

Exhibit No. ___ (RP-2)
Docket: U-110808
Witness: Rayne Pearson

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

DOCKET U-110808

QUALIFICATIONS OF

RAYNE PEARSON

**STAFF OF
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

1 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

2 A. My name is Rayne Pearson. My business address is The Richard Hemstad
3 Building, 1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W., P.O. Box 47250, Olympia, WA
4 98504-7250.

5
6 **Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

7 A. I am employed by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
8 (“Commission”) as a Compliance Investigator.

9
10 **Q. How long have you been employed by the Commission?**

11 A. I have been employed by the Commission for two years and four months.

12
13 **Q. Please describe your educational background.**

14 A. I obtained my undergraduate degree in Journalism and Women’s Studies from New
15 York University, and my J.D. from Seattle University School of Law in 2004.

16
17 **Q. Please describe your current job duties at the Commission.**

18 A. As a Compliance Investigator, I conduct complex investigations to ensure that
19 regulated companies provide services in accordance with commission rules and
20 regulations; make recommendations to management and the commission regarding
21 penalties or revocation of operating authority; and represent the agency in both
22 quasi-judicial formal proceedings and court proceedings.

23

1 Q. Have you ever testified before the Commission in any proceeding?

2 A. Yes. I have appeared as a Staff witness in the following cases:

3 1. In an evidentiary hearing in a formal complaint where Staff was seeking to
4 have the Commission classify a water company as a regulated entity and
5 impose penalties for operating without having first filed a tariff with the
6 Commission. *WUTC v. Lowper Corp.*, Docket UW-110213. The company
7 was classified as such, and penalties were imposed.

8 2. In evidentiary hearings in eight formal complaints where Staff was seeking
9 to have the Commission classify carriers as household goods movers
10 requiring a permit to operate, and impose penalties for operating without a
11 permit. *WUTC v. Daryl Munn d/b/a Innovative Moving Systems*, Docket
12 TV-111368; *WUTC v. Spencer Tracy d/b/a BestGuys Moving & Labor*,
13 Docket TV-111367; *WUTC v. Richard Dengah d/b/a Empire Moving &*
14 *Storage*, Docket TV-111387; *WUTC v. Gerald Munroe d/b/a AAA Movers*,
15 Docket TV-111386; *WUTC v. Todd Willis d/b/a Save-A-Lot Moving*,
16 Docket TV-111385; *WUTC v. Wade Taylor d/b/a Professional Relocation*
17 *Services*, Docket TV-111371; *WUTC v. Daniel Bradford d/b/a Last Minute*
18 *Movers*, Docket TV-111370; *WUTC v. Robert Kulesza d/b/a A&R Moving*
19 *Services*, Docket TV-111343. The companies were all classified as such,
20 and penalties were imposed.

21 3. In an evidentiary hearing in a formal complaint where Staff was seeking to
22 have the Commission revoke the registration of 20 telecommunications
23 companies that failed to file annual reports and pay regulatory fees. *WUTC*

1 v. *Affordable Voice Communications, Inc. et. al*, Docket UT-111529. Each
2 of the companies' registrations were revoked.

3 4. In an evidentiary hearing in a formal complaint where Staff was seeking to
4 have the Commission cancel the operating permits of two household goods
5 carriers that failed to file annual reports and pay regulatory fees. *WUTC v.*
6 *Anda Moving, LLC, 5 Star Movers and Delivery, LLC*, Docket TV-111530.
7 Both of the companies' permits were cancelled.