street Project on July	
23	11, 2001 to be effective on July 12, 2001.	
24	7. The 170 <sup>th</sup> Street Project is Phase II of street improvements to the South 170 <sup>th</sup> Street.	
25	Phase I of this project extended from International Boulevard to 37 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South. Because a	
26		
	DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT IN SUPPORT OF CITIES' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION - 3	

portion of the underground conversion area for Phase I is zoned and used for commercial purposes, PSE performed the underground conversion for Phase I under Schedule 71. According to the City's contract with PSE, the City's share of the total cost of the underground conversion was 30%. A copy of the underground conversion contract for Phase I is attached as Exhibit A.

8. There is no difference in the road dimensions or poles in Phase I and Phase II of the South 170<sup>th</sup> Street Project. In Phase II of the Project, several of the existing poles on South 170<sup>th</sup> Street are located so that they would be in the center of the sidewalk if the electric system were not converted to underground. If the poles remained in their current location, they would obstruct safe pedestrian traffic. These poles would need to be relocated even if the system were not converted to underground.

9. Although PSE performed the underground conversion for Phase I of the 170<sup>th</sup> Street
Project under Schedule 71 with the City responsible for 30% of the total costs of the underground
conversion, PSE is now claiming that the City is responsible for 70% of part of the costs. During
Phase I of the South 170<sup>th</sup> Street project, an identical road section was built and some poles were
also located in the center of the sidewalk. The dimensions of the road, the road widening, and the
new sidewalk are the same in Phase I of the project as they are in Phase II.

19 10. On January 29, 1999, the City, its consultant, and representatives from PSE, Qwest,
and AT&T met to discuss the specifics of accomplishing the conversion of overhead utilities to
underground for Phase II of the South 170<sup>th</sup> Street project. More than two years later on March 14,
2001, PSE presented the City with an Underground Conversion Agreement under Schedule 71 that
would have made the City responsible for 30% of the underground conversion costs. Before the
City signed the agreement, I inquired if Schedule 70 should be the appropriate schedule for the

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT IN SUPPORT OF CITIES' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION - 4

South 170<sup>th</sup> Street Phase II project since the properties adjacent to the project are both zoned and used exclusively as residential. PSE told me for the first time that since the project contained three-phase distribution, PSE was going to do the underground conversion under Schedule 71. PSE later changed the City reimbursement rate to 70% after SeaTac filed its complaint at the WUTC. PSE has since changed the City rate again to one-quarter of the conversion cost at 30% and three-quarters of the conversion cost at 70%.

11. The cost to the City under Schedule 70 for the underground conversion of Phase II of the 170<sup>th</sup> Project is approximately \$34,561.00. The total cost of the underground conversion is estimated to be \$454,870. At the 30% City reimbursement rate, the City's responsibility under Schedule 71 would be approximately at \$136,461. At PSE's latest city reimbursement rate, the cost to the City would be \$272,922, based on one-quarter of the conversion cost at 30% and three-quarters of the conversion cost at 70%.

12. The City has adopted the King County Road Standards, 1993. Chapter 8 "Utilities" states that on vertical curb type roads with a speed limit less than 40 mph, poles shall be placed clear of sidewalks and at least five and one-half feet from the curb face in residential areas. The speed limit in this portion of South 170<sup>th</sup> Street is 30 mph.

13. The South 170<sup>th</sup> Street project is funded primarily by Washington StateTransportation Improvement Board (TIB) grant funds and City funds.

14. The conversion of all utilities to underground is required on the 170<sup>th</sup> Street Project. SeaTac Ordinance No. 97-1002 states: "It is found and determined by the City that the health and safety, particularly the safety of the traveling public, and general welfare of the residents of the City require that all such existing overhead facilities be relocated underground as soon as practicable in

DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT IN SUPPORT OF CITIES' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION - 5

1	accordance with the requirements specified herein and that all such new facilities be installed	
2	underground, as specified herein." Furthermore, Section 11.20.030 (D) "Underground	
3	Requirements" states:	
4 5 6	All extensions, relocating, or rebuilds of existing overhead electric and communication facilities in areas zoned by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City as urban low density (UL), urban medium density (UM) and urban high density (UH), shall be installed underground from and after the effective date thereof.	
7	15. There has always been a verbal understanding between the City and PSE that PSE	
8	will relocate their electric facilities, remove aerial electric wires and poles that obstruct construction	
9 10	on City streets, and replace these with underground facilities within the City rights-of-way on	
11	arterial streets. In fact, evidence of this verbal understanding is the fact that PSE has adhered to the	
12	City's verbal request in previous projects.	
13	16. On July 12, 2001, PSE presented SeaTac with a draft underground conversion	
14	agreement for Phase II of the 170 <sup>th</sup> Street Project that required the City to purchase private	
15 16	easements for its exclusive use and possession. Even though the draft underground conversion	
10	agreement contained a reservation of rights on some of the issues in dispute and even though Phase	
18	II of the 170 <sup>th</sup> Street Project does not require any easements off the public rights-of-way the City	
19	objected to signing any such agreement. The City cannot agree to purchase easements for PSE's use	
20	under the terms in PSE's draft underground conversion agreement. A copy of PSE's draft	
21	underground conversion agreement is attached as Exhibit B.	
22 23	17. PSE refused to begin ordering materials or start on the underground conversion until	
23 24	the City executed the draft underground conversion agreement. The project was already under way	
25	by this point. In order to keep the project on schedule, the contractor required that the conduit for	
26	the underground conversion of PSE's overhead system be at the site no later than August 2, 2001.	
	DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT	

IN SUPPORT OF CITIES' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION - 6

We were concerned that the contractor might charge delay damages against the City if the project were delayed by PSE, so it was essential for PSE to order materials and begin work on the project. In order to avoid delays and the risk of delay damages, the City finally agreed to execute an agreement containing the objectionable terms, but preserving our rights on the issues in dispute before the WUTC.

18. To the best of my knowledge, in the past PSE has not insisted that the City buy private easements for PSE's use for any underground conversion projects. PSE may have purchased easements at its own expense, but I have never seen any cost item for easements on invoices submitted to the City by PSE. The only instance of which I am aware where an easement was in PSE's name involved a road improvement project on Des Moines Memorial Drive South. On or about October 2000, PSE identified the need to obtain an easement for their facilities on private property while the project was under construction. At first, we tried to work with PSE to locate their facilities within the right-of-way, but this was impossible due to inadequate space. By that time, the City's consultant right-of-way agent had already completed his work on right-of-way acquisitions. Consequently, we did not have right-of-way acquisition personnel available to negotiate an easement. PSE approached the property owner to obtain an easement. The property owners suggested that they would sign an easement on the condition that the City of SeaTac would extend a water service line from the street to their property. The City agreed to go along with this proposal only because the contractor had put us on notice that we would be liable for delay costs. Also, the road was torn up and the contractor was available to extend the water service line at that time. We never anticipated this issue until construction was well under way. To the best of my recollection this was an isolated incident, not a standard practice for the City of SeaTac.

DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT IN SUPPORT OF CITIES' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION - 7

1	19. The City's preference is to locate all of PSE's facilities within the existing right-of-
2	way. If it is determined that there is not sufficient space within the right-of-way to accommodate
3	PSE's facilities, the City of SeaTac will agree to buy easements in the City's name for space
4	sufficient to accommodate all utilities facilities. The City would purchase easements in the City's
5	name, but not for the exclusive use of PSE. The consequence of placing certain operations in the
6 7	existing rights-of-way is that the relocated facilities would be subject to the terms of the franchise
8	agreement just as the existing facilities are subject to the terms of the franchise agreement.
9	Additionally, the consequence of placing utility facilities outside the rights-of-way is that
10	development potential of adjacent private property is diminished.
11	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the
12	foregoing is true and correct.
13	Executed on August, 2001.
14 15	
15 16	
10	THOMAS W. GUT
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26	

1		
2	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
2	I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have this day served the DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT IN SUPPORT OF CITIES' MOTION FOR SUMMARY	
4	DETERMINATION filed by the Cities of Auburn, Bremerton, Des Moines, Federal Way, Lakewood, Redmond, Renton, SeaTac, and Tukwila, upon all parties of record in this proceeding, via facsimile, followed by U.S. mail, as follows:	
5		
6	Kirstin S. Dodge Perkins Coie	
7	411 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 1800 Bellevue, WA 98004	
8		
9	Simon ffitch Office of the Attorney General	
10	900 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98164-1012	
11		
12	Mary M. Tennyson Office of the Attorney General	
	1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W.	
13	P. O. Box 40128	
14	Olympia, WA 98504-0128	
15	Michael L. Charneski	
16	19812-194th Avenue N.E. Woodinville, WA 98072-8876	
	Woodinvine, W/Y 90072 0070	
17	Dennis J. Moss, Administrative Law Judge	
18	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W.	
19	P. O. Box 47250	
20	Olympia, WA 98504-7250	
	DATED at Seattle, Washington, this day of August, 2001.	
21		
22		
23	Jo Ann Sunderlage	
24	Secretary to Carol S. Arnold	
25		
26		
20		
	DECLARATION OF THOMAS W. GUT IN SUPPORT OF CITIES' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION - 9	