

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; OCTOBER 19, 2015
1:33 P.M.
-o0o-

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)
Complainant,) Docket TR-150284
v.)
BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY,)
Respondent.)

JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be on the record in Docket TR-150284, entitled Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission versus BNSF Railway Company. We are here on Monday, October 19th at 1:30 p.m., for a hearing on the settlement agreement between Commission Staff and the Company.

HEARING ON SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL, VOLUME II
Pages 10 - 100
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GREGORY J. KOPTA

I am Gregory Kopta, the administrative law judge who is assigned to this case, and presiding with me on the bench today are Chairman David Danner and Commissioners Philip Jones and Ann Rendahl. Our purpose today is to allow the Commissioners to ask questions and for the parties, if they wish to say anything more about the agreement, to explain to the Commission why it is in the public interest and should be adopted as the resolution of this case.

1:33 P.M.
OCTOBER 19, 2015

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest
Olympia, Washington 98504-7250

First we have several witnesses that are available for providing testimony, so I will swear you all in. If you would stand and raise your right hand.

REPORTED BY: SHERRILYN SMITH, CCR# 2097

Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC
1325 Fourth Avenue
Suite 1840
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.287.9066 | Seattle
360.534.9066 | Olympia
800.846.6989 | National
www.buellrealtime.com

APPEARANCES
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
GREGORY J. KOPTA
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW
PO Box 47250
Olympia, Washington 98504
360.664.1136

BETTY YOUNG, DAVE PRATT, JOHAN HELLMAN, COURTNEY WALLACE, JERALD COMPTON, having been first duly sworn on oath testified as follows:

COMMISSIONERS:
CHAIRMAN DAVID W. DANNER
COMMISSIONER ANN E. RENDAHL
COMMISSIONER PHILIP B. JONES

JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Let's identify each witness for the record before we begin. We will start to my immediate left.

FOR COMMISSION STAFF:
JULIAN BEATTIE
Office of the Attorney General
Utilities and Transportation Division
PO Box 40128
1400 South Evergreen Park Drive SW
Olympia, Washington 98504
360.664.1225
jbeatte@utc.wa.gov

MS. YOUNG: Betty Young, Utilities and Transportation Staff in Transportation Safety.

FOR BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY:
P. STEPHEN DIJULIO
Foster Pepper, PLLC
1111 Third Avenue
Suite 3400
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.447.8904
dijup@foster.com

MR. PRATT: Dave Pratt, Commission Staff.

MR. HELLMAN: My name is Johan Hellman, I am the Executive Director of Government Affairs for BNSF Railway Company in the Pacific Northwest. My area includes Washington, Oregon, and British Columbia.

-o0o-

JUDGE KOPTA: If you would use the microphone, too, please.

MS. WALLACE: Courtney Wallace, Regional Director of Public Affairs for BNSF for the Pacific Northwest.

JUDGE KOPTA: And our last witness.

MR. COMPTON: Jerald Compton, J-E-R-A-L-D. I am the EOC manager with Washington State Emergency Management Division, and I am the lead

Page 14

1 for the 24/7 warning center.
 2 JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you very much.
 3 And while we were identifying folks, how about
 4 appearances from the attorneys. We just need name,
 5 firm and company that you are representing.
 6 Let's begin with BNSF.
 7 MR. DiJULIO: Thank you. This is Steve
 8 DiJulio, Foster Pepper, representing BNSF, respondent,
 9 in TR-150284.
 10 JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.
 11 And for Commission Staff.
 12 MR. BEATTIE: Julian Beattie, Assistant
 13 Attorney General, representing Commission Staff.
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.
 15 Anyone else wishing to make an appearance?
 16 Hearing none, we are ready to proceed.
 17 Unless anyone has any kind of opening remarks,
 18 then I will immediately go to Commissioner questions.
 19 Hearing nothing, Mr. Chairman, would you like
 20 to begin?
 21 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Thank you. I would.
 22 Thank you all for being here this afternoon.
 23 Well, let me start by saying that the
 24 settlement and the narrative supporting the settlement
 25 agreement were, I have to term them a bit of a black

Page 15

1 box. I was trying to understand what went into it, so
 2 I very much appreciate the response to the Bench
 3 Request No. 1. That filled in a lot of my
 4 understanding of what has been going on.
 5 It seems I -- there's three things that I see
 6 here. One is that there's questions about the --
 7 when -- when calls were made to the EOC as required by
 8 our rules, and then some legal questions about who was
 9 responsible when a train was on shipper's property as
 10 opposed to on the tracks, and then last is a question
 11 about responsibilities when the fuel that leaks is
 12 fuel, as opposed to -- or when the oil that leaks is
 13 fuel, as opposed to a commodity.
 14 So I guess let me start by asking some
 15 questions around the reporting to the EOC. From what
 16 I understand, a request was made to EOC when we
 17 were -- when our staff was doing its investigation.
 18 They were looking at when -- were phone calls made to
 19 the EOC, when were they made, were they in compliance
 20 with our rules for a 30-minute time line. In some
 21 cases the calls were made, although not perhaps within
 22 30 minutes.
 23 The original information we received from EOC
 24 was that they were not received and then later that
 25 was changed. I am just wondering what the process is

Page 16

1 at EOC. When they receive calls of this sort, how are
 2 they generally handled?
 3 Mr. Compton, let me ask you that.
 4 MR. COMPTON: When a HAZMAT call comes
 5 in to the EOC, records from BNSF or any other person,
 6 we will take that call, take all the pertinent
 7 information, basically containing what was spilled,
 8 how much was spilled, where was it spilled, and a
 9 little bit of information about what occurred to cause
 10 the spill, when it occurred, and then we will record
 11 at that point the date and time of the call that we
 12 received.
 13 That information primarily goes to the
 14 Department of Ecology and to the local jurisdiction.
 15 In specific cases, such as railroad incidents, we also
 16 generate an e-mail to the Utilities and Transportation
 17 Commission, basically outlining all of that
 18 information as well. If it would be something on I-5,
 19 we would notify WSP, because they have specific
 20 jurisdiction there. So there are some ancillary
 21 notifications that we will make.
 22 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Is this -- the
 23 reporting to the UTC, is there some form of memorandum
 24 of understanding or memorandum of agreement that you
 25 have with our agency? What is -- what is the backdrop

Page 17

1 for this activity?
 2 MR. COMPTON: We operate based on an
 3 established set of standard operating procedures.
 4 Those are in writing at the Alert and Warning Center.
 5 In the cases of all of our partners, we coordinate
 6 with them as to what kind of information they need
 7 regarding specific incidents that may occur. Those
 8 are incorporated into those standard operation
 9 procedures.
 10 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. So there is no
 11 memorandum of agreement with the UTC, but there is
 12 standard operating procedures.
 13 And I haven't seen those. Are those something
 14 that you could provide to us or --
 15 MR. COMPTON: Absolutely.
 16 CHAIRMAN DANNER: -- that our staff has?
 17 Do you have -- Mr. Pratt, do we have those?
 18 MR. PRATT: (No verbal response.)
 19 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. That would be
 20 helpful, if you could get those to us.
 21 MR. COMPTON: When would you like them?
 22 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Well, let me -- I will
 23 work through the Judge. Maybe this will be a bench
 24 request.
 25 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, this will be Bench

Page 18

1 Request, actually, No. 3, since we have two other
 2 bench requests.
 3 When do you think you would be able to get
 4 those to us?
 5 MR. COMPTON: I can have them in e-mail
 6 within the next 15, 20 minutes.
 7 JUDGE KOPTA: By the end of tomorrow.
 8 We will give you even more than 15 minutes. That
 9 would be great. Thank you.
 10 MR. BEATTIE: Judge Kopta, this is
 11 Julian Beattie, Counsel Staff. Just for clarity of
 12 the record, EOC is not a party to this proceeding.
 13 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Thank you very much
 14 for clarifying that. I do know that. I am just
 15 trying to develop a chronology of events here.
 16 MR. COMPTON: One more question. Who do
 17 I send that to?
 18 JUDGE KOPTA: You would send it to our
 19 records center, UTC.wa.gov -- records@UTC.wa.gov.
 20 MR. COMPTON: Records@ UTC.wa.gov.
 21 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. And address it to
 22 Steve King, executive director and secretary.
 23 MR. COMPTON: Very good, sir.
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.
 25 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Mr. Compton, when you

Page 19

1 first responded to inquiries from our agency, or when
 2 your agency did, I should say, it was communicated to
 3 us that the -- either that the calls didn't happen or
 4 there -- there seemed to be some misunderstanding. I
 5 was just wondering when those calls came in to you,
 6 the ones for example, let me see here, on -- I have
 7 the date here -- on 12/09 at -- so December 9th you
 8 would have received some -- some calls, and what --
 9 how would those have been responded to?
 10 MR. COMPTON: In some cases we received
 11 these via phone call. In other cases we received them
 12 via a hard copy report from the National Response
 13 Center. In most of the cases we expect to receive
 14 both, a phone call and a report.
 15 We will receive one of those first, then we
 16 will act on that, whichever ones come in first. So if
 17 it is a phone call, we will page out; if it's after
 18 hours, we will page out the Ecology responder, provide
 19 the information to them. And then if we get an NRC
 20 following after the fact, we will forward that to them
 21 via e-mail as well. The same thing with the local
 22 jurisdiction.
 23 As far as our notification to the Utilities
 24 and Transportation Commission, we will generate an
 25 e-mail summary of the event and send it to them.

Page 20

1 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: You used the term
 2 RC, what is -- I think I heard you --
 3 MR. COMPTON: Oh, NRC. National
 4 Response --
 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: NRC. Thank you.
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: And so did that happen
 7 in all cases with the -- with the calls that were made
 8 from BNSF to the EOC, in the incidents that we have
 9 under review today? Are you aware of some that may
 10 have been called in or e-mailed to your agency, but
 11 that were not then communicated with the UTC?
 12 MR. COMPTON: I do have the records on
 13 each one here. All of the information that we
 14 provided to the UTC, I have a copy of with me today.
 15 There is unfortunately a human element involved,
 16 especially when we are talking about after hours. As
 17 it gets later in the day, people's minds get a little
 18 cloudier.
 19 It is also a fact that we are not handling
 20 just hazardous material spills, but a number of other
 21 spills, or a number of other types of events, such as
 22 weather events and other things that are going on in
 23 the state. And so I will admit that there are times
 24 where our duty officers will slide on a particular
 25 notification that they should, by SOP, accomplish.

Page 21

1 In regards to the specific -- was it
 2 December the 9th?
 3 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Well, I'm looking at
 4 one, for example, on Attachment 8 to the Bench -- to
 5 Bench Request No. 1.
 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Do you have that
 7 bench request response?
 8 MR. COMPTON: I have it in my e-mail,
 9 but I don't have it before me.
 10 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Mr. Beattie, do
 11 you have a copy with you that you can share?
 12 MR. BEATTIE: Commissioner Rendahl, I
 13 don't have a clean copy.
 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. All right.
 15 MR. DiJULIO: (Complies.)
 16 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Again, I am not
 17 looking to go event by event, I'm just -- I'm just
 18 trying to get a sense of -- there were some that
 19 apparently fell through the cracks. I am trying to
 20 understand when it was determined that they fell
 21 through the cracks and how did it get communicated to
 22 the UTC that there had been no calls made.
 23 MR. COMPTON: Okay. This particular one
 24 that I am looking at was opened at 17:16. Just a
 25 moment.

Page 22

1 All right. So on this particular one, it was
 2 received at 5:16 in the afternoon. It was a
 3 notification of an occurrence that happened at 10:45
 4 that day in Vancouver. On the back of each report --
 5 this one only contains the front, but on the back of
 6 it, it has a record of the notifications that were
 7 made. I do see here that no notification to the UTC
 8 was made or documented, on the reports that I have
 9 here in front of me.

10 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So how is it that we
 11 received -- in response to our inquiries, that no
 12 calls had come in?

13 MR. COMPTON: This particular one here,
 14 there is no call listed on it. It was an NRC-only
 15 report.

16 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. And when was it
 17 discovered that a call had come in?

18 MR. COMPTON: I don't see any
 19 documentation here that a call did come in.

20 This may be one that I discussed with
 21 Mrs. Young a short time ago via e-mail, in which they
 22 have records, phone records, of an actual call. That
 23 call was not documented on the paperwork.

24 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. So that would
 25 have been brought to your attention, then, by

Page 23

1 Burlington Northern?

2 MR. COMPTON: It was, in fact, brought
 3 to my attention by Ms. Young.

4 CHAIRMAN DANNER: By Ms. Young. Okay.
 5 And so we can assume in that instance that a
 6 call was made and no record was made of the call?

7 MR. COMPTON: I believe that that would
 8 be the case.

9 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.

10 And then can you tell me what steps have been
 11 made to ensure that we are not going to continue to
 12 have things fall through the cracks?

13 MR. COMPTON: Both myself and the EOC
 14 supervisor, my supervisor, have sat with the duty
 15 officer team and reinforced the importance -- the
 16 legal importance of the work that we do in the Alert
 17 and Warning Center.

18 The best we could do is basically reinforce
 19 what the SOP states. It's very plainly stated in
 20 there what notifications we have to make, including
 21 those to the UTC. It's very plainly stated how we
 22 record what we need to document. When a slip-up is
 23 made, all we can do is address that with that
 24 individual duty officer.

25 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Is the desk staffed

Page 24

1 24/7?

2 MR. COMPTON: It is.

3 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. So it really
 4 shouldn't matter what time of day a call comes in --

5 MR. COMPTON: That's correct.

6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: -- somebody is there.

7 MR. COMPTON: That's correct.

8 Another -- sometimes it can be an issue, is we
 9 do have two duty officers. If we have a number of
 10 calls that come in, and they do tend to come in large
 11 clumps, clusters, and one handles the actual call
 12 regarding a particular spill and the other one picks
 13 up a call that is related to that spill and jots down
 14 information. Another thing that I have been trying to
 15 reinforce with them is the communication back and
 16 forth between the two duty officers on duty at any
 17 given time. It's so important that that -- that call
 18 that the second duty officer receives gets documented
 19 on the original documents, which the other duty
 20 officer actually has possession of. So there is some
 21 slip-ups that can occur in that regard.

22 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So what comfort can
 23 you give to the Commission and to the public that
 24 we've got this under control and that when calls come
 25 in, they are not -- I mean I know you are dealing with

Page 25

1 Oso and bridges going down and every other thing. How
 2 can I be sure that in the future, that when these
 3 calls come in, they are going to be processed, as you
 4 have laid out in your SOP?

5 MR. COMPTON: It is a major point of
 6 emphasis to the duty officers in regards to the legal
 7 ramifications of the work that we do in that office.
 8 It is constantly reinforced. In fact, an e-mail went
 9 out to them in regards to this hearing as a
 10 reinforcement.

11 All we can do is continue to monitor them and
 12 receive information and feedback from our partners in
 13 regards to anything that is occurring that seems to be
 14 not according to that SOP.

15 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.

16 And then under your SOP you also notify
 17 Ecology when there is a spill?

18 MR. COMPTON: They are the primary party
 19 that we notify, yes.

20 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. All right.
 21 Well, thank you very much. I appreciate your
 22 attention to this matter, so that we make sure we
 23 have -- the SOP is followed and that we -- we have the
 24 information that we need, because we do rely on the
 25 EOC for that information.

Page 26

1 JUDGE KOPTA: I would like to follow up
 2 on a couple of questions, if I might.
 3 So you said that something did come in either
 4 by telephone or by some other means. What is the
 5 other means it might come in?
 6 MR. COMPTON: The National Response
 7 Center sends us reports via fax and e-mail.
 8 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.
 9 MR. COMPTON: We will receive it --
 10 usually, those two come in simultaneously. It makes
 11 for an easier reporting process. We can forward the
 12 NRC to the UTC and other partners.
 13 JUDGE KOPTA: Does every call have both
 14 a phone call component and another component?
 15 MR. COMPTON: No.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: Is there any record of
 17 phone calls, other than a live person jotting it down?
 18 MR. COMPTON: Well, it does get recorded
 19 upon the forms for each incident.
 20 JUDGE KOPTA: But it is a person that
 21 actually is on the phone and jots that down, there's
 22 no recording of the telephone call?
 23 MR. COMPTON: There are recordings. At
 24 this point in time our recording system has a few
 25 technical glitches to it, but we can definitely see if

Page 27

1 we can recover phone calls, if you have a particular
 2 one in mind.
 3 JUDGE KOPTA: No, I was just wondering
 4 what kind of record, other than a human being writing
 5 something down. Is there any requirement for a
 6 confirming e-mail after a telephone call?
 7 MR. COMPTON: A confirming e-mail to
 8 who?
 9 JUDGE KOPTA: From the person who made
 10 the phone call to the person who received it, just to
 11 say, Following up on our conversation, here are the
 12 details, or --
 13 MR. COMPTON: No requirement.
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: Is that something that you
 15 have considered doing?
 16 MR. COMPTON: Well, there's not a lot we
 17 can do to require a commercial entity to do anything
 18 beyond what they decide they are going to do in
 19 regards to reporting. They have specific legal
 20 requirements for reporting spills to us. As far as
 21 the administrative piece behind there, I am not aware
 22 of anything that would give us any kind of leverage to
 23 require them to do more than make the call.
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: So from your
 25 understanding, what is the obligation of a private

Page 28

1 entity, just either a phone call or through the NPC?
 2 MR. COMPTON: I don't know the
 3 particulars of the law. I do know that companies that
 4 handle hazardous materials are required to report
 5 spills of those materials. Our number is published on
 6 the Department of Ecology website as a primary.
 7 During the day, our primary thing is
 8 waterborne spills. Those are required by law to come
 9 to the Alert and Warning Center. We don't -- we also
 10 accept other types of spills during the day as well,
 11 and provide that information on to the Department of
 12 Ecology. We really don't take on the full
 13 responsibility of that until after the five o'clock
 14 hour, when the Department of Ecology closes. At that
 15 point, we become their answering service. We have a
 16 list of responders for each of their four regional
 17 offices that are on call for any given day. When we
 18 receive a call, we notify them and pass it on to them,
 19 as well as, as I said earlier, the local jurisdiction
 20 and any ancillary partner, such as the UTC.
 21 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Thank you.
 22 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Mr. Compton, when the
 23 desk receives a call, how quickly do you turn that
 24 around and notify the UTC or the Department of
 25 Ecology?

Page 29

1 MR. COMPTON: Our requirement to the
 2 Department of Ecology is within 25 minutes. Normally,
 3 it's between 5 and 10 minutes of hanging up that phone
 4 that we are speaking with them.
 5 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 6 MR. COMPTON: And it depends on how
 7 quickly they get back to us. The system for
 8 notification of them, especially after hours, is a
 9 pager system. We page them out, wait for their call
 10 back. If we don't hear from them within ten minutes,
 11 repeat the page. We do have a backup for each
 12 regional office as well. If we cannot reach the
 13 primary within 15 minutes or so, we will go to the
 14 backup.
 15 CHAIRMAN DANNER: And what about the
 16 UTC?
 17 MR. COMPTON: The UTC has required us --
 18 or not required, but they have asked us to basically
 19 keep them informed via e-mail. There is no call-out
 20 process for them or anything, unless there is
 21 something really significant that occurs. Now, that's
 22 somewhat subjective. And if something amazingly large
 23 occurs, standardly I will get a call as well, because
 24 there is a potential of activation of the EOC.
 25 CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right.

Page 30

1 So let me ask Mr. Pratt, then. So there's a
 2 requirement that calls be made within 30 minutes from
 3 the Railroad to the EOC. The EOC then turns around
 4 and contacts you. Generally e-mail, but if a, quote,
 5 really significant event occurs, then they will
 6 contact you by phone. The 30-minute deadline suggests
 7 that time is of the essence. It seems that time is
 8 important. So when a call comes to the UTC, whether
 9 it's an e-mail or a telephone call, what is our
 10 standard operating procedure?
 11 MR. PRATT: Okay. As Mr. Compton said,
 12 I think that primarily will depend upon the
 13 seriousness of the call. The issue we are talking
 14 about here, about hazardous materials releases,
 15 generally our job there is to be made aware of them,
 16 to understand.
 17 Because Ecology is the responding agency, one
 18 question -- it's really not even a question, one
 19 statement they make to me during those calls, or in
 20 e-mail, is that Ecology was notified. That's my
 21 primary concern there, if there's a spill that Ecology
 22 knows about it, that they are on track. Our case,
 23 from that point, is to make sure we are aware of it,
 24 we have record of it, and if action is required that
 25 we take it. We do not generally take action on

Page 31

1 hazardous material spills because it is outside of our
 2 expertise.
 3 The issues we might take action on would be if
 4 there was a collision, a derailment, a fatality, we
 5 might send staff out to the location if we believe
 6 that it is critical. We would also coordinate with
 7 the FRA. A lot of times if we get a call of a serious
 8 issue, say there's a derailment, I might contact the
 9 FRA. We will coordinate our resources with them.
 10 Generally, they are the lead agency in that point of
 11 view there, but often we hear before them. I would
 12 say probably in the last year FRA has also asked to be
 13 added to this notification list now, so they get it
 14 too.
 15 Our job there is to coordinate and make sure
 16 we respond as necessary, dependent upon the incident.
 17 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. So let's say
 18 that 1,611 gallons leaked and we are notified within
 19 30 minutes. What would be the action that you would
 20 take if you knew that Ecology had been notified, or
 21 perhaps you are notified and Ecology hasn't been, or
 22 you're not told whether Ecology has --
 23 MR. PRATT: No, generally I do. That's
 24 generally something they report to me. They will say,
 25 Ecology has been notified, yes or no?

Page 32

1 If there is a spill like that and Ecology has
 2 not been notified, my job would be to contact them
 3 right away, or ask EOC to contact them right away.
 4 They disperse the spill response. They would get
 5 somebody out there to contain it and clean up.
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: But you wouldn't --
 7 there's no urgency on your part to get a UTC inspector
 8 up to that facility?
 9 MR. PRATT: Not specifically on a spill.
 10 Again, it would depend upon the seriousness of it.
 11 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 12 MR. PRATT: I can think of some
 13 scenarios maybe where we would want to send somebody
 14 up, but primarily we would want to make sure that
 15 somebody was there cleaning it up.
 16 Most of these issues fall under FRA
 17 jurisdiction. We would make sure that FRA had an
 18 inspector on their way. Often, if they don't, we
 19 would send one in their place.
 20 CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right.
 21 So in a number of cases -- and maybe this is
 22 for Mr. Hellman -- the calls were not -- they were
 23 made on the same day, but they were not made within 30
 24 minutes. There's a number of instances of this. In
 25 the Railroad's opinion, is there a time criticality to

Page 33

1 making a report within 30 minutes?
 2 MR. HELLMAN: Certainly, Mr. Chairman,
 3 we make every effort to comply with laws and
 4 regulations where we are operating. Safety is the
 5 number one priority of our railroad.
 6 My understanding is that in this situation,
 7 there was concern over conflicting Washington state
 8 regulations. BNSF has made notifications using
 9 Washington Department of Ecology spill notice
 10 criteria, but through productive discussions with the
 11 UTC regarding the reporting of potential releases,
 12 they may not otherwise trigger a report to the EOC
 13 under Ecology guidelines. BNSF has now expanded its
 14 reporting in an effort to capture those isolated
 15 incidents where a report to Ecology may not be
 16 required.
 17 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So Ecology wouldn't
 18 require you to report a spill to them within 30
 19 minutes, but the UTC might; is that what you
 20 are saying?
 21 MR. HELLMAN: What I am saying is I
 22 think there was perhaps some confusion about
 23 overlapping regulations and that protocols that were
 24 in place to ensure that we were meeting regulations
 25 through Ecology were somehow confused with what

Page 34

1 that responsibility -- how that responsibility
 2 translates to the UTC.
 3 CHAIRMAN DANNER: But in either case,
 4 you would have been required to notify the EOC; is
 5 that correct?
 6 MR. HELLMAN: My understanding is that
 7 we did notify the EOC on the possible spillage that we
 8 felt would have been captured underneath the laws and
 9 regulations of the State.
 10 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. But in a number
 11 of these cases it wasn't within the 30-minute
 12 deadline.
 13 MR. HELLMAN: I think some of those
 14 were -- were argued within the settlement agreement,
 15 or discussed within the agreement, and that the
 16 agreement reflects the best communication between our
 17 organization, the UTC, the State of Washington, in
 18 terms of how those actually came. I believe there was
 19 some discussion and possibly some conflict over what
 20 exactly was reported or reportable and when those
 21 reports were made.
 22 MR. DiJULIO: From the statement,
 23 Commissioner Danner, it is clear that there was some
 24 reporting that was not right within the 30 minutes.
 25 Some of that is directly related to where the calls

Page 35

1 started. In some cases, as reflected by reporting,
 2 the calls came directly from local people at BNSF
 3 in -- on the ground, in the state of Washington. In
 4 other cases, the calls went to a desk in Fort Worth,
 5 that is charged by -- that is -- it's a 24/7 emergency
 6 hotline, that the Railroad publishes, that the UTC and
 7 EOC has, that is reporting -- any incident reported
 8 immediately. Sometimes the calls come out of that
 9 desk to the reporting agencies.
 10 As Mr. Hellman indicated, one of the questions
 11 that arose last fall, that has now been reconciled in
 12 the course of these discussions, is that BNSF has
 13 created an app for all of its personnel. It has all
 14 of the reporting requirements in the 30-plus states
 15 that have reporting separately from the National
 16 Response Center, the NRC, to make sure that any spill
 17 gets reported, whether it falls within some of the
 18 jurisdictional limits that may differ, depending what
 19 jurisdiction you're in, because it differs.
 20 Some reporting is required by the NRC, that --
 21 or some reporting is required at the State of
 22 Washington level, that is not required at the NRC.
 23 That was one of the tensions. Ecology has generally
 24 adopted the NRC standard. We have -- BNSF, for its
 25 part, isn't paying attention to any distinctions, it

Page 36

1 is reporting everything. I will state that for --
 2 from an internal standpoint, the goal of the -- of
 3 BNSF, both locally and at the national desk in Fort
 4 Worth, is to report within 15 minutes, not half an
 5 hour now.
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. Well, I
 7 appreciate that.
 8 I understand that, you know, we are in a
 9 federal system and you operate in many states, but I
 10 also believe that -- that with planning and resources
 11 that -- that you can satisfy all of the various
 12 masters that you have. I am happy to hear about that
 13 progress.
 14 So I next want to turn to --
 15 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chairman Danner,
 16 may I ask a few questions --
 17 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Oh, sure.
 18 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- before you
 19 turn to another --
 20 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Do you want to stay on
 21 this topic for a while?
 22 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes.
 23 CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right.
 24 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That makes sense.
 25 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Go right ahead.

Page 37

1 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I just have a
 2 few.
 3 This is for both Staff and for Mr. Compton.
 4 If you could both talk about this, whether you have
 5 had conversations with the 24/7 call center staff, and
 6 the call center staff, to talk about particularly
 7 these railroad reporting incidents. It sounds like,
 8 Mr. Compton, from what you have said, that you have
 9 been reminding your staff about the importance of
 10 this. Have the two agencies had conversations about
 11 this?
 12 MR. COMPTON: We have had regular
 13 conversations, primarily my supervisor and myself,
 14 with Dave Pratt and with Ms. Young, through e-mails
 15 and telephone.
 16 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And Ms. Young or
 17 Mr. Pratt?
 18 MR. PRATT: Yes, I would agree with
 19 that. We have had multiple conversations since this
 20 case started, to make sure we understood procedures.
 21 We talked about the problems that occurred and their
 22 assurances that those were corrected.
 23 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So are you
 24 confident at this point, that you think any -- any
 25 misunderstandings or lack of follow-through have been

Page 38

1 corrected?

2 MR. PRATT: I've been given the

3 assurances, yes.

4 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.

5 And Mr. Compton?

6 MR. COMPTON: I think it can be

7 documented through the e-mails that we have been

8 sending to them, based on the reports that we have

9 received over the last few months.

10 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thanks.

11 That's all I have on this particular question

12 about the EOC, so thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Mr. Jones, do you have

14 any questions at this time?

15 COMMISSIONER JONES: No.

16 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.

17 So I wanted to ask the -- to get some

18 clarification on this issue of possession, if you

19 will. As I understand it, when there is a leak and it

20 is discovered on a shipper's property, even though

21 that leak may have happened for a thousand miles on

22 the track, and may be actually leaking on the track,

23 if it's not discovered until it is on the shipper's

24 property, then it is not a reportable incident. Is

25 that the understanding?

Page 39

1 I don't know if this is directed to counsel or

2 if this is directed at witnesses, but I will throw it

3 out there for whoever feels that they can help me

4 clarify that information.

5 MR. DiJULIO: As indicated in the

6 settlement, that's one of the disputed areas of

7 concern. It is the position of BNSF that when the

8 piece of equipment is no longer under control of the

9 railroad, then the railroad has no further

10 responsibility for it. In the case of the incident

11 that was cited regarding November 5th, not only was it

12 not on BNSF trackage, it was not on BNSF property, and

13 it was not under the control of the Railroad. As I

14 suspect, the Commission understands the Railroad

15 doesn't own most of the cars that are operating.

16 So our position, legal position, but certainly

17 not for purposes of settlement, is that when the leak

18 is discovered, it is the responsibility of the entity

19 that controls the facility, controls the track,

20 controls the train, that is responsible for reporting.

21 As it turns out, nevertheless, BNSF did report it to

22 the NRC in that case.

23 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So, you know -- and

24 this -- this is -- I struggle with this one because in

25 some ways this sounds like it could be, you know, a

Page 40

1 high-speed chase, where you are trying to get across

2 the state line, where you are absolved of

3 responsibility. In this case, you may have a leak

4 that occurs in Montana and Idaho and Washington, gets

5 to the shipper's property, crosses the line, and the

6 Railroad has no duty to either inspect its trains

7 along the way or a duty to notify the EOC, even though

8 it may know about the leak before the shipper does.

9 I guess if -- if that is the position of the

10 Railroad, it seems a rather -- a rather technical one,

11 as opposed to a policy-based one. I am just

12 wondering, is there any other responsibility that the

13 Railroad has when it is on the track before it gets

14 across the state line to the shipper's property?

15 MR. DiJULIO: Well, answering the

16 broader question, and unrelated to the specifics of

17 this incident, BNSF is very much concerned about that,

18 and I suspect the Commission is aware of the issue.

19 In fact, the -- one of the more clearer exposures in

20 this particular case relates to an incident that was

21 not reported, regarding what are known as McKenzie

22 valves, a piece of equipment that is not owned by the

23 Railroad, a piece of equipment on a car that has been

24 a cause of concern. That is the Railroad's concern,

25 that it is in fact resulting in spillage of product

Page 41

1 and is addressing that.

2 It is not the fact that, you know, it is

3 running across state lines. It does have the

4 responsibility under the national standards for

5 inspection of its trains, and does in fact inspect

6 those trains throughout the course of the transit from

7 point to point. And some of the investigation --

8 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So where -- where does

9 that inspection take place?

10 MR. DiJULIO: It depends on where the

11 train is. Obviously, if the train is moving, there is

12 not going to be an opportunity for inspection.

13 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Sure.

14 MR. DiJULIO: But as I think indicated

15 by Ms. Young's investigation, and UTC's own

16 investigation, when they are in yard, when they are in

17 switching areas, then there is a presence of an

18 inspection. In fact, in the Pasco yard, which is one

19 of the large yards in the state, there were two

20 incidents that were reported by -- as a result of a

21 UTC inspection of the trains.

22 There is an opportunity, and the Railroad

23 will -- does inspect those cars, those trains, when it

24 is in a position to do so. Traditionally, typically,

25 in yards, beginning, middle, when it is in stoppage

Page 42

1 position, and at the end, typically.
 2 CHAIRMAN DANNER: And so just as a
 3 general matter, an oil train that is leaving
 4 North Dakota, going west, it will stop in yards along
 5 the way in almost every case. They don't just go as
 6 an entire train all the way to Cherry Point, for
 7 example?
 8 MR. DiJULIO: There are two questions
 9 there. The question is as an entire train. The
 10 trains that typically leave North Dakota are unit
 11 trains. They are trains of approximately 100 cars in
 12 size, engines, plus buffer cars on either end, so
 13 maybe 106, 108 cars total in length. Those unit
 14 trains go from point -- from point of origination to
 15 point of destination. The assemblage of the cars
 16 occurs at the point of origination, in North Dakota.
 17 CHAIRMAN DANNER: And it doesn't change
 18 until --
 19 MR. DiJULIO: And it doesn't typically
 20 change until it gets to the refinery, point of
 21 delivery, shipper, wherever it's going.
 22 But those unit trains are going to stop at
 23 some point along the way for switching, as they move
 24 from one track to another track, in order to get to
 25 where they are located. That's when the Railroad does

Page 43

1 inspect trains.
 2 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Is that inspection
 3 something that happens regularly? Is that part of
 4 their operating procedures, or it just doesn't --
 5 happen happenstance, if there's an --
 6 MR. DiJULIO: It's part --
 7 CHAIRMAN DANNER: -- inspector in the
 8 yard?
 9 MR. DiJULIO: It's part of the operating
 10 procedures.
 11 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 12 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Mr. DiJulio, I
 13 would assume, too, that there are hours of operation
 14 requirements for the locomotive engineers, that they
 15 have to stop to change engineers at some point between
 16 South Dakota or North Dakota?
 17 I may have to ask your experts here.
 18 MR. DiJULIO: But I don't know whether
 19 they change on the fly or whether the train physically
 20 stops or not.
 21 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Right.
 22 MR. HELLMAN: The train would physically
 23 stop and they would change out the crew. That happens
 24 regularly between North Dakota and the final
 25 destination, wherever that may be.

Page 44

1 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And when you
 2 change out a crew, do you do any -- did they do any
 3 inspection of the train, to make sure that the
 4 locomotive engineer, who is taking possession of the
 5 train and driving it, knows that the condition of the
 6 train is a certain way?
 7 MR. HELLMAN: Correct, there is a set of
 8 operating procedures that they go through. There is
 9 an actual whole manual that travels with the train
 10 crew. There's a set of procedures that they go
 11 through when they stop that train, when they secure
 12 the train, when they pass that train over, with the
 13 idea that they are going to be handing the next crew a
 14 safe train. The next crew that's coming online will
 15 also be ensuring that that train is safe.
 16 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I am assuming
 17 that with this valve issue that's been identified,
 18 that there is a procedure now to make sure that the
 19 valves are secure and not leaking?
 20 MR. HELLMAN: In terms of the McKenzie
 21 valve, Mr. DiJulio may be best to answer that question
 22 because the McKenzie valve issue is an ongoing issue.
 23 I can say that the issue of the McKenzie valves has
 24 been highlighted within the railroad and that those
 25 people who are working with those trains are aware of

Page 45

1 that and are particularly sensitive to the possible
 2 challenges that those valves may create.
 3 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Actually, I would like
 4 to follow up on that.
 5 So these are valves that we know have had
 6 defects, that have led to some leakage, yet they are
 7 still being -- they are still being used, the cars
 8 that they are on are still being used; is that
 9 correct?
 10 MR. HELLMAN: Well, my understanding is
 11 that the Railroad has raised those issues and they are
 12 being discussed at a higher level, within the federal
 13 bureaucracy, I imagine.
 14 Part of the challenge that we have is that we
 15 operate the trains. We don't always necessarily own
 16 the cars that we are moving with and therefore have
 17 limited authority over the rolling stock that might be
 18 moving on our railroad.
 19 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So even --
 20 MR. HELLMAN: There's a whole set of
 21 issues that --
 22 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Even if a tank has
 23 been identified as having a defective valve that is
 24 prone to leakage, that you wouldn't be able to tell
 25 the tank car company or the shipper that you want

Page 46

1 to -- you don't want to take that car at this time?
 2 MR. HELLMAN: Well, not in all
 3 circumstances. You know, you would have to go through
 4 a process where the other side would provide their
 5 evidence, and there would be a discussion as to
 6 whether or not the issues that we raise are accurate
 7 or whether or not the issues that they raise are
 8 accurate. So even though we may not agree with a
 9 piece of rolling stock or say something like a valve,
 10 we don't always have control over that. The best
 11 control we have is to ensure that people are aware of
 12 those issues and are taking necessary steps to ensure
 13 that that won't come back and create a safety issue
 14 while it is under our authority.
 15 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Are you aware of any
 16 FRA or other federal government review of McKenzie
 17 valves?
 18 MR. HELLMAN: I am going to defer to
 19 Ms. Wallace on that.
 20 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Thank you.
 21 Ms. Wallace?
 22 MS. WALLACE: So the federal government
 23 and the federal regulators are aware of the issue.
 24 They --
 25 CHAIRMAN DANNER: And the federal what,

Page 47

1 I'm sorry?
 2 MS. WALLACE: The federal regulators are
 3 aware of the issue.
 4 A notification has gone out to the shippers,
 5 so the owners of the tank cars are required -- and I
 6 can get you the exact timing, I'm happy to do that and
 7 send that to you, about the exact timing of when the
 8 valves need to be replaced.
 9 I know several of the tank car owners here in
 10 the state of Washington are actively working on, with
 11 the tank car manufacturers, to get those replacements
 12 in and to meet that deadline. I believe the deadline
 13 is -- I will get you the exact time line and send that
 14 to you. But there has been a notification and a
 15 requirement sent out to all the owners of the tank
 16 cars to get those valves replaced.
 17 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. I don't know
 18 insofar as it is a federal document, can we take
 19 notice of it if we obtain it or do you want to do a
 20 bench request?
 21 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, just for
 22 clarification, let's make it a bench request. We will
 23 make it Bench Request 4.
 24 Mr. DiJulio, since you are a party, when do
 25 you expect that you would be able to get us that?

Page 48

1 CHAIRMAN DANNER: And our staff may
 2 already have it.
 3 MR. DiJULIO: It is common information,
 4 it's been widely publicized, it has been put out. We
 5 should -- we will get it to the information center for
 6 this record by the close of business on Wednesday the
 7 21st.
 8 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.
 9 CHAIRMAN DANNER: I did notice
 10 Mr. Lewis's nod, in the back of the room, that he
 11 actually has this document in his possession. If you
 12 would rather just have him distribute it, we can do it
 13 that way as well.
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: Since this is on the
 15 record, why don't we just go ahead and have you
 16 provide it to us. It makes for a cleaner record if
 17 the party provides it.
 18 MR. DiJULIO: That's fine, happy to do
 19 so.
 20 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Mr. DiJulio, is
 21 there a standing sort of fix? I am assuming that the
 22 Railroad or the manufacturer or FRA has come up with
 23 some kind of temporary fix so that we don't have
 24 railroads running around with leaking valves operating
 25 right now. Is there one in effect?

Page 49

1 MS. WALLACE: Yes. I actually just
 2 pulled up the directive from the FRA. There is a fix.
 3 They have outlined two. It's pretty technical, but
 4 basically it is going to be replacing a certain type
 5 of 3-inch ball valve with the correct 1- or 2-inch
 6 valves.
 7 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So before they
 8 replace those valves, is there some way to ensure,
 9 like putting in another, I don't know --
 10 MS. WALLACE: Another fix?
 11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- washer, for
 12 lack of a better term.
 13 MS. WALLACE: Yes, I believe there is.
 14 I am not an engineer or a technical expert on this,
 15 but it is in the directive that I believe Staff has
 16 and that we will send out as well.
 17 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So right
 18 now we don't -- there is no leaking valve at the --
 19 they are not leaking because there has been a
 20 temporary fix, but the valve issue is being corrected?
 21 MS. WALLACE: There is a directive right
 22 now, and I know the tank car owners are working very
 23 closely to address the issue.
 24 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Are you aware --
 25 MR. DiJULIO: They don't all leak, but

Page 50

1 some -- but enough of them do leak that it is a
 2 problem.
 3 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Thank you for that
 4 clarification.
 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Because of that, are
 7 there any changes to the Railroad's operations, such
 8 as more frequent inspections, or anything along those
 9 lines?
 10 MS. WALLACE: We are working very
 11 closely with the owners of the tank cars to make sure
 12 that they are in compliance with the directive,
 13 providing any technical expertise that they may
 14 request. We are in constant communication with them
 15 on which tank cars may be affected. Again, not all
 16 tank cars are impacted. We do know that most of our
 17 customers and shippers are working very closely to
 18 make sure that this issue does get resolved.
 19 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. But there's
 20 no -- no change in the Railroad's operating procedures
 21 with regard to inspections or something like that?
 22 MS. WALLACE: No.
 23 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 24 MS. WALLACE: Our inspections continue.
 25 And the one thing I will add on --

Page 51

1 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Do you mean continue
 2 in the way they would if it were an oil train or if it
 3 were any other commodity being shipped?
 4 MS. WALLACE: Correct. And we do have
 5 stricter operating procedures on unit trains, crude by
 6 rail, and those have been going on in voluntary
 7 measures over the last 18 months or so.
 8 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. Thank you.
 9 If I may, so once the train moves onto the
 10 refinery property or the shipper's property and a leak
 11 is detected by -- let's -- I mean, in some cases it's
 12 the FRA inspectors, but let's -- if it's -- if it's
 13 determined -- if it's identified by an employee of the
 14 refinery, what obligation does the refinery have to
 15 call the EOC or the Department of Ecology?
 16 MR. DiJULIO: Well, my response is that
 17 they have the same responsibility for spill reporting
 18 as any of us do in that regard.
 19 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. And so is
 20 that -- have you received -- Mr. Compton, have you
 21 received calls from shippers or refiners about rail --
 22 oil leaks on trains?
 23 MR. COMPTON: Primarily, when it comes
 24 to a train leak, they are calls from the rail owner,
 25 whether it be Union Pacific, BNSF, whoever it is.

Page 52

1 CHAIRMAN DANNER: But to clarify, from
 2 the railroad?
 3 MR. COMPTON: Exactly.
 4 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Not the tank car owner
 5 or the refiner, but from --
 6 MR. COMPTON: That's true.
 7 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Burlington Northern
 8 or UP or another rail line?
 9 MR. COMPTON: However, we do receive
 10 calls from refineries and others about spills that are
 11 on the scene. I cannot tell you -- there's so many.
 12 There's I think in the neighborhood of 3,000 a year,
 13 somewhat more than that, that are received from all of
 14 the people throughout the state to the alert warning
 15 center. I can't give you a specific case of whether
 16 or not it was a railcar or if it was just being
 17 reported as --
 18 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Yeah, so -- so you
 19 don't -- do you know whether they are required to
 20 notify you?
 21 MR. COMPTON: I do not. We receive the
 22 calls based on -- the Ecology folks are the ones that
 23 are the actual legal authority in our review. We just
 24 receive the calls and pass the information on.
 25 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Mr. Beattie or

Page 53

1 Mr. DiJulio, do you have information in regard to the
 2 obligation of the shippers?
 3 MR. BEATTIE: Chairman Danner, I am not
 4 aware of any other -- you know, any obligations on
 5 shippers or refiners, I haven't done that research.
 6 The WAC that is at issue in this case only applies to
 7 railroad companies.
 8 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. All right.
 9 JUDGE KOPTA: Moving on? I have a
 10 couple of questions.
 11 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Yes, go ahead.
 12 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. DiJulio, does the
 13 railroad have a contractual arrangement with each of
 14 its shippers?
 15 MR. DiJULIO: Yes.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: And as part of the terms
 17 and conditions, is there anything in there about
 18 reporting, in terms of spills on the property? Does
 19 the shipper have any obligation to inform the Railroad
 20 if there is a spill from one of the cars that's been
 21 delivered to its property?
 22 MR. DiJULIO: I don't know the answer to
 23 that question.
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: In this one incident that
 25 is listed in the response to the bench request and is

Page 54

1 part of the settlement agreement, the Railroad did in
 2 fact report this spill, even though it was on the
 3 shipper's property. Is that something that's part
 4 of -- maybe Mr. Hellman would know. Is that something
 5 that is part of the Railroad's standard procedure, if
 6 it learns of a spill, even if it's not responsible, it
 7 would go ahead and report it?
 8 MR. HELLMAN: Could you repeat the
 9 question, please?
 10 JUDGE KOPTA: Sure. In the first
 11 incident, the November 5th incident at the Blaine BP
 12 Cherry Point facility, that was on the shipper's
 13 property. The Railroad did in fact report that. Not
 14 to the EOC, I gather, but to perhaps the --
 15 MR. DiJULIO: NRC.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: -- NRC. Is that something
 17 that's part of the Railroad's normal procedure if it
 18 learns of a spill, even though it is not perhaps
 19 technically legally responsible for it, that it will
 20 report that?
 21 MR. HELLMAN: Yeah, I can't speak to the
 22 specifics of that.
 23 JUDGE KOPTA: Does the Railroad have any
 24 kind of a procedure or process to report spills that
 25 it learns of, even if it may not be ones that it

Page 55

1 believes it has a legal obligation to report?
 2 MR. HELLMAN: I don't know of one. I
 3 imagine it would be on a case-by-case basis. In this
 4 specific instance -- I don't know the specifics of
 5 this instance, so I really can't speak to it.
 6 MR. DiJULIO: I know that as a result of
 7 the recent emphasis on reporting, that the Fort Worth
 8 desk reports without evaluation, it just reports and
 9 worries about responsibility later.
 10 JUDGE KOPTA: So is it common for
 11 shippers to inform the Railroad when it discovers a
 12 spill on a tank car that's been delivered?
 13 MR. DiJULIO: We hope so.
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: Anything more than hope?
 15 MR. DiJULIO: I can't answer the
 16 question as to whether or not they are contractually
 17 obligated to do so.
 18 JUDGE KOPTA: But at least in this one
 19 instance they did in fact report it?
 20 MR. DiJULIO: Well, again, we believe
 21 that we received a report from them and reported
 22 accordingly, but we also could have been on site for
 23 some other reason and determined that there was a leak
 24 and reported it.
 25 JUDGE KOPTA: So at this point you don't

Page 56

1 know whether there is any kind of process in place for
 2 the Railroad to be informed by a shipper if there has
 3 been a spill on the shipper's property as a result of
 4 a tank car that's been delivered by the Railroad to
 5 the shipper?
 6 MR. DiJULIO: We cannot answer that
 7 question today.
 8 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you.
 9 COMMISSIONER JONES: Judge, I have a
 10 follow-up question on that.
 11 JUDGE KOPTA: Sure.
 12 COMMISSIONER JONES: So on this BP
 13 Cherry Point facility on November 5th, 2014, it is my
 14 understanding in this bench request that BNSF did
 15 report it to the NRC, correct?
 16 MR. DiJULIO: Correct.
 17 COMMISSIONER JONES: Now, is that under
 18 the control of the EPA, the Coast Guard? I'm a
 19 little -- do you know where that resides in the
 20 federal government, Mr. DiJulio?
 21 MR. DiJULIO: That's the Department of
 22 Transportation.
 23 COMMISSIONER JONES: It's DOT?
 24 MR. DiJULIO: Yes.
 25 COMMISSIONER JONES: But there was no

Page 57

1 report to the EOC by BNSF?
 2 MR. DiJULIO: Not in that case, correct.
 3 COMMISSIONER JONES: Mr. Compton, so did
 4 Savage report that? Did the shipper report that to
 5 the EOC?
 6 MR. COMPTON: I do not have any report
 7 at all on that particular day. I did print the log
 8 for November the 5th. I don't have anything in regard
 9 to this incident.
 10 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.
 11 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Again, Mr. Compton,
 12 just to clarify, when something is reported to the
 13 NRC, eventually -- or what is the process for them to
 14 get that information to you, or do you have to go find
 15 it from NRC?
 16 MR. COMPTON: It's an interesting
 17 question. They push the information, we don't -- we
 18 don't pull it.
 19 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 20 MR. COMPTON: The NRC that I'm speaking
 21 of, the National Response Center, it's my
 22 understanding it is governed by the U.S. Coast Guard.
 23 There may be two -- two governmental agencies here
 24 that we are talking about, that have a very similar
 25 acronym, I'm just not sure.

Page 58

1 MR. DiJULIO: It --
 2 COMMISSIONER JONES: Yeah, that's why --
 3 MR. DiJULIO: It is the Coast Guard, I
 4 apologize. I just -- frankly, I was thinking about
 5 all of this under DOT. It is the Coast Guard.
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: The Coast Guard used
 7 to be under the DOT.
 8 MR. DiJULIO: It used to be a long time
 9 ago.
 10 MR. COMPTON: So the only thing I can
 11 think of -- and I'm just talking off the cuff here, I
 12 have no specific knowledge of this particular incident
 13 because it did not come to us -- is since it was so
 14 close to the border, it may have been, by the NRC,
 15 construed as a north of the border-type station, as
 16 opposed to an actual state of Washington situation.
 17 Again, I am just talking right off the cuff here.
 18 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So if something
 19 happens in the far north of the United States, the NRC
 20 will have confusion --
 21 MR. COMPTON: I don't --
 22 CHAIRMAN DANNER: -- about where the
 23 boundary is?
 24 MR. COMPTON: -- know. I cannot answer
 25 that. I am just saying that's the only conceivable

Page 59

1 scenario in my head that would say that they did
 2 not -- as a reason why they would not forward it to
 3 us.
 4 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 5 MR. COMPTON: We get --
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: In most cases they
 7 will send you information when things get reported?
 8 MR. COMPTON: Exactly. Along with other
 9 partners, including the U.S. Coast Guard and others.
 10 COMMISSIONER JONES: So I have a few
 11 questions, if I could, for Mr. Hellman and BNSF.
 12 I'm a little confused about the improved
 13 enhanced reporting requirements that you briefly
 14 mentioned. So you are saying that all of your
 15 employees now have an app? Or Mr. DiJulio said that.
 16 MR. HELLMAN: Mr. DiJulio said that.
 17 COMMISSIONER JONES: So who has the app
 18 and who do they report to on that app? Does it go to
 19 NRC, the state EOC, somebody else? Just kind of
 20 clarify that for me, please.
 21 MR. DiJULIO: Because, as Commissioner
 22 Danner inquired about the fact the trains cross state
 23 lines, the Railroad wanted to be sure that its people
 24 were reporting properly when it gets information
 25 regarding a spill. What it did was created an app

Page 60

1 that has the reporting responsibilities for each of
 2 the states that the Railroad operates in, as well as
 3 the federal reporting responsibilities. So that if
 4 there is a call from North Dakota to the service
 5 interruption desk in Fort Worth, those people have the
 6 phone numbers and the reporting responsibilities there
 7 so they don't have to go look for it or figure out who
 8 to report to. It's all right there.
 9 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.
 10 MR. DiJULIO: So that's what that app is
 11 there to do, is to make sure that the folks on the
 12 ground know whom to call, where. And also the desk in
 13 Fort Worth knows that if -- for example, somebody on
 14 the ground in the Pasco yard didn't make the call, the
 15 person in Fort Worth knows to whom to make the call.
 16 So those are the --
 17 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.
 18 MR. DiJULIO: That's the purpose of that
 19 app, to inform the people to make sure the reporting
 20 gets done timely.
 21 COMMISSIONER JONES: I used to be in
 22 operations in my previous life. I am a big believer
 23 in single point of contact.
 24 Does that mean that the employee with the app
 25 has the ability to communicate directly with EOC state

Page 61

1 of Washington, EOC state of Oregon, or does everything
 2 have to go to the 7-by-24 active desk in Fort Worth?
 3 MR. DiJULIO: It depends upon the --
 4 well, first of all, everything has to be reported
 5 under BNSF's policies to the service interruption desk
 6 in Fort Worth. That desk, 24/7, is also responsible
 7 for reporting. Some of the reports are -- indicate
 8 here that some of the calls came from the operational
 9 people on the ground in the state of Washington,
 10 particularly Justin Piper, who is the -- who is not
 11 only stationed in the state of Washington, but is also
 12 the western assistant director for hazardous material.
 13 Because of his particular sensitivity to the EOC, he
 14 will personally call the EOC, in addition to placing
 15 his call to Fort Worth. And so because of the
 16 heightened sensitivity to this, EOC may be getting
 17 calls from two BNSF sources with respect to the same
 18 spill.
 19 COMMISSIONER JONES: Is that your
 20 understanding, too, Mr. Hellman, that BNSF, since a
 21 number of these incidents, is reporting almost any --
 22 I mean, the WAC 480-60-2310, in Sub A says "Release of
 23 any hazardous material." So what is -- are you
 24 reporting almost any hazardous material per the
 25 guidance that Mr. DiJulio just mentioned?

Page 62

1 MR. HELLMAN: That's correct,
 2 Commissioner. We have taken a more conservative
 3 approach.
 4 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.
 5 And then just briefly, if you would, before we
 6 move on to the next area of questions, describe how --
 7 just so I have an understanding, you talked about the
 8 various jurisdictions. You are responsible for B.C.,
 9 Oregon?
 10 MR. HELLMAN: Correct.
 11 COMMISSIONER JONES: So how do B.C. and
 12 Oregon differ and are similar to reporting
 13 requirements, that 30 minutes, in any hazardous
 14 material? How -- are they roughly similar to the
 15 state of Washington or not?
 16 MR. HELLMAN: Well, I think given the
 17 level of conservatism that we just described in
 18 approaching this, we are reflecting that in the areas
 19 that we serve, including B.C., and Oregon as well.
 20 Because we travel across 28 states throughout the
 21 West, we try to have kind of standard operating
 22 procedures as much as possible. The additional
 23 securities that we are seeking in Washington, we will
 24 likely be using those as well.
 25 I would also mention that Mr. Piper also

Page 63

1 covers the state of Oregon as well, so there is going
 2 to be consistency on an individual level, based on the
 3 information that Mr. DiJulio just communicated.
 4 COMMISSIONER JONES: Thank you.
 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you have
 6 adopted a 15-minute notification period, at least in
 7 Oregon, Washington, or all of your 28-state area?
 8 MR. HELLMAN: We are communicating as
 9 quickly as we can.
 10 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thanks.
 11 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So I want to ask next
 12 about the question -- there was a spill on
 13 January 25th, and it's the thirteenth item listed in
 14 Bench Request No. 1, and it talks about, What is a
 15 reportable incident? It says a Reportable incident
 16 is -- this was not one because it did not occur during
 17 the course of transportation in commerce. In this
 18 case, the lube oil leaked from the locomotive and was
 19 not being transported in commerce.
 20 Can you explain that distinction to me?
 21 MR. DiJULIO: Yes, the simplest way to
 22 explain it is that while there is a reporting
 23 requirement for -- and the comment was made with
 24 respect to UTC's jurisdiction. We all have
 25 responsibilities with respect to reporting of

Page 64

1 hazardous waste spills, whether it is the UTC's
 2 jurisdiction or subject to the state hazardous waste
 3 laws. The fact is, that if -- we are supposed to
 4 report an oil spill out of our car, it happens all the
 5 time. It is not a commodity in transit that is
 6 therefore subject to the Commission's jurisdiction and
 7 therefore not reportable, consistent with the
 8 Commission's regulation.
 9 That's the answer to that question. It's
 10 not -- internal lubrication material, whether it's in
 11 my engine or in the WUT -- or a BNSF locomotive, is
 12 not an item in commerce, not reportable as such.
 13 Whether it had a responsibility to report it to
 14 Ecology is a different issue, but it did not have a
 15 responsibility to report it to the UTC.
 16 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Basically, because
 17 there's a -- you are defining -- let me go back.
 18 MR. DiJULIO: It's a locomotive. It's
 19 not an item in commerce, it's not being transported,
 20 it is internal to the engine. If it is in a tank car,
 21 it is reportable.
 22 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So help me with this
 23 because I am reading 49 CFR 171.15. That is the CFR
 24 that has been adopted by reference by the UTC, as
 25 required to do. It says, Reportable incident. A

Page 65

1 telephone report is required whenever any of the
 2 following occurs during the course of transportation
 3 in commerce.
 4 So it says when something occurs during the
 5 course of transportation in commerce. I am trying to
 6 figure out how that would be limited to the commodity,
 7 as opposed to anything else that is a facet of making
 8 mass transportation in commerce possible. I mean,
 9 certainly in terms of the underlying policy, it would
 10 seem to me that the environmental impacts of a spill
 11 that involves fuel oil, as opposed to commodity oil,
 12 wouldn't be that different, and so it wouldn't make
 13 sense to have a rule that makes that kind of a
 14 distinction when the environmental impact would be the
 15 same.
 16 But I also read this as saying when it occurs
 17 during the course of transportation in commerce, that
 18 that certainly would be more inclusive than just the
 19 commodity itself.
 20 I'm wondering if you have any -- is there case
 21 law on this? Is there something I am not seeing here?
 22 MR. DiJULIO: The Railroad relies on
 23 precedent from -- with respect to federal
 24 interpretation of that standard from throughout the
 25 country in that respect. I don't have the citation,

Page 66

1 the authority, but it is a well recognized
 2 distinction.
 3 CHAIRMAN DANNER: And so --
 4 MR. DiJULIO: The Commission regulates
 5 solid waste transport, but you don't regulate the
 6 lunch -- the garbage in the -- of the driver on his
 7 UTC rounds. He may violate law by throwing his bag of
 8 litter on the road, but it's not violation of the UTC
 9 regulations.
 10 CHAIRMAN DANNER: And so somebody
 11 somewhere is responsible for reporting that fuel oil,
 12 which is not commodity oil, has fallen onto the ground
 13 and is creating an environmental hazard, but we
 14 don't -- it's not our agency, so somebody -- and
 15 it's -- this is in the CFR, so it appears that it is
 16 not DOT's responsibility. Whose responsibility is it
 17 to notify somebody that fuel oil has fallen onto the
 18 earth?
 19 MR. DiJULIO: I can't answer that
 20 question.
 21 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Are you aware that
 22 somebody is responsible for that?
 23 MR. DiJULIO: If it is a hazardous
 24 substance and is reportable otherwise pursuant to EPA
 25 or Ecology or other regulatory standards, then it

Page 67

1 would be reportable. In this case, I don't know
 2 whether 100 gallons of lube oil would meet the
 3 requirements for reporting under RICRA or the state
 4 act or otherwise.
 5 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So since I am not
 6 aware of the well-developed case law on this, I was
 7 wondering if I could get some case law from you so
 8 that I could -- or from counsel, or Staff, so that I
 9 can get some -- some -- get my own mind around the
 10 fact that when something occurs during the course of
 11 transportation in commerce, it is only the commodity
 12 itself.
 13 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Hellman, it looks like
 14 he is wanting to respond, Mr. DiJulio, but I will let
 15 you nod in his direction first.
 16 MR. DiJULIO: Well, I was looking to see
 17 if I actually have that here today. I am looking at
 18 my notes and I don't -- I am not locating it.
 19 Mr. Hellman.
 20 MR. HELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, a point of
 21 clarification. You are referring to reporting of an
 22 incident that occurred January 25th, 2015; is that
 23 correct?
 24 CHAIRMAN DANNER: I'm looking at that
 25 one, but I am also looking at the CFR generally. I

Page 68

1 mean they are both referring to part 71 15 7b of 49
 2 CFR.
 3 MR. HELLMAN: So as a point of
 4 clarification, the question is not whether BNSF
 5 actually reported that incident, but it's a more broad
 6 interpretation of the CFR; is that correct?
 7 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Yeah, I'm trying --
 8 I'm trying to understand how there is a reading here
 9 that when something -- we have a leak of fuel oil from
 10 a train that is operating in transportation in
 11 commerce, that that definition of transportation in
 12 commerce is very narrow and wouldn't include fuel oil
 13 that falls to the earth and creates an environmental
 14 hazard, but would only deal with commodity oil that
 15 falls to the earth and creates an environmental
 16 hazard.
 17 MR. HELLMAN: Okay. Thank you,
 18 Mr. Chairman, for that clarification.
 19 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 20 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a
 21 follow-up question. So it appears from Bench
 22 Request 1 that there are four -- four incidents that
 23 are potentially subject to whether they are a
 24 reportable incident or not. Two that parties appear
 25 to have stipulated that or not, and that would be

Page 69

1 No. 10, which was the December 13, 2014, and that was
 2 lube oil in Quincy-Columbia subdivision, and the one
 3 we were just talking about, the January 25, 2015
 4 Seattle BNSF Interbay yard. Those are the two that
 5 the parties agree. I guess I am looking to Staff and
 6 counsel and Mr. DiJulio that -- agree that subject to
 7 this reportable distinction we are talking about, in
 8 terms of being in the course of transportation in
 9 commerce, have stipulated that these are not subject
 10 to being reported.
 11 MR. BEATTIE: It is my understanding --
 12 and I will confer with Mr. DiJulio after the hearing
 13 to provide additional legal backup for this. It is my
 14 understanding that based on some of the comments he
 15 made during the settlement negotiations, that Staff
 16 was satisfied that this particular substance and the
 17 way it was spilled did not meet the definition of
 18 release of a hazardous material, out of the WAC, and
 19 that's why we were satisfied that it was inappropriate
 20 for the Commission to penalize the Company for that
 21 particular release.
 22 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Mr. DiJulio, is
 23 that your understanding as well?
 24 MR. DiJULIO: That is correct,
 25 Commissioner. And -- but with respect to the general

Page 70

1 sensitivity to this issue, you have also understood
 2 from the record in this case, that nevertheless it was
 3 reported.
 4 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: It was reported
 5 to the FRA under 5800.
 6 MR. DiJULIO: Correct.
 7 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
 8 And then there are two other incidents that it
 9 appears the parties couldn't reach agreement about,
 10 and that would be the first one on November 5th at the
 11 BP Cherry Point facility, and the second one being
 12 the -- number two, in the Pasco grain yard, and
 13 that -- I understand the nature of that is whether in
 14 fact -- or I understand from just reviewing the
 15 documents and trying to figure this out, that it
 16 appears that it has to do with possession.
 17 Is that a correct understanding of what the
 18 dispute might be about?
 19 MR. DiJULIO: That's correct.
 20 MR. BEATTIE: Commissioner Rendahl, the
 21 dispute regarding the first incident is whether -- you
 22 know, can be characterized as whether the -- you know,
 23 in whose custody was the car at the time of the leak,
 24 and also whether BNSF knew, because the rule language
 25 speaks of learning of an incident. So the dispute is

Page 71

1 whether BNSF -- anybody at BNSF knew that a leak
 2 occurred in transit, which would -- you know, from
 3 Staff's litigation position was that that would have
 4 triggered the requirement.
 5 We are not --
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So --
 7 MR. BEATTIE: -- able to reach agreement
 8 on that.
 9 CHAIRMAN DANNER: The language you just
 10 used, though, you said if the leak occurred while
 11 in -- I can't remember exactly what you said -- in
 12 the --
 13 MR. BEATTIE: In transit.
 14 I want to be --
 15 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Before that you said,
 16 though, that the leak -- the leak occurred while the
 17 train was in the railroad's possession. So there's a
 18 difference between the leak -- where the leak occurred
 19 and where it was discovered. Are you -- is -- are you
 20 talking about where the leak happened or are you
 21 talking about where the leak was discovered?
 22 MR. BEATTIE: Well, let me preface my
 23 answer to that question by saying I want to be
 24 careful, because the purpose of our being here today
 25 is not to actually litigate this case. We are in

Page 72

1 agreement that we are joining forces to support this
 2 settlement.
 3 Were we to go to hearing, Staff's position,
 4 which is known to the Company, would be that an FRA
 5 inspector informed a BNSF representative that a leak
 6 had occurred, and specifically informed that
 7 representative that the leak occurred in transit.
 8 Staff's position is that such information would be
 9 sufficient to that BNSF representative to trigger,
 10 hey, I've got to call this in.
 11 Of course, you know, this isn't an evidentiary
 12 hearing, so I don't want to get too much into these
 13 disputed facts. The fact of the matter is, BNSF's
 14 position, which Steve DiJulio has already articulated,
 15 is that the leak was discovered when the car was not
 16 in BNSF's custody, and further, that there was no
 17 clear evidence that it occurred in transit, thus not
 18 triggering any requirement.
 19 That's sort of the crux of the dispute. For
 20 purposes of settlement, we agree to disagree on that
 21 and move forward with the penalty that we thought
 22 reflected --
 23 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I appreciate
 24 the nature of the hearing that we are having. I am
 25 just trying to get a sense of why the parties would

Page 73

1 believe something was reportable or not or why they
 2 couldn't agree, and not wanting to delve into the
 3 discussions occurring in settlement negotiations.
 4 That's why I was asking whether this had to do more
 5 with nature of possession and maybe timing of
 6 discovery. Those first two appear to be in that
 7 nature, and the latter to appear to be the question of
 8 whether it is in fact subject to the rule.
 9 MR. BEATTIE: We would agree on the
 10 latter two. On the second one, just a quick point of
 11 clarification. From my view, the crux of the ongoing
 12 dispute about that, that has been settled by the
 13 parties, is from BNSF's perspective the quantity was
 14 small, one gallon we are talking about, and that there
 15 was no evidence of contact with the ground. The
 16 parties continue to dispute whether that still,
 17 despite the quantity and the lack of hitting the
 18 ground, would trigger the reporting requirement.
 19 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So can I ask a
 20 question? When something leaks from -- when a liquid
 21 leaks from a train, where does it go if it doesn't hit
 22 the ground? Does it disperse into the air? I'm just
 23 curious whether that -- that was a curious comment.
 24 MR. BEATTIE: Well, given -- you know,
 25 again with the same caveat I had before, it would be

Page 74

1 staff's position at an evidentiary hearing that --
 2 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 3 MR. BEATTIE: -- requirement to hit the
 4 ground is not actually in the rule.
 5 MR. DiJULIO: It could very well sit on
 6 the side of the car and just get gummy.
 7 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you for --
 8 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So --
 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- allowing me to
 10 ask these specific questions.
 11 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So there is no -- is
 12 there some kind of legal presumption that it hits the
 13 ground, or is there a legal presumption that it gums
 14 up on the side of the car, or does that require an
 15 evidentiary hearing in all cases?
 16 MR. DiJULIO: It's the position of the
 17 Railroad, Commissioner Danner, that that would be an
 18 evidentiary hearing issue.
 19 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 20 And then I just want some clarification,
 21 because again, Mr. Beattie, what you said was, with
 22 regard to January 25, 2015 leak of 100 gallons of lube
 23 oil, you said that didn't rise to a hazardous
 24 materials incident. Was that the -- was that the
 25 reason or the basis for this one being contested, or

Page 75

1 because in the narrative that you provide here in
 2 Bench Request No. 1 you talk about it as not having
 3 occurred during the course of transportation in
 4 commerce? I'm just wondering, what is the basis for
 5 your position on that?
 6 MR. BEATTIE: My understanding is --
 7 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Is it because it is
 8 not in commerce --
 9 MR. BEATTIE: -- lube oil --
 10 CHAIRMAN DANNER: -- or is it because
 11 it's not --
 12 MR. BEATTIE: -- could not be defined as
 13 a hazardous material within the meaning of the WAC.
 14 That's why Staff let go of those particular incidents
 15 for purposes of settlement.
 16 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. So it's not --
 17 it's not because it is not in commerce, it is because
 18 lube oil may not be a hazardous material.
 19 MR. BEATTIE: Within the meaning of the
 20 WAC, correct.
 21 COMMISSIONER JONES: Is that your
 22 understanding too, Mr. Pratt?
 23 MR. PRATT: Yes, it is.
 24 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So may I ask, what are
 25 the characteristics of lube oil that make it more or

Page 76

1 less hazardous than crude oil?
 2 MR. HELLMAN: Is the question directed
 3 to me, Mr. Chairman?
 4 CHAIRMAN DANNER: It is thrown out there
 5 for whoever.
 6 MR. HELLMAN: You were looking at me.
 7 I can't speak to the specific qualities of it.
 8 MR. PRATT: Mr. Danner, I can answer
 9 that question.
 10 CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you.
 11 MR. PRATT: I don't know the
 12 characteristics, but I can tell you that the FRA
 13 produces a table of hazardous materials and it is --
 14 there is a whole list, it is hundreds of pages of
 15 tables. Lube oil is not on that table, so it is not
 16 defined by the FRA as a hazardous material.
 17 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Is lube oil -- is
 18 there any distinction that lube oil is different than
 19 any of the other materials on there? In fact, are you
 20 giving a label to something where it is really just
 21 oil?
 22 MR. PRATT: There is no distinction in
 23 their rules that I am aware of.
 24 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So it could be that we
 25 are calling this lube oil, when in reality it is oil

Page 77

1 for purposes of federal rules? I mean, I am just
 2 asking that question.
 3 Mr. DiJulio?
 4 MR. DiJULIO: This is a nonengineer
 5 person speaking.
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: To another
 7 nonengineer.
 8 MR. DiJULIO: Lube oil is not explosive,
 9 it's not flammable. And so there is a distinction
 10 among the qualities or the characteristics of lube oil
 11 that distinguishes it from other types of oil. I know
 12 that from my understanding, but that's all I know.
 13 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. Well -- and
 14 that's helpful, although, again, my nonengineer,
 15 nonscientific head would assume that it doesn't help
 16 the plants grow if it fell to the earth. I am just
 17 trying to figure out the gradations and why things are
 18 treated differently in law and rule.
 19 Other questions?
 20 COMMISSIONER JONES: On that point,
 21 Mr. Chairman, I just refer us to the definition of
 22 hazardous material in our rule. It just says,
 23 Materials that are corrosive, flammable, explosive,
 24 reactive with other materials, or toxic.
 25 So if that is indeed the case, that's my

Page 78

1 understanding of lube oil, being a nonengineer, but
 2 having been to some hazardous material testing sites
 3 before.
 4 A question for Mr. Hellman. This is just
 5 putting this in perspective a little bit. So this
 6 like a math quiz on unit oil trains.
 7 The largest incident here that we are talking
 8 about is, number one, at BP Cherry Point, in terms of
 9 crude oil, right? And I want to speak in barrels.
 10 So in one barrel, how many gallons? How many
 11 gallons in a barrel?
 12 MR. HELLMAN: Roughly 50 gallons, to my
 13 understanding.
 14 COMMISSIONER JONES: Would you accept
 15 42?
 16 MR. HELLMAN: I would accept that,
 17 gladly.
 18 COMMISSIONER JONES: So the biggest of
 19 the 14 incidents here, the largest spill of petroleum
 20 crude is Item No. 1, at Cherry Point, right? Roughly
 21 about 38 barrels.
 22 If you assume that there are 100 tank cars in
 23 a unit oil train, how many -- how many barrels of oil?
 24 MR. HELLMAN: Commissioner, I don't do
 25 math publicly, I'm sorry.

Page 79

1 COMMISSIONER JONES: Would you hazard a
 2 guess -- sorry, "hazard." Would you venture a guess
 3 on how many barrels of crude oil are in a tank car?
 4 MR. HELLMAN: In a tank car?
 5 COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes.
 6 MR. HELLMAN: How many barrels of crude
 7 are in a tank car?
 8 COMMISSIONER JONES: Barrels of crude
 9 petroleum.
 10 MR. HELLMAN: In terms of gallons, I
 11 would venture 25- to 30,000, and then convert that to
 12 barrels.
 13 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay. Subject to
 14 check, would you accept about 700 barrels of crude oil
 15 in a tank car?
 16 MR. HELLMAN: Yes, that sounds about
 17 right.
 18 COMMISSIONER JONES: And about 60- to
 19 70,000 barrels on a 100-unit oil train?
 20 MR. HELLMAN: Generally, yes.
 21 COMMISSIONER JONES: Those are fairly
 22 significant quantities of crude oil, right?
 23 MR. HELLMAN: Certainly.
 24 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.
 25 So the largest spill that we are dealing with

Page 80

1 is 38 barrels, which would be about, if math serves,
 2 maybe 4 percent. And I am not saying that's
 3 insignificant, I'm just trying to put this in
 4 perspective. Four percent of one unit car, right?
 5 MR. HELLMAN: Okay.
 6 COMMISSIONER JONES: But what you
 7 replied to me before is that you are reporting to the
 8 EOC, in this reporting protocol that you have through
 9 the NRC, is you are -- you are being very
 10 conservative, not just for crude oil but for anything
 11 related to petroleum products, and you are reporting
 12 any, even if it's a gallon or one-tenth of a barrel.
 13 You are trying to report as much as possible.
 14 MR. HELLMAN: Well, Commissioner, I
 15 don't know that I can give you a specific amount or
 16 level or threshold that we are reporting or not
 17 reporting. What I can say is that we are certainly
 18 approaching it -- taking a conservative approach. We
 19 are trying to be more aggressive on the reporting than
 20 perhaps we have been in the past.
 21 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.
 22 That's all I have on that one, before we get
 23 to further questions.
 24 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have some
 25 questions, and I think counsel will be very happy to

Page 81

1 hear it has something to do with the settlement
 2 agreement.
 3 So the -- and this is to both Staff and BNSF,
 4 but I think I would like to hear first from Staff.
 5 So is this -- would you say that the
 6 substantial reduction and violations subject to
 7 penalty that you all agreed to in the settlement is
 8 due to the updated information from the EOC?
 9 MR. BEATTIE: Yes, Commissioner Rendahl.
 10 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
 11 MR. BEATTIE: Also, the phone log that
 12 was provided by BNSF through the course of informal
 13 discovery, that indicated other calls had been made.
 14 There are about four incidents that -- you know,
 15 totaling about over 300,000 violations under state law
 16 that were reevaluated by Staff simply based on those
 17 phone logs.
 18 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
 19 MR. BEATTIE: So it wasn't just the EOC
 20 updating its information, it was also through the
 21 process of discovery.
 22 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.
 23 So -- and I don't know if Mr. Pratt or
 24 Ms. Young, you can answer this.
 25 If the Commission had received correct

Page 82

1 information from the EOC initially during its
 2 investigation, would Staff have recommended a penalty
 3 significantly less than the one that was recommended
 4 in the investigation report?
 5 MR. PRATT: Yes. By doing the math in
 6 the report we have, we believe we ended up with 239
 7 violations, so we would have pursued those instead of
 8 700.
 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And so would
 10 Staff have still recommended a complaint and penalties
 11 with the correct -- assuming you had the correct
 12 information?
 13 MR. PRATT: I believe so, yes.
 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And --
 15 MR. PRATT: I guess I say the way that I
 16 believe that is I would have to go back to that day
 17 when we evaluated it. We do have two options in a
 18 case like this, a penalty assessment or a complaint.
 19 We would have evaluated those two options, so we would
 20 have pursued one of them.
 21 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And so -- but the
 22 rationale for Staff pursuing the complaint is because
 23 of the number of issues and the ongoing issue with the
 24 leaks?
 25 MR. PRATT: Yes. And the fact that we

Page 83

1 are limited to \$100 per violation on the penalty
 2 assessment, and we didn't believe that was the
 3 appropriate amount.
 4 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And so by filing
 5 the complaint, did you think that Staff received the
 6 response necessary from the Company, the Railroad
 7 Company?
 8 MR. PRATT: Yes, we have. And I will
 9 say at this point that we believe that there has been
 10 complete compliance since this time. We have been --
 11 we have been watching our records, we've been watching
 12 the EOC reports and the NRC reports. We do believe
 13 that they have made a substantial improvement. I will
 14 say that I am getting calls now about one cup of
 15 spills.
 16 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's good.
 17 So I don't know, Mr. DiJulio, if you have
 18 anything to add to what Staff responded to?
 19 MR. DiJULIO: I will observe -- I cannot
 20 obviously comment on what Staff was thinking or what
 21 Staff's consideration or intent was, but from the
 22 report itself, from March 2015, the report itself in a
 23 number of places recognizes -- and I quote, recognizes
 24 that BNSF generally complies with Commission
 25 regulations.

Page 84

1 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But it showed
 2 also --
 3 MR. DiJULIO: Stating again, BNSF staff
 4 has been cooperative and responsive, and, quote, BNSF
 5 has consistently demonstrated compliance.
 6 As indicated by Mr. Hellman, and in the
 7 materials before the Commission, there were issues
 8 regarding to whom and in what quantities reports
 9 should be made. The report itself, from March 2015,
 10 would be characterized as perhaps expressing
 11 frustration, that it was not -- Staff was not getting
 12 the Railroad's attention sufficiently. That has been
 13 addressed completely. As Mr. Hellman has indicated,
 14 the Railroad is reporting, and also as Mr. Pratt has
 15 indicated, the Railroad is reporting.
 16 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Right, because
 17 the investigation report indicates a number of
 18 communications in which Staff attempted to provide
 19 technical assistance to the Railroad, and continued
 20 questions from the Railroad about what the requirement
 21 was.
 22 MR. DiJULIO: Yes. And again, without
 23 speaking for or with respect to the intent of Staff,
 24 had the Railroad been more responsive and demonstrated
 25 its reporting compliance more readily, we may not be

Page 85

1 in the position we are in today, but nevertheless we
 2 are and we want to move forward from here.
 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Right.
 4 So in terms of the settlement agreement, one
 5 of the provisions in the settlement agreement has to
 6 do with -- I think it's in Paragraph 6 of the
 7 settlement agreement, about technical assistance.
 8 That settlement provides that at a mutually convenient
 9 time and date to be established by separate agreement
 10 of parties, Staff will meet with Company
 11 representatives to discuss, among other potential
 12 topics, best practices for compliance with the rule.
 13 Have the Company and Staff met since the
 14 settlement agreement was filed to -- have you begun
 15 these technical assistance meetings?
 16 I guess that question is both for you,
 17 Mr. DiJulio, and for Staff, or Mr. Hellman and the
 18 Staff.
 19 MR. DiJULIO: Those discussions -- on
 20 behalf of the Railroad, those discussions commenced in
 21 the course of the parties' both early settlement
 22 discussions and in the informal discovery. Those --
 23 the discussions began. There has not been a formal
 24 meeting between Railroad personnel and Staff, as
 25 provided in Paragraph 6 of the settlement agreement.

Page 86

1 I will defer to the other parties to comment
 2 on that as well.
 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Mr. Pratt.
 4 MR. PRATT: I would agree with
 5 Mr. DiJulio's statement there about the -- during the
 6 process we did have a lot of conversations about this.
 7 We did not schedule anything formal. We believed it
 8 was appropriate to wait until this settlement was
 9 finalized and then have formal meetings. We are
 10 planning on those, the Company is planning on those.
 11 It would include staff down lower in the
 12 organizations, to make sure we get down to where we
 13 need to be. Mr. Piper, as they have mentioned his
 14 name a few times, would be part of those. Ms. Hunter,
 15 who is out of the state today, would also be part of
 16 those.
 17 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So in the event
 18 you don't agree on what the best practices are, would
 19 we hear back from the Staff and the Company?
 20 MR. PRATT: Certainly. I am confident
 21 that we would -- we will be able to agree on that.
 22 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
 23 And then one other question for both Staff and
 24 the Company. So given that -- and this is about
 25 Paragraph 5 of the settlement, on the monetary

Page 87

1 penalty. Given that there are still some areas of
 2 potential disagreement, but given the -- the
 3 importance of -- of this issue, the settlement
 4 suspends over half of the penalty. What's the basis
 5 for that?
 6 MR. PRATT: Our belief -- our belief of
 7 when we -- when we determined formulas for a suspended
 8 penalty versus what is paid and what is suspended
 9 over, is that we believe there should be a fair
 10 penalty assessed at the time and that there should be
 11 a substantial penalty left, so to speak, hanging over
 12 the head of the Company, to help keep them in
 13 compliance. We believe it is good incentive to have a
 14 large suspended penalty hanging over them to create
 15 compliance.
 16 MR. DiJULIO: From the Railroad's
 17 perspective on this issue, we looked to prior cases in
 18 settlements, and we believe this settlement is
 19 consistent with prior settlements that the Commission
 20 has approved. From an advocacy standpoint, arguably
 21 it is higher than potentially more serious complaints
 22 that have been raised regarding issues subject to the
 23 Commission jurisdiction, but again, that's a
 24 negotiated issue between the parties. The Railroad is
 25 prepared to accept this as a reasonable compromise

Page 88

1 regarding the claims and issues.
 2 But in terms of what this -- where this came
 3 from, it didn't come out of thin air, it came out of
 4 looking at other settlements the Commission has
 5 approved.
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: I'm going to have
 7 follow-up on that.
 8 You are looking at other settlements involving
 9 transportation companies, or are you looking at other
 10 settlements involving household good movers?
 11 MR. DiJULIO: Transportation companies.
 12 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Transportation
 13 companies.
 14 So the penalty relative to the size of the
 15 company or the size of the activity, you are looking
 16 at all of that. These would be other penalties that
 17 we have assessed against Burlington Northern or other
 18 railroads in the state?
 19 MR. DiJULIO: The other penalty that was
 20 assessed against Burlington Northern was for a number
 21 of crossing violations.
 22 CHAIRMAN DANNER: I remember that.
 23 MR. DiJULIO: You will remember that,
 24 Commissioner Danner, from a prior case.
 25 Without evaluating the degree of safety issues

Page 89

1 associated with that, the -- this settlement is
 2 certainly within the same framework of that settlement
 3 in terms of issues, amounts, and amount suspended.
 4 CHAIRMAN DANNER: I recall that one
 5 was -- I thought that was 105,000?
 6 MR. BEATTIE: Chairman Danner, that's
 7 Docket TR-121921. I have the Order 01 that I am
 8 reading from. I believe that the Commission can take
 9 official notice of this document. The maximum
 10 authorized penalty was 457,500 in that case and the
 11 Commission approved a penalty of 105,000, and
 12 suspended approximately half of that.
 13 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 14 MR. BEATTIE: And so, yes, Staff would
 15 agree with Mr. DiJulio's remarks, that while not
 16 obviously binding precedent, this case did inform the
 17 settlement discussions. Actually, the total penalty
 18 that the parties are advocating for in this case
 19 represents a higher percentage of the maximum penalty
 20 than was approved in the previous case.
 21 CHAIRMAN DANNER: You are talking about
 22 the full penalty, not -- not the penalty -- the
 23 unsuspended part of the penalty?
 24 MR. BEATTIE: That's correct.
 25 CHAIRMAN DANNER: You're talking about

Page 90

1 the \$71,000 as being about 10 percent of the --
 2 MR. BEATTIE: 10 percent, no. It is
 3 actually about 30 percent of what the parties agree
 4 would be in dispute were this case to go to an
 5 evidentiary hearing.
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. So you are
 7 working off of 239, or whatever that was?
 8 MR. BEATTIE: Correct.
 9 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 10 MR. BEATTIE: And imagining that in that
 11 case, were the Commission to find every violation
 12 committed and impose the maximum penalty, the maximum
 13 exposure for the Company would be 239,000. And so if
 14 you --
 15 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Yeah.
 16 MR. BEATTIE: -- you know, do the math
 17 there.
 18 CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you.
 19 That's helpful.
 20 COMMISSIONER JONES: So I have a
 21 question for Staff, and it is on the settlement
 22 agreement, as Commissioner Rendahl said. It's on this
 23 Paragraph 5, you know, the money.
 24 The total penalty is 71,700, right, Mr. Pratt?
 25 MR. PRATT: Correct.

Page 91

1 COMMISSIONER JONES: And you are going
 2 to suspend -- so if we approve the settlement within
 3 30 days, BNSF will pay \$31,700 to the Commission,
 4 right?
 5 MR. PRATT: Correct.
 6 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay. So what
 7 gives you comfort -- I think you spoke to this just
 8 earlier. What gives you comfort that this is
 9 sufficient to provide leverage? As you said, it is
 10 something over their heads, over the head of the
 11 Company. There is a little bit of leverage there.
 12 But what gives you comfort that this will be, A,
 13 honored, and B, that there is a sufficient culture of
 14 compliance now at BNSF?
 15 MR. PRATT: I guess I would go back to
 16 the previous docket that Mr. Beattie mentioned, with
 17 the -- with the format we used there, and with the
 18 procedures we used there, as far as the same kind
 19 of -- kind of weighting on the penalty and the
 20 suspension.
 21 We believe we have had 100 percent compliance
 22 on the crossings since that case. That kind of
 23 informed me on this case, that said if we follow the
 24 same procedures, that we would hope that we could gain
 25 the same 100 percent compliance going forward, as

Page 92

1 shown in the past practice.
 2 COMMISSIONER JONES: And based on what
 3 you said earlier, that they are reporting almost any
 4 violation now, whether it is 1 gallon or 42 barrels of
 5 crude -- well, I think the maximum is like 38 -- that
 6 gives you some comfort as well?
 7 MR. PRATT: Yes. Like I say, I have
 8 received notices for one cup of material being
 9 spilled.
 10 COMMISSIONER JONES: And then what about
 11 after one year? Let's say everything works out well
 12 from the settlement agreement perspective and they
 13 continue to comply, and then after one year you don't
 14 have the sword of Damocles hanging over their heads,
 15 right?
 16 MR. PRATT: Correct.
 17 COMMISSIONER JONES: So what gives you
 18 comfort that it will continue? Is it the technical
 19 assistance meetings that Commissioner Rendahl referred
 20 to, that you will have a regular meeting of the minds
 21 with the relevant authorities, or what?
 22 MR. PRATT: Well, I would say with the
 23 settlement agreement, we have one year that we have
 24 that penalty hanging over their head. After the one
 25 year ended, if we found more violations of this, I

Page 93

1 would probably go for the full amount of penalty
 2 available to me. We would have known that there was
 3 multiple technical assistance, there was a settlement
 4 agreement that was agreed upon, there was a penalty
 5 paid.
 6 If it was after the year, we wouldn't go after
 7 the previous suspended penalty, but my belief there
 8 would be there was no reason for the reporting not to
 9 happen. I would probably file a complaint at that
 10 time, asking for the full -- the full amount
 11 available.
 12 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay. Thank you.
 13 That's all I have.
 14 CHAIRMAN DANNER: So I guess just to
 15 comment, the -- this -- this is a very large company
 16 that is shipping an awful lot of commodity through the
 17 state of Washington. While I don't want to question
 18 the Company's commitment to compliance with our rules
 19 or with safety, I -- I don't know that this amount is
 20 necessarily a sword of Damocles. It seems more of a
 21 Nerf sword of Damocles.
 22 You know, so I am -- I think whatever we end
 23 up with in this case, there is going to have to be
 24 continued vigilance. I don't think if there is going
 25 to be a future violation, that that would -- even

Page 94

1 though that might trigger the rest of this penalty,
 2 that we would be foreclosed from additional
 3 complaints, sanctions on those same violations in the
 4 future; is that correct?
 5 MR. PRATT: Yes.
 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 7 So I do -- I don't have any more questions. I
 8 do want to say I am very pleased that -- you know, for
 9 all -- for all of the issues that this has brought
 10 forward, it does seem to me, as Staff has commented,
 11 that the Company is -- has really stepped up in terms
 12 of compliance, and I appreciate that EOC has also
 13 stepped up in terms of its adherence to its SOP. In
 14 that regard, I am pleased. I think we are making
 15 great progress here.
 16 In terms of this actual case and the actual
 17 settlement, it is my hope that we will take it under
 18 advisement and -- when we are done with the hearing
 19 today, and we will come back with our response when we
 20 have one.
 21 JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further?
 22 COMMISSIONER JONES: No.
 23 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No.
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: One issue that we still
 25 need to resolve is, the Chairman asked some questions

Page 95

1 about the interpretation of 47 CFR Section 171.15. I
 2 would ask for some supplemental briefing on that. It
 3 is not a bench request since it is a legal
 4 interpretation.
 5 Do you have a date by which you can provide us
 6 with that? It doesn't need to be long. I would think
 7 five pages at the most.
 8 CHAIRMAN DANNER: I would just like some
 9 citations, actually.
 10 MR. DiJULIO: That's fine. And I will
 11 comment further. Commissioner Jones read the
 12 definition in the course of his comments and
 13 questions. Water is a corrosive material. Under a
 14 broad -- if you look at this definition in that
 15 regard, spilling of water is a reportable incident
 16 because water is a corrosive. We will provide that
 17 authority, but I think consistent with the way that
 18 the federal and the state application of those
 19 standards has been applied, we believe that the
 20 reporting will be demonstrated as appropriate.
 21 We will provide that information. That should
 22 go directly to Judge Kopta and not as a bench
 23 response?
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: It's not a bench response,
 25 but it is as you would file a brief.

Page 96

1 MR. DiJULIO: Yes.
 2 JUDGE KOPTA: It would just be with a
 3 cover letter, just to Mr. King, with certificate of
 4 service.
 5 MR. DiJULIO: Yes.
 6 JUDGE KOPTA: And by what date would you
 7 anticipate?
 8 MR. DiJULIO: That will be by the close
 9 of business next Monday.
 10 JUDGE KOPTA: One week from today?
 11 MR. DiJULIO: One week.
 12 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.
 13 CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you
 14 for that.
 15 JUDGE KOPTA: And Staff obviously may
 16 also provide its own information, or jointly with the
 17 Company, whichever you prefer.
 18 MR. BEATTIE: I will confer with
 19 Mr. DiJulio. I anticipate, without waiving
 20 opportunity to provide our own brief, but I anticipate
 21 a joint response to that question.
 22 JUDGE KOPTA: That would be fine. So we
 23 will make that October 26th.
 24 COMMISSIONER JONES: Judge Kopta?
 25 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, Commissioner Jones?

Page 97

1 COMMISSIONER JONES: Just a final
 2 comment. I would just reiterate what Chairman Danner
 3 said. Mr. Compton, thank you for coming and
 4 participating in this. This is a joint
 5 responsibility, as I view it. We didn't mean to put
 6 you on the hot seat today for any reason other than to
 7 inform this discussion, because there are various
 8 places it can go. Thank you for coming.
 9 MR. COMPTON: Thank you.
 10 JUDGE KOPTA: Is there anything further
 11 we need to discuss?
 12 MR. DiJULIO: To be clear, Judge Kopta,
 13 we have two bench requests, Bench Request 3 directed
 14 to Staff, Bench Request No. 4 directed to the
 15 Railroad, there may or may not be joint responses to
 16 the bench requests, as well as the request for legal
 17 authority. That's what I see as deliverables coming
 18 out of this.
 19 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. I would make one
 20 correction, and that was the EOC was going to provide
 21 us with a response to Bench Request No. 3.
 22 MR. DiJULIO: Is that possible when they
 23 are not a party?
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, since he is here
 25 testifying, then we think so. I don't think that

Page 98

1 there is any -- you don't have any opposition to
 2 providing that information, do you, Mr. Compton?
 3 MR. COMPTON: Absolutely not.
 4 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, the EOC will provide
 5 that to us tomorrow.
 6 And also be sure to include the docket number
 7 on there so we know where it goes.
 8 MR. COMPTON: Can I get that from you,
 9 please?
 10 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, it is Docket
 11 TR-150284.
 12 MR. COMPTON: And that was Bench Request
 13 No. 3?
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: No. 3.
 15 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Mr. DiJulio, would it
 16 be your preference that you and Mr. Beattie be the
 17 intermediaries of that information?
 18 MR. DiJULIO: If the EOC is going to
 19 cooperate, we have not objection.
 20 CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay.
 21 MR. DIJULIO: There is no reason for us
 22 to handle any more paper.
 23 CHAIRMAN DANNER: They have been very
 24 cooperative. I echo Mr. Jones's comments. Thank you
 25 very much for your participation.

Page 99

1 MR. COMPTON: Thank you.
 2 MR. BEATTIE: So just to be clear, there
 3 are no bench requests directed at Staff, other than
 4 informal request for briefing on the issues related to
 5 Incidents 10 and 13; is that correct?
 6 JUDGE KOPTA: That's correct, unless you
 7 wanted to weigh in on the McKenzie valve...
 8 MR. BEATTIE: Thank you.
 9 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. We are
 10 adjourned.
 11 MR. DiJULIO: Thank you.
 12 (Proceedings concluded 3:21 p.m.)
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 100

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF WASHINGTON
 COUNTY OF KING

I, Sherrilyn Smith, a Certified
 Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington,
 do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is
 true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill
 and ability.

 SHERRILYN SMITH