## Docket No. UG-200568 - Vol. III

# WUTC v. Cascade Natural Gas Corporation

February 24, 2021



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

COURT REPORTING AND LEGAL VIDEO

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



I	Page 27		Page 29
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		1 A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont.)	
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND )DOCKET UG-200568		FOR AWEC:	
		CHAD M. STOKES	
) Complainant, )		4 Cable Huston LLP	
) vs. )		5 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 5 Portland, Oregon 97204	
)		(503) 224-3092	
CASCADE NATURAL GAS ) CORPORATION, )		6 cstokes@cablehuston.com	
		8	
Respondent. )		FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT:	
		SIMON FFITCH	
		10 Attorney at Law 321 High School Road NE	
VIRTUAL EVIDENTIARY HEARING, VOLUME III		11 Suite D3. Box No. 383	
Pages 27-288		Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110 12 (206) 669-8197	
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MICHAEL HOWARD		simon@ffitchlaw.com	
		13 14 TESTIMONY OFFERED BY:	
February 24, 2021		15 ANN BULKLEY	
9:05 A.M.		16 DAVID PARCELL J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE	
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission		16 J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE NICOLE KIVISTO	
621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast		17 PATRICK DARRAS	
Lacey, Washington 98503		18 JAMES KAISER 18 MICHAEL PARVINEN	
REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358		DAVID PANCO	
Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC		19   JOANNA HUANG     20   20	
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840 Seattle, Washington 98101		21	
(206) 287-9066   Seattle		22 23	
(360) 534-9066   Olympia (800) 846-6989   National		23	
www.buellrealtime.com		25	
	Page 28		Page 30
			rage st
A P P E A R A N C E S ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:		1 EXAMINATION INDEX 2 ANN BULKLEY PAGE	
MICHAEL HOWARD			
		3 By Ms. McDowell 48, 63	
		3 By Ms. McDowell 48, 63 4 By Ms. Gafken	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF:		3 By Ms. McDowell	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN		<ul> <li>By Ms. McDowell</li></ul>	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General		3 By Ms. McDowell	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       5         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       5         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       8       70	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       5         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       5         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       87         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       5         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       87         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       51, 113	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS:		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         5       DAVID PARCELL         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       87         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       51, 113         12       By Ms. McDowell.       92	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       5         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       51, 113         12       By Ms. McDowell.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER MCDOwell Rackner & Gibson PC		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       5         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       51, 113         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       51, 113         11       By Ms. Gafken.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       14	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       5         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       51, 113         12       By Ms. McDowell.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       91         11       By Ms. Gafken.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         14       By Ms. McDowell.       123         15       By Commissioner Rendahl.       124	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jocelyn@mrg-law.com		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       5         6       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       51, 113         12       By Ms. Gafken.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         14       By Ms. McDowell.       123         15       By Commissioner Rendahl.       124	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 4000 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jocelyn@mrg-law.com		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       51, 113         12       By Ms. Gafken.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         14       By Commissioner Rendahl.       123         15       By Commissioner Balasbas.       128         17       128       128	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jocelyn@mrg-law.com		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         14       By Ms. McDowell.       123         15       By Ms. McDowell.       124         16       By Commissioner Balasbas.       128         17       18       PATRICK DARRAS	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jocelyn@mrg-law.com jordan@mrg-law.com		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       91         11       By Ms. Gafken.       92         12       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         13       By Commissioner Rendahl.       123         14       By Commissioner Balasbas.       124         17       PATRICK DARRAS       136, 155	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JOCDELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JOCDEUN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jocelyn@mrg-law.com shoshana @mrg-law.com shoshana @mrg-law.com		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         14       By Ms. McDowell.       123         15       By Ms. McDowell.       124         16       By Commissioner Balasbas.       128         17       18       PATRICK DARRAS	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jocelyn@mrg-law.com shoshana@mrg-law.com jordan@mrg-law.com		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE         11       By Ms. Gafken.         12       By Ms. McDowell.         13       NICOLE KIVISTO         14       By Commissioner Rendahl.         15       By Commissioner Balasbas.       123         16       PATRICK DARRAS         17       By Ms. Schoonover.       136, 155         18       PATRICK KAISER	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jocelyn@mrg-law.com shoshana@mrg-law.com jordan@mrg-law.com SHOR DUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Office of the Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       92         11       By Ms. Gafken.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         14       By Commissioner Rendahl.       123         15       By Commissioner Balasbas.       128         17       PATRICK DARRAS       136, 155         18       PATRICK DARRAS       136, 155         19       By Mr. Callaghan.       137         14       JAMES KAISER       22	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jocelyn@mrg-law.com shoshana@mrg-law.com shoshana@mrg-law.com Shoshana Shoshana Shoshana Shoshana Shoshan		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       92         11       By Ms. Gafken.       92         12       By Ms. McDowell.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         14       By Commissioner Rendahl.       123         15       By Commissioner Balasbas.       124         16       By Ms. Schoonover.       136, 155         17       PATRICK DARRAS       137         18       PATRICK DARRAS       137         19       By Ms. Schoonover.       136, 155         19       By Ms. Schoonover.       136, 155         13       JAMES KAISER       By Ms. Baird.       161, 174	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jocelyn@mrg-law.com shoshana@mrg-law.com jordan@mrg-law.com SHOR DUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Office of the Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       92         11       By Ms. Gafken.       92         12       By Ms. McDowell.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         14       By Commissioner Rendahl.       123         15       By Commissioner Balasbas.       124         16       By Ms. Schoonover.       136, 155         17       By Ms. Schoonover.       136, 155         18       PATRICK DARRAS       137         19       By Mr. Callaghan.       137         14       By Ms. Baird.       137         15       By Ms. Baird.       161, 174         13       By Ms. Gafken.       162	
FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov FOR CASCADE NATURAL GAS: KATHRYN MCDOWELL JOCELYN PEASE SHOSANA BAIRD JORDAN SCHOONOVER McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 katherine@mrg-law.com jordan@mrg-law.com shoshana@mrg-law.com jordan@mrg-law.com Shoshana@mrg-law.com jordan@mrg-law.com Shoshana		3       By Ms. McDowell.       48, 63         4       By Ms. Gafken.       52         DAVID PARCELL       By Mr. Callaghan.       49         7       By Ms. McDowell.       70         8       By Ms. Gafken.       70         9       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       87         10       J. RANDALL WOOLRIDGE       92         11       By Ms. Gafken.       92         12       By Ms. McDowell.       92         13       NICOLE KIVISTO       92         14       By Commissioner Rendahl.       123         15       By Commissioner Balasbas.       124         16       By Ms. Schoonover.       136, 155         17       PATRICK DARRAS       137         18       PATRICK DARRAS       137         19       By Ms. Schoonover.       136, 155         19       By Ms. Schoonover.       136, 155         13       JAMES KAISER       By Ms. Baird.       161, 174	

1 (Pages 27 to 30)

Page 31	Page 33
1 EXAMINATION INDEX (Cont.)	1 EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)
2 MICHAEL PARVINEN PAGE	2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE
3         By Ms. Pease	3 PCD-8X Exhibit DJP-5 of David J. Panco, Company's 46 Revised Supplemental Response to UTC Staff
5 By Mr. Stokes	4 Data Reguest No. 92
6 By Commissioner Rendahl 226, 230, 233	5 PCD-9X Exhibit PCD-6 of Patrick C. Darras, 46
7 By Chair Danner	Cascade's Supplemental Response to UTC
8 By Commissioner Balasbas 232	6 Data Request No. 92 7 PCD-10X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property 46
DAVID PANCO	That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate
10	8 Effective Date
By Mr. Callaghan	9 PCD-11X Exhibit MCP-6 of Maryalice C. Peters, 46
By Ms. Pease	2020 Plant Additions
12	10 PCD-12X Exhibit DJP-6 of David J. Panco, 46
13 JOANNA HUANG	11 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data
14         By Mr. Callaghan	Request No. 124
16	12 PCD 13X Exhibit D IP 7 of David L Panco 46
EXHIBIT INDEX	PCD-13X Exhibit DJP-7 of David J. Panco, 46 13 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC
	Staff Data Request No. 124
EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE	14
BE-1 Response to Bench Request No. 1 46	PCD-14X Company's Revised Supplemental Response 46
19	15 to UTC Staff Data Request No. 92 16 MPP-1T Direct Testimony 46
NAK-1T Direct Testimony 46	17 MPP-2T Rebuttal Testimony 46
NAK-2T Rebuttal Testimony 46	18 MPP-3 2015-2020 Monthly Operating Reports 46
21	19 MPP-4 2019 Operating Report 46
TJN-1T Direct Testimony 46	20         MPP-5         Retirement and Removal Calculation         46           21         MPP-6         Protected EDIT Accounting Detail         46
22 TJN-2C Confidential - Cascade's Current 46	21 MPP-6 Protected EDIT Accounting Detail 46 22 MPP-7X UE-090134, 2009 Avista GRC Order 10 46
23 Outstanding Debt	23 MPP-8X UE-090704/705, 2009 PSE GRC Order 11 46
24 TJN-3C Confidential - Long Term Debt 46	24 MPP-9X UE-152253, 2015 Pac Power GRC Order 12 46
25TJN-4T Rebuttal Testimony46	25
Page 32	Page 34
1 EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)	1 EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)
2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE	2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE
3 TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports 46	3 MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint 46
<ul> <li>3 TJN-5 Fitch and S&amp;P Global Ratings Reports 46</li> <li>4 TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption 46</li> <li>Potential Confidential</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>TJN-5 Fitch and S&amp;P Global Ratings Reports 46</li> <li>TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption 46</li> <li>Potential Confidential</li> </ul>	3 MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint 46 Settlement Agreement 4 MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05 46
<ul> <li>TJN-5 Fitch and S&amp;P Global Ratings Reports 46</li> <li>TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption 46 Potential Confidential</li> <li>TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently 46</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint 46 Settlement Agreement</li> <li>MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05 46</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>TJN-5 Fitch and S&amp;P Global Ratings Reports 46</li> <li>TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption 46</li> <li>Potential Confidential</li> <li>TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently 46</li> <li>Outstanding Debt Confidential</li> <li>AEB-1T Direct Testimony 46</li> </ul>	3 MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint 46 Settlement Agreement 4 MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05 46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         5       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       Settlement Agreement       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         6       Effective Date       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         5       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       7         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       Settlement Agreement       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         7       7       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         5       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       7         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       Settlement Agreement       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         6       Effective Date       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         5       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46	<ul> <li>MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint 46 Settlement Agreement</li> <li>MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05 46</li> <li>MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property 46 That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate Effective Date</li> <li>MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46 Rebuttal Testimony 46</li> </ul>
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         5       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       Settlement Agreement       4         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras,       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         7       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       14       14	<ul> <li>MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint 46 Settlement Agreement</li> <li>MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05 46</li> <li>MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property 46 That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate Effective Date</li> <li>MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46 Rebuttal Testimony 46</li> </ul>
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         9       Potential Confidential       46         0       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         0       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         1       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         Settlement Agreement       4         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       Effective Date         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras,       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-12 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         7       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       14	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         Settlement Agreement       4         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       Effective Date         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46         8       Rebuttal Testimony         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-1 Direct Testimony       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation       46         14       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       16	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         Settlement Agreement       4         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       Effective Date         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras,       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-12 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         9       Potential Confidential       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       46         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46	<ul> <li>MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint 46 Settlement Agreement</li> <li>MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05 46</li> <li>MPP-11X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property 46 That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate Effective Date</li> <li>MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46 Rebuttal Testimony 46</li> <li>PJA-1T Direct Testimony 46</li> <li>MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet 46</li> <li>MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation 46</li> <li>MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation 46</li> <li>MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test 46 Year Results</li> </ul>
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       16	<ul> <li>MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint 46 Settlement Agreement</li> <li>MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05 46</li> <li>MPP-11X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property 46 That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate Effective Date</li> <li>MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46 Rebuttal Testimony 46</li> <li>PJA-1T Direct Testimony 46</li> <li>MCP-12 Proposed Tariffs 46</li> <li>MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation 46</li> <li>MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation 46</li> <li>MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test 46 Year Results</li> <li>MCP-6 2020 Plant Additions 46</li> </ul>
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         10       AEB-3 Resume       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46	<ul> <li>MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint 46 Settlement Agreement</li> <li>MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05 46</li> <li>MPP-11X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property 46 That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate Effective Date</li> <li>MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46 Rebuttal Testimony 46</li> <li>PJA-1T Direct Testimony 46</li> <li>MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet 46</li> <li>MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation 46</li> <li>MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation 46</li> <li>MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test 46 Year Results</li> </ul>
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-3T Rebuttal Testimony       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate Effective Date       46         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-1 Direct Testimony       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         14       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         15       MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test       46         16       MCP-6 2020 Plant Additions       46         17       MCP-7T Supplemental Testimony       46         18       18       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       "2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-3T Rebuttal Testimony       46         19       PCD-4 Updated Summary of 2020 Capital Projects       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-1 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         14       MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test       46         15       MCP-6 2020 Plant Additions       46         16       MCP-7T Supplemental Testimony       46         17       MCP-8       Result of Operations Summary 46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         7       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       "2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-3T Rebuttal Testimony       46         19       PCD-4 Updated Summary of 2020 Capital Projects       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-1 Direct Testimony       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         14       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         15       MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test       46         16       MCP-6 2020 Plant Additions       46         17       MCP-7T Supplemental Testimony       46         18       MCP-8       Result of Operations Summary       46         19       (Replaces MCP-2) Sheet       10       10
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         10       AEB-3 Resume       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       "2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-3T Rebuttal Testimony       46         19       PCD-4 Updated Summary of 2020 Capital Projects       46         20       PCD-5 Cascade's Response to AWEC Data Request       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-1D Direct Testimony       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation       46         14       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         15       MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test       46         16       MCP-6 2020 Plant Additions       46         17       MCP-7T Supplemental Testimony       46         18       MCP-8       Result of Operations Summary       46         19       (Replaces MCP-2) Sheet       46       46         19       (Replaces MCP-3)       Sheet       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         9       Potential Confidential       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         10       AEB-3 Resume       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       "2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-3T Rebuttal Testimony       46         19       PCD-4 Updated Summary of 2020 Capital Projects       46         19       PCD-5 Cascade's Response to AWEC Data Request       46         20       PCD-5 Cascade's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         21       PCD-6 Cascade's Supplemental Response to UTC       46<	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       Effective Date         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras,       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-1D Direct Testimony       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation       46         14       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         15       MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test       46         16       MCP-6 2020 Plant Additions       46         17       MCP-7T Supplemental Testimony       46         18       MCP-8       Result of Operations Summary       46         19       (Replaces MCP-2) Sheet       46       46         19       (Replaces MCP-3)       Sheet       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         7       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       "2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-3T Rebuttal Testimony       46         19       PCD-4 Updated Summary of 2020 Capital Projects       46         20       PCD-5 Cascade's Response to AWEC Data Request       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       MPP-12X U-190531, Policy Statement on Property       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       Effective Date         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras,       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-10 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation       46         14       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         15       MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test       46         16       MCP-7T Supplemental Testimony       46         17       MCP-8       Result of Operations Summary       46         19       (Replaces MCP-2) Sheet       20       MCP-9       Revenue Requirement Calculation       46         19       (Replaces MCP-3)       MCP-10       Summary of Proposed Adjustments<
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         9       Potential Confidential       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         10       AEB-3 Resume       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       "2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-3T Rebuttal Testimony       46         19       PCD-4 Updated Summary of 2020 Capital Projects       46         20       PCD-5 Cascade's Response to AWEC Data Request       46         21       62 (November 12, 2020)       22       PCD-6 Cascade's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         22       PCD-6 C	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-1 Direct Testimony       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation       46         14       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         15       MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test       46         16       MCP-6 2020 Plant Additions       46         17       MCP-7T Supplemental Testimony       46         18       MCP-8       Result of Operations Summary 46         19       (Replaces MCP-2) Sheet       46         20       MCP-10       Summary of Proposed Adjustments       46         14
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         9       Potential Confidential       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       "2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-3T Rebuttal Testimony       46         19       PCD-4 Updated Summary of 2020 Capital Projects       46         16       PCD-5 Cascade's Response to AWEC Data Request       46         17       PCD-6 Cascade's Supplemental Response to UTC       46      <	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras,       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-1 Direct Testimony       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation       46         14       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         15       MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test       46         16       MCP-6 2020 Plant Additions       46         17       MCP-7T Supplemental Testimony       46         18       MCP-8       Result of Operations Summary       46         19       (Replaces MCP-2) Sheet       46       46         19       MCP-10       Summary of Proposed Adjustments       46
3       TJN-5 Fitch and S&P Global Ratings Reports       46         4       TJN-6C Confidential - Cascade's Debt Redemption       46         6       Potential Confidential       46         7       TJN-7C Confidential - Cascade's Cost of Currently       46         6       Outstanding Debt Confidential       46         7       AEB-1T Direct Testimony       46         8       AEB-2 General Economic Statistics       46         9       AEB-3 Resume       46         10       AEB-4T Rebuttal Testimony       46         11       AEB-5 Return on Equity Updated Modeling Results       46         12       AEB-6 Responses to CNGC Data Requests       46         13       AEB-7X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         14       AEB-8X Cascade's Response to Public Counsel       46         15       Data Request No. 7, with Attachment       "2018-2020 CNG Regulated Returns"         16       PCD-1T Direct Testimony       46         17       PCD-2 Major Capital Project Summary       46         18       PCD-3T Rebuttal Testimony       46         19       PCD-4 Updated Summary of 2020 Capital Projects       46         20       PCD-5 Cascade's Response to AWEC Data Request       46	3       MPP-10X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Joint       46         4       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         5       MPP-11X UG-190210, 2019 Cascade GRC Order 05       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         6       That Becomes Used and Useful After Rate       46         7       MPP-13X Exhibit PCD-3T of Patrick C. Darras, 46       46         8       Rebuttal Testimony       46         9       PJA-1T Direct Testimony       46         10       PJA-2 Proposed Tariffs       46         11       MCP-1 Direct Testimony       46         12       MCP-2 Result of Operations Summary Sheet       46         13       MCP-3 Revenue Requirement Calculation       46         14       MCP-4 Conversion Factor Calculation       46         15       MCP-5 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test       46         16       MCP-6 2020 Plant Additions       46         17       MCP-7T Supplemental Testimony       46         18       MCP-8       Result of Operations Summary 46         19       (Replaces MCP-2) Sheet       46         20       MCP-10       Summary of Proposed Adjustments       46         14

2 (Pages 31 to 34)

	Page 35	Page 37
1 2 3	EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.) EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE MCG-14 Summary of Proposed Adjustments to Test 46 Year Results	1 EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.) 2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 3 ANH-6 Cascade Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 88
4	MCG-15 2020 Plant Additions 46	4 KMH-1T Response Testimony 46
5	IDM-1T Direct Testimony 46	KMH-2 ROO (Results of Operations) Summary Sheet 46
6	IDM-2 Summary of Revenues by Rate Schedule 46	KMH-3 Summary of Adjustments 46
7		KMH-4 Revenue Requirement Calculation 46
8	IDM-3 Revenue Adjustments 46	KMH-5 Conversion Factor 46
9	IDM-4 Revenue Distribution 46	KMH-6 Test Year Per-Books Audit Adjustment 46
10 11	IDM-5 Decoupling Mechanism, Authorized 46 Revenue Per Customer IDM-6T Supplemental Testimony 46	11 KMH-7 Annualize Cost Recovery Mechanism (CRM) 46 Adjustment
12	IDM-7 Summary of Revenues by Rate 46 (Replaces IDM-2) Schedule	KMH-8 Cascade's Response to UTC Staff DR No. 127 46
13		KMH-9 Interest Coordination Adjustment 46
14	IDM-8 Revenue Adjustments 46 (Replaces IDM-3)	JH-1T Response Testimony 46
15 16	IDM-9 Revenue Distribution 46 (Replaces IDM-4)	JH-2 Staff's Calculation of Pro Forma Wage 46 16 Adjustment, Adjustment P-2
17	IDM-10 Decoupling Mechanism, 46 (Replaces IDM-5) Authorized Revenue Per Customer	17 JH-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 10 18
18 19	IDM-11 Rebuttal Testimony 46 IDM-12 Summary of Revenues by Rate Schedule 46	JH-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 19 Request No. 13
20	IDM-13 Revenue Adjustments 46	20 JH-5 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 14
21 22	IDM-14 Revenue Distribution 46 IDM-15 Decoupling Mechanism, Authorized Revenue 46	21 JH-6X UE-170485/UG-170486: Response Testimony 46
23	Per Customer BLR-1T Direct Testimony 46	22         of Joanna Huang           23         JH-7X         UE-190335/UE-190222: Response         46
24	·	Testimony of Joanna Huang 24 DJP-1T Response Testimony 46
25	BLR-2 Weather Normalization Inputs 46	25
	Page 36	Page 38
-		
1 2	EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.) EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE	1         EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)           2         EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION   PAGE
3	BLR-3 Weather Normalization Results 46	3 DJP-2 Comparison of Company's and Staff's 46
4	11111 A Marshan Managelling Desults Operation 10	
5	BLR-4 Weather Normalization Results Comparison 46 BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth 46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments
6	BLR-5Results Comparison to Customer Growth46BLR-6Revenue Impact46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46
6 7	BLR-5Results Comparison to Customer Growth46BLR-6Revenue Impact46JEK-1CTConfidential - Rebuttal Testimony46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 89
6 7 8	BLR-5Results Comparison to Customer Growth46BLR-6Revenue Impact46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 89 DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46
6 7	BLR-5       Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6       Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT       Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C       Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C       Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 89 DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 91 DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response 46
6 7 8	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 89 DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 91 DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response 46 To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92
6 7 8 9	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth46BLR-6 Revenue Impact46JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony46JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation46Program Review (October 2018)46JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data46Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy46Technical Craft Clerical Survey (October 2020)46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 89 DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 91 DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response 46 To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92 DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 124
6 7 8 9 10	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 89 DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 91 DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response 46 To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92 DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46
6 7 8 9 10 11	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 89 DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 91 DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response 46 To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92 DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 124 DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC 46 Staff Data Request No. 124 DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony 46
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed Pro Forma Plant Adjustments DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 89 DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 91 DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response 46 To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92 DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data 46 Request No. 124 DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC 46 Staff Data Request No. 124 DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony 46 DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of 46
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         Request No. 89       6         0       DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 91       8         8       DJP-5 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       request No. 91       8         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       46         11       DJP-7 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         12       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         13       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of       46         14       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         Technical Craft Clerical Survey (October 2020)       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         Watson 2020 Salary Budget and Economic       46         Data, North America       46         JEK-6X Cascade's Supplemental Response to Public       46         Counsel Data Request No. 79, with       41         Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary Review       46         Counsel, "Attachment "PC-79 Year-End"       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         Request No. 89       6         0       DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 91       46         8       DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response       46         7       To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92       46         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       46         11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         12       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of       46         14       David J. Panco       46         15       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         16       Request 14 (2/9/21)       46
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         Technical Craft Clerical Survey (October 2020)       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         Watson 2020 Salary Budget and Economic       46         Data, North America       46         JEK-6X Cascade's Supplemental Response to Public       46         Counsel Data Request No. 79, with       41         Attachment "PC-79 Year-End       5alary Review for 2019," Attachment "PC-79	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         Request No. 89       6         0       DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 91       8         8       DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response       46         7       To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92       9         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       46         11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         12       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of 46       46         14       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         15       DJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         16       IDJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         17       Request 15 (2/19/21)       46
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         Watson 2020 Salary Budget and Economic       46         Data, North America       46         JEK-6X Cascade's Supplemental Response to Public       46         Counsel Data Request No. 79, with       41         Attachment "PC-79 Year-End       Salary Review for 2019," Attachment "PC-79         Year-End Salary Review Letter for 2021,"       and Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 89         6       DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 91         8       DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response       46         7       To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       11         11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         12       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of 46         14       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         15       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         16       DJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         17       Request 15 (2/19/21)       18       DCP-1T Response Testimony       46
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         Technical Craft Clerical Survey (October 2020)       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         Watson 2020 Salary Budget and Economic       46         Data, North America       46         JEK-6X Cascade's Supplemental Response to Public       46         Counsel Data Request No. 79, with       41         Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary Review       46         Salary Review for 2020, "Attachment "PC-79       Year-End Salary         Year-End Salary Review Letter for 2021,"       and Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary         Review Approvals"       40	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         Request No. 89       6         0       DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 91       8         8       DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response       46         7       To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92       9         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       46         11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         12       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of 46       46         14       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         15       DJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         16       IJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         17       Request 15 (2/19/21)       46
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         Technical Craft Clerical Survey (October 2020)       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         Watson 2020 Salary Budget and Economic       46         Data, North America       46         JEK-6X Cascade's Supplemental Response to Public       46         Counsel Data Request No. 79, with       4ttachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary Review for 2019," Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary Review for 2020," Attachment "PC-79         Year-End Salary Review for 2020," Attachment "PC-79       Year-End Salary Review Approvals"         CRM-1T Response Testimony       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         Request No. 89       6         0       DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 91       8         8       DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response       46         7       To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92       9         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         12       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of 46       46         14       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         15       DJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         16       DCP-1T Response Testimony       46         17       Request 15 (2/19/21)       46         18       DCP-17 Response Testimony       46         19       DCP-2 Background and Experience Profile       46         19       DCP-4 Economic Indicators </td
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       Technical Craft Clerical Survey (October 2020)         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         Watson 2020 Salary Budget and Economic       Data, North America         JEK-6X Cascade's Supplemental Response to Public       46         Counsel Data Request No. 79, with       Attachment "PC-79 Year-End         Salary Review for 2020," Attachment "PC-79       Year-End Salary Review Letter for 2021,"         and Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary       Review Approvals"         CRM-1T Response Testimony       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         Request No. 89       6         6       DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 99         6       DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response       46         7       Request No. 92       9         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       46         11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         12       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of 46       46         14       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         15       DJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         16       DCP-1T Response Testimony       46         17       Request 15 (2/19/21)       46         18       DCP-13 Cascade Total Cost of Capital       46         20       DCP-3 Cascade History of Credit Ratings       46
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         Technical Craft Clerical Survey (October 2020)       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         Watson 2020 Salary Budget and Economic       46         Data, North America       46         JEK-6X Cascade's Supplemental Response to Public       46         Counsel Data Request No. 79, with       41         Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary Review       51         for 2019," Attachment "PC-79 Year-End       51         Salary Review for 2020," Attachment "PC-79       Year-End Salary Review Letter for 2021,"         and Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary       46         ANH-1T Response Testimony       46         ANH-1 Response Testimony       46         ANH-3 Revenue Summary       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         Request No. 89       6         0       DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 91       8         8       DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response       46         7       To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92       9         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         12       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of 46       46         14       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         15       DJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         16       DCP-1T Response Testimony       46         17       Request 15 (2/19/21)       46         18       DCP-17 Response Testimony       46         19       DCP-2 Background and Experience Profile       46         19       DCP-4 Economic Indicators </td
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         Technical Craft Clerical Survey (October 2020)       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         Watson 2020 Salary Budget and Economic       46         Data, North America       46         JEK-6X Cascade's Supplemental Response to Public       46         Counsel Data Request No. 79, with       41         Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary Review       46         Salary Review for 2020," Attachment "PC-79       Year-End Salary Review Letter for 2021,"         and Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary       46         ANH-1T Response Testimony       46         ANH-2 Rate Spread and Rate Design       46         ANH-3 Revenue Summary       46         ANH-4 Residential Bill Impact       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         Request No. 89       6         DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 91       8         9       DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response       46         7       To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92       9         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         12       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of 46       46         14       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         15       DJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         16       DCP-1T Response Testimony       46         17       Request 15 (2/19/21)       18         18       DCP-17 Response Testimony       46         19       DCP-2 Background and Experience Profile       46         20       DCP-3 Cascade Total Cost of Capital
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BLR-5 Results Comparison to Customer Growth       46         BLR-6 Revenue Impact       46         JEK-1CT Confidential - Rebuttal Testimony       46         JEK-2C Confidential - Pearl Meyer Compensation       46         Program Review (October 2018)       46         JEK-3C Confidential - Excerpt from EAP Data       46         Information Solutions, LLC 2020 Energy       46         Technical Craft Clerical Survey (October 2020)       46         JEK-4 2020 Payroll Cost Increases       46         JEK-5C Confidential - Excerpt of Willis Towers       46         Watson 2020 Salary Budget and Economic       46         Data, North America       46         JEK-6X Cascade's Supplemental Response to Public       46         Counsel Data Request No. 79, with       41         Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary Review       51         for 2019," Attachment "PC-79 Year-End       51         Salary Review for 2020," Attachment "PC-79       Year-End Salary Review Letter for 2021,"         and Attachment "PC-79 Year-End Salary       46         ANH-1T Response Testimony       46         ANH-1 Response Testimony       46         ANH-3 Revenue Summary       46	Proposed Pro Forma Plant and Proposed         4       Pro Forma Plant Adjustments         5       DJP-3 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         Request No. 89       6         6       DJP-4 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         7       Request No. 91       8         8       DJP-5 Company's Revised Supplemental Response       46         7       To UTC Staff Data Request No. 92       9         9       DJP-6 Company's Response to UTC Staff Data       46         10       Request No. 124       11         11       DJP-7 Company's Supplemental Response to UTC       46         12       DJP-8T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         13       DJP-9X UG-170929: Revised Response Testimony of 46         14       David J. Panco       46         15       DJP-10X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         16       DJP-11X Staff's Response to Cascade Data       46         17       Request 15 (2/19/21)       46         18       DCP-1T Response Testimony       46         19       DCP-2 Background and Experience Profile       46         20       DCP-3 Cascade Total Cost of Capital       46         21       DCP-4 Economic Indicators

3 (Pages 35 to 38)

Pa	Dage 30
1       EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)         2       EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION       PAGE         3       DCP-8 Proxy Companies Basis for Selection       46         4       DCP-9 Proxy Companies DCF Cost Rates       46         5       DCP-10 Standard & Poor's 500 ROE and 20-Year       46         6       DCP-11 Proxy Companies CAPM Cost Rates       46         7       DCP-12 Proxy Companies ROE and M/B       46         8       DCP-13 Standard & Poor's 500 ROE and M/B       46         9       DCP-13 Standard & Poor's 500 ROE and M/B       46         9       DCP-14 Risk Indicators       46         10       DCP-15 Risk Premium Analysis       46         11       DCP-16x U.S. Department of the Treasury: Daily       46         12       Treasury Yield Curve Rates       13         13       DCP-117, and DCP-12       10         14       DCP-11, and DCP-12       10         15       DCP-18X Adjusted DCP-12, Page 1 (Excluding 46       46         16       DCP-19X UE-190529/190530: Response Testimony 46       46         17       Of David C. Parcell and Exhibits DCP-3, DCP-3, DCP-10, DCP-12, and DCP-14       46         18       DCP-20X UE-190529/UG-190530: Order 08 (excerpt)       46         19 <td>age 39       Page 41         1       EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)         2       EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION       PAGE         3       MEG-19C Confidential - Cascade Response to UTC 46 Staff Data Request 5, with Confidential 4       Attachments         5       MEG-20C Confidential - Cascade Response to 46 Public Counsel Data Request 42, with 6       Confidential Attachments         6       Confidential Attachments       MEG-21 Cascade's Response to AWEC Data Request 46 50, with Attachment         8       MEG-22 Cascade 2nd Revised Supplemental Response 46 7 o UTC Staff Data Request 92, with Attachment       MEG-23 Cascade Response to UTC Staff Data 46 8         9       To UTC Staff Data Request 26 and 27 12       JRW-1Tr Response Testimony 46 13       JRW-2 Recommended Cost of Capital 46 14         14       JRW-3 Summary Financial Statistics for Proxy 46 Groups       JRW-4 Capital Structure Ratios and Debt Cost 46 Ratios         17       JRW-5 The Relationship Between Expected ROE and 46 Market-to-Book Ratios       JRW-7 Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Model 46 JRW-8 Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Model 46 JRW-8 Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Study 46</td>	age 39       Page 41         1       EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)         2       EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION       PAGE         3       MEG-19C Confidential - Cascade Response to UTC 46 Staff Data Request 5, with Confidential 4       Attachments         5       MEG-20C Confidential - Cascade Response to 46 Public Counsel Data Request 42, with 6       Confidential Attachments         6       Confidential Attachments       MEG-21 Cascade's Response to AWEC Data Request 46 50, with Attachment         8       MEG-22 Cascade 2nd Revised Supplemental Response 46 7 o UTC Staff Data Request 92, with Attachment       MEG-23 Cascade Response to UTC Staff Data 46 8         9       To UTC Staff Data Request 26 and 27 12       JRW-1Tr Response Testimony 46 13       JRW-2 Recommended Cost of Capital 46 14         14       JRW-3 Summary Financial Statistics for Proxy 46 Groups       JRW-4 Capital Structure Ratios and Debt Cost 46 Ratios         17       JRW-5 The Relationship Between Expected ROE and 46 Market-to-Book Ratios       JRW-7 Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Model 46 JRW-8 Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Model 46 JRW-8 Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Study 46
22 AIW-3 Staff's Recalculation of Revenue 46 Requirement Related to Adjustment R-4,	JRW-10 Cascade Natural Gas Corp. Recommended 46
23     Restat End of Period (EOP)       24     MEG-1Tr       25     46	23       Cost of Capital and ROE Results         24       JRW-11 GDP and S&P 500 Growth Rates       46         25       25
Pag	age 40 Page 42
1       EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)         2       EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION       PAGE         3       MEG-2 Qualifications/Curriculum of Mark E.       46         3       MEG-3r Summary of Revenue Requirement       46         4       MEG-3r Summary of Revenue Requirement       46         5       Recommendations       46         6       MEG-4r Results of Operations Summary Sheet       46         7       MEG-5 Plant in Service       46         8       MEG-6 Payroll Expense       46         9       MEG-7 Incentive Compensation       46         10       MEG-8 Depreciation Rate Adjustment       46         11       MEG-9 Interest Coordination Adjustment       46         12       MEG-10 Director's Fees Adjustment       46         13       MEG-11 Cost of Capital       46	1       EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)         2       EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION       PAGE         3       JRW-12 Educational Background, Research, and 46         Related Business Experience of Dr. J       Randall Woolridge         5       JRW-13 Cascade Response to Public Counsel Data 46         Request 31 31       Request 31 31         6       6         7       JRW-14T Cross-Answering Testimony       46         7       JRW-15X Public Counsel's Response to Cascade 46         8       Data Request 2 (12/9/20)         9       JRW-16X Public Counsel's Response to Cascade 46         9       Data Request 5 (12/9/20)         9       JRW-17X UE-190529/UG-190530: Response Testimony 101         0f J. Randall Woolridge and Exhibits       JRW-3, JRW-9, and JRW-10         10       0f J. Randall Woolridge and Exhibits         JRW-3, JRW-9, and JRW-10       12         46       BGM-1T Response Testimony 46         16       BGM-2 Regulatory Appearances of Bradley G. 46         16       BGM-3 Revenue Requirement Calculations 46         16       BGM-5 Cost of Debt with New Debt Issuances 46         17       BGM-5 Cost of Debt with New Debt Issuances 46         18       BGM-6 AWEC Proposed Pro Forma Capital Additions 46         19

4 (Pages 39 to 42)

		Page	43		Page 45
1				1	
1 2	EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.) EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION	PAGE		1 2	good morning, Judge Howard. This is Nash Callaghan, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of
3	BGM-13X UG-170929: Response Testimony		46	3	Commission Staff.
-	Bradley G. Mullins (Excerpt)	01	10	4	
4				5	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
	SMC-1T Response Testimony	46		6	And Public Counsel?
5				7	MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. My name is Lisa
	SMC-2 Professional Qualifications	46			Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel.
6				8	
7 8				10	JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an
° 9					appearance for AWEC?
10				11	MR. STOKES: Good morning, everyone. Chad
11				12	Stokes with the Cable Huston law firm on behalf of the
12				13	Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.
13				14	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
14				15	And The Energy Project?
15				16	MR. FFITCH: Good morning, Judge Howard,
16				17	Chairman Danner, and Commissioners. Simon ffitch
17				18	appearing on behalf of The Energy Project.
18 19				19	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
20				20	Next I'd like to address exhibits. I
21				21	understand the parties stipulated to the admission of
22				22	all the prefiled exhibits and testimony including
23				23	cross-examination exhibits; however, Public Counsel is
24				24	reserving its objection to Exhibit JRW-17X for the
25				25	present time.
		Page	4.4	<u> </u>	
		Paye	44		Page 46
1		5	44	1	-
1	LACEY, WASHINGTON; FEBRUARY 24	5	44	1	Do I understand that correctly and would any
2	9:05 A.M.	5	44	2	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue?
2 3	9:05 A.M. 000	5	44	2 3	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that
2 3 4	9:05 A.M.	5	44	2 3 4	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any
2 3 4 5	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S	l, 2021	44	2 3 4 5	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used.
2 3 4 5 6	9:05 A.M. o0o P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco	l, 2021 ord. It	44	2 3 4 5 6	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken.
2 3 4 5 6 7	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time	l, 2021 ord. It	44	2 3 4 5 6 7	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m.	l, 2021 ord. It	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	9:05 A.M. o0o P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an	l, 2021 ord. It is	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9:05 A.M. 00o P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L	l, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	9:05 A.M. 00o P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am press	l, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	9:05 A.M. 00o P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am press this matter along with the Commissioners.	, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	9:05 A.M. 00o P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am press	, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	9:05 A.M. 00o P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am press this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary here	, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am prese this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary here in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gene	, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing eral rate	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.) JUDGE HOWARD: Before I discuss the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am prese this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary her in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gene case.	, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing eral rate	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am prese this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary her in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gene case. Let's start with short appearances from	I, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing eral rate the	44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.) JUDGE HOWARD: Before I discuss the procedure of the hearing today, are there motions or requests from any of the parties?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am prese this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary he in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gene case. Let's start with short appearances from parties and let's start with Cascade.	I, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing eral rate the nner,		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.) JUDGE HOWARD: Before I discuss the procedure of the hearing today, are there motions or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	9:05 A.M. 00o P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am prese this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary here in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gene case. Let's start with short appearances from parties and let's start with Cascade. MS. PEASE: Good morning, Chair Dar	I, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in eral rate the nner, ocelyn Pe	ease	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.) JUDGE HOWARD: Before I discuss the procedure of the hearing today, are there motions or requests from any of the parties? Hearing nothing, let's discuss our schedule. First we will hear testimony from the three cost of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	9:05 A.M. 00o P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am press this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary here in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gene case. Let's start with short appearances from parties and let's start with Cascade. MS. PEASE: Good morning, Chair Dar Commissioners, Judge Howard. My name is Ju	I, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing eral rate the the nner, ocelyn Pe have with	ease	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.) JUDGE HOWARD: Before I discuss the procedure of the hearing today, are there motions or requests from any of the parties? Hearing nothing, let's discuss our schedule. First we will hear testimony from the three cost of capital witnesses, Bulkley, Parcell, and Woolridge as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am pres this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary he in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gene case. Let's start with short appearances from parties and let's start with Cascade. MS. PEASE: Good morning, Chair Dar Commissioners, Judge Howard. My name is J with McDowell Rackner Gibson for Cascade. I	I, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing eral rate the the nner, ocelyn Pe have with	ease	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.) JUDGE HOWARD: Before I discuss the procedure of the hearing today, are there motions or requests from any of the parties? Hearing nothing, let's discuss our schedule. First we will hear testimony from the three cost of capital witnesses, Bulkley, Parcell, and Woolridge as a panel. Then we will call individual witnesses in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am pres this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary he in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gen case. Let's start with short appearances from parties and let's start with Cascade. MS. PEASE: Good morning, Chair Dar Commissioners, Judge Howard. My name is Jo with McDowell Rackner Gibson for Cascade. I me today co-counsel Katherine McDowell, Jord Schoonover, and Shoshana Baird.	I, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing eral rate the the nner, ocelyn Pe have with	ease h	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.) JUDGE HOWARD: Before I discuss the procedure of the hearing today, are there motions or requests from any of the parties? Hearing nothing, let's discuss our schedule. First we will hear testimony from the three cost of capital witnesses, Bulkley, Parcell, and Woolridge as a panel. Then we will call individual witnesses in the order agreed to by the parties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am pres this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary he in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gene case. Let's start with short appearances from parties and let's start with Cascade. MS. PEASE: Good morning, Chair Dar Commissioners, Judge Howard. My name is Ju with McDowell Rackner Gibson for Cascade. I me today co-counsel Katherine McDowell, Jord	I, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing eral rate the the nner, ocelyn Pe have with	ease h	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.) JUDGE HOWARD: Before I discuss the procedure of the hearing today, are there motions or requests from any of the parties? Hearing nothing, let's discuss our schedule. First we will hear testimony from the three cost of capital witnesses, Bulkley, Parcell, and Woolridge as a panel. Then we will call individual witnesses in the order agreed to by the parties. Are there any concerns?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	9:05 A.M. 000 P R O C E E D I N G S JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the reco is Wednesday, February 24th, 2021. The time approximately 9:05 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington L and Transportation Commission, and I am pres this matter along with the Commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary he in Docket UG-200568, which is Cascade's gen- case. Let's start with short appearances from parties and let's start with Cascade. MS. PEASE: Good morning, Chair Dar Commissioners, Judge Howard. My name is Jo with McDowell Rackner Gibson for Cascade. I me today co-counsel Katherine McDowell, Jord Schoonover, and Shoshana Baird. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have an	I, 2021 ord. It is Jtilities siding in earing eral rate the nner, ocelyn Pe have with dan appearan	ease h	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Do I understand that correctly and would any party care to speak to that issue? MS. GAFKEN: You do understand that correctly, and I think we can wait to address any potential objections to JRW-17X when it's used. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. And I will, therefore, admit all the prefiled testimony and exhibits into evidence with the exception of JRW-17X. I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter so it will be made part of the record, and we will address Exhibit JRW-17X when it is offered into evidence. (All prefiled testimony and exhibits admitted with the exception of JRW-17X.) JUDGE HOWARD: Before I discuss the procedure of the hearing today, are there motions or requests from any of the parties? Hearing nothing, let's discuss our schedule. First we will hear testimony from the three cost of capital witnesses, Bulkley, Parcell, and Woolridge as a panel. Then we will call individual witnesses in the order agreed to by the parties.

5 (Pages 43 to 46)

	Page 47		Page 49
1	with the cost of capital panel. Let's I believe I	1	asked to myself. So those lines 1 through 10, they are
2	saw at least two of the three witnesses on the call. We	2	cited as a quotation, but they're not offset. So when
3	have Mr. Parcell, Ms. Bulkley, do we have Woolridge on	3	you're reading, you might think that they were might
4	the line?	4	be confusing.
5	MR. WOOLRIDGE: Yes, yes, I'm here.	5	Q. Okay. Do you have any other changes or
6	JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, great. Thank you.	6	corrections to your testimony?
7	Would all three of the cost of capital	7	A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
8	witnesses please turn on your camera and I will swear	8	Q. So if I were to ask you the questions that are
9	you in.	9	set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your
10	(Witness panel sworn.)	10	answers be the same?
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Pease, would you please	11	A. Yes, they would.
12	introduce Cascade's witness?	12	MS. MCDOWELL: This witness is available for
13	MS. MCDOWELL: Your Honor, this is Katherine	13	cross-examination.
14	McDowell. I'll be presenting Ms. Bulkley this morning.	14	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
15	Can you hear and see me okay?	15	Mr. Callaghan, would you introduce Staff's
16	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, please proceed.	16	witness.
17	MS. MCDOWELL: So just one question to you.	17	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor, yes.
18	Since the exhibits have been admitted, would you like me	18	in a check of have thank you, four honor, yes.
19	to dispense with the normal colloquy and just proceed to	19	EXAMINATION
20	ask if there's changes or corrections and then turn the	20	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
21	witness over or would you like me to go through and	21	Q. Mr. Parcell, how are you employed? Mr. Parcell,
22	identify this witness's exhibits and testimony?	22	can you hear me?
23	JUDGE HOWARD: You could just a just a	23	A. Without my earplug, I can barely hear. I hear
24	brief introduction and perhaps the range of exhibit	24	fine with earplugs in, but I can hear almost nothing. I
25	numbers and as they are marked. We don't need	25	have my speaker turned as high as it'll go. Can I try
	Page 48		Page 50
			rage JU
1	necessarily to address each one.	1	earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?
1 2	necessarily to address each one. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.	1 2	
			earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?
2		2	earplugs again, see if there's still background noise? Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?
2 3	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.	2 3	<ul><li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li><li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li><li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li></ul>
2 3 4	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.	2 3 4	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL:	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed? A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did did Commission Staff hire you to</li> </ul>
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed? A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> </ul>
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed? A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president. Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did – did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed? A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president. Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed? A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president. Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning? A. Yes, I have.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed? A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president. Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning? A. Yes, I have. Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did – did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed? A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president. Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning? A. Yes, I have. Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed? A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president. Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning? A. Yes, I have. Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did - did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. A. Good morning. Q. How are you employed? A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president. Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning? A. Yes, I have. Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your rebuttal in exhibits, which are AEB-1 through AEB-6?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Parcell is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. How are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president.</li> <li>Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your rebuttal in exhibits, which are AEB-1 through AEB-6?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Parcell is available for cross-examination. Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. How are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president.</li> <li>Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your rebuttal in exhibits, which are AEB-1 through AEB-6?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Parcell is available for cross-examination. Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. How are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president.</li> <li>Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your rebuttal in exhibits, which are AEB-1 through AEB-6?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did - did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Parcell is available for cross-examination. Thank you.</li> <li>MUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Gafken, would you please introduce</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. How are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president.</li> <li>Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your rebuttal in exhibits, which are AEB-1 through AEB-6?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I have one formatting correction in my rebuttal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so</li> <li>I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did – did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Parcell is available for cross-examination. Thank you.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Gafken, would you please introduce</li> <li>Public Counsel's witness.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. How are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president.</li> <li>Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your rebuttal in exhibits, which are AEB-1 through AEB-6?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I have one formatting correction in my rebuttal testimony. On page 85 at lines 1 through 10, there is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did – did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Parcell is available for cross-examination. Thank you.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Gafken, would you please introduce</li> <li>Public Counsel's witness.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: Yes, thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. How are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president.</li> <li>Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your rebuttal in exhibits, which are AEB-1 through AEB-6?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I have one formatting correction in my rebuttal testimony. On page 85 at lines 1 through 10, there is what appears to be Q and A. It should be as an offset</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did - did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Parcell is available for cross-examination. Thank you.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Gafken, would you please introduce</li> <li>Public Counsel's witness.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: Yes, thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. How are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president.</li> <li>Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your rebuttal in exhibits, which are AEB-1 through AEB-6?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I have one formatting correction in my rebuttal testimony. On page 85 at lines 1 through 10, there is what appears to be Q and A. It should be as an offset quote because it is a quote from the testimony of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did – did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Parcell is available for cross-examination. Thank you.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Gafken, would you please introduce</li> <li>Public Counsel's witness.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: Yes, thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. That sounds good.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. How are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm employed by Concentric Energy Advisors as a senior vice president.</li> <li>Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared testimony and exhibits for this proceeding this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. And are those exhibits your direct testimony in Exhibits AEB-1 through let me get my exhibit numbers correct, through AEB basically your direct and your rebuttal in exhibits, which are AEB-1 through AEB-6?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I have one formatting correction in my rebuttal testimony. On page 85 at lines 1 through 10, there is what appears to be Q and A. It should be as an offset</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>earplugs again, see if there's still background noise?</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you hear me?</li> <li>A. I hear you just fine now, thank you.</li> <li>Q. All right. Thank you. It sounds okay to me, so I think let's proceed.</li> <li>Mr. Parcell, how are you employed?</li> <li>A. I'm with Technical 4 Associates, Incorporated as a principal and economist.</li> <li>Q. And did - did Commission Staff hire you to provide analysis and testimony for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are those Exhibits DCP-1T through DCP-15?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any corrections or updates to those exhibits?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Parcell is available for cross-examination. Thank you.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.</li> <li>Ms. Gafken, would you please introduce</li> <li>Public Counsel's witness.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: Yes, thank you.</li> </ul>

6 (Pages 47 to 50)

	Page 51	Page 5
1	EXAMINATION	1 testimony, Exhibit AEB-4T, and go to page 3.
2	BY MS. GAFKEN:	2 A. Yes, I'm there.
3	Q. Dr. Woolridge, would you please state your name	3 Q. Okay. Turning your attentions to lines 5 and 6
4	for the record and spell your last name?	4 on page 3, you state that capital market conditions have
5	A. Yes, my name the initial J, Randall Woolridge,	<ul> <li>changed dramatically in 2020 and you note the heightened</li> </ul>
6	and that's spelled W-o-o-l-r-i-d-g-e. I am a professor	6 volatility in equity markets, correct?
7	of finance at the Pennsylvania State University.	7 A. Yes, and higher betas also on the line as well.
8	Q. And were you retained by Public Counsel for this	8 Q. Okay. Please turn to page 4 of your rebuttal
9	case to evaluate Cascade's cost of capital and return on	9 testimony, Exhibit AEB-4T, starting at line 21.
10	equity issues?	10 A. Yes, I'm there.
11	A. Yes.	11 Q. There you note that Public Counsel's
12	Q. Did you prepare testimony, cross-answering	12 recommendation recommended ROE of 9 percent is toward
13	testimony, and exhibits for this case, which has been	13 the low end of authorized returns for natural gas
14	marked and admitted as Exhibits JRW-1T through JRW-14?	14 distribution companies in the U.S. since 2018; is that
15	A. Yes.	15 correct?
16	Q. Do you have any changes or updates to your	16 A. Yes, that's correct.
17	testimony or exhibits?	17 Q. Staying with the same exhibit, AEB-4T, could you
18	A. I have one little typo, which is on page 42 at	18 please turn to line 7 – I'm sorry, page 7, line 6.
19	line 5.	19 A. Page 7, line 6. Yes, I'm there.
20	Q. And what is that typo?	20 <b>Q. Thank you.</b>
21	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry, is that	21 You note that the majority of authorized ROEs
22	for the initial or the response testimony or or	for natural gas distribution companies since 2018 have
23	cross-answering?	23 been within a range of 9.4 to 9.8 percent, which
24	DR. WOOLRIDGE: The response testimony.	24 suggests that regulators are relying on more than just
25	A. There's a table two on the right-hand column, it	25 the results of the traditional model; is this correct?
_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,
	Page 52	Page 5
1	says equity cost rate at 8.95 percent, and as discussed	1 A. Yes, it is correct. There is there are
2	that's that 9.0 percent. 8.95 on [inaudible.]	2 results higher than that nine 9.8 as well. I think
3	THE COURT REPORTER: This is the court	<sup>3</sup> there was also as high as 10 in 2020, but yes.
4	reporter. I can't hear what he's saying.	4 Q. Okay. Could you please turn to Cross-Exhibit
5	DR. WOOLRIDGE: Can you hear me?	5 AEB-7X?
6	THE COURT REPORTER: Now I can. Thank you.	6 A. Let me just pull that up.
7	A. Okay. It's on table 2, line 5, page 42, the	7 Q. Take your time and just let me know when whe
8	right-hand column should be 9.0 percent and not 8.95	8 you get that exhibit pulled up.
9	percent.	9 A. It's loading.
10	BY MS. GAFKEN:	10 <b>Q. Okay.</b>
11	Q. Mr. Woolridge, were your testimony and exhibits	A. Just to make sure I have the right exhibit, this
12	prepared by you or under your instruction and	12 would be
13	supervision?	13 Q. So the Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X is Public Counsel's
14	A. Yes.	14 data request No. 78 to Cascade and the Company's
15	MS. GAFKEN: Mr. Woolridge is available for	15 response.
16	cross-examination.	16 A. Okay.
17	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Gafken, you	17 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: 78 or No. 7?
18	may proceed with your cross-examination.	18 MS. GAFKEN: It's it's Cross-Exhibit 7X,
	MS. GAFKEN: Thank you.	19 but it's it's data request 78. It's the one with the
19		20 S&P Global Market Intelligence Article.
19 20		e en erezan manter mengeneer maerer
	ΕΧΑΜΙΝΑΤΙΟΝ	A. Yes, I have that up now. I I pulled up the
20	E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. GAFKEN:	-
20 21		A. Yes, I have that up now. I I pulled up the
20 21 22	BY MS. GAFKEN:	A. Yes, I have that up now. I I pulled up the wrong exhibit before, I apologize.
20 21 22 23	BY MS. GAFKEN: Q. Good morning, Ms. Bulkley. My name is Lisa	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I have that up now. I I pulled up the</li> <li>wrong exhibit before, I apologize.</li> <li>BY MS. GAFKEN:</li> </ul>

7 (Pages 51 to 54)

	Page 55	Page 57
1	A. I've got it now.	1 ranges, correct?
2	Q. Okay. Thank you.	2 A. Yes.
3	So looking at Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X, do you	3 Q. The greatest number of ROEs authorized in 2020
4	recognize that as Public Counsel's data request No. 78	4 is shown in the 9.5 to 9.49 percent range, correct?
5	to Cascade and the Company's response?	5 A. No, I don't believe that range that you stated
6	A. Yes, I do.	6 is correct. The the greatest number would be in the
7	Q. Okay. Could you please refer to page 1 of that	7 9.25 to 9.49. Interestingly, this chart actually lines
8	exhibit, and I want to start first with the response to	8 up very well with the results of my TCF analysis, so
9	subpart A. Response to subpart A states that you are	9 being in that 9.5 to to 10.15 range, so
10	familiar with the S&P Global Market Intelligence and the	10 Q. Authorized ROE is not the equivalent to earned
11	RRA data that is available through this service,	11 ROE; is that correct?
12	correct?	12 A. That's correct.
13	A. Yes, that's correct.	13 Q. As part of your engagement in this case, did you
14	Q. And RRA refers to regulatory research	14 review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?
15	associates; is that correct?	15 A. I did.
16	A. Yes.	16 Q. And Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel
17	Q. In response to subsection B, that states that	17 [Brief interruption.]
18	you review the RRA data that is referenced in the	18 MS. GAFKEN: Somebody is not on mute. Maybe
19	attached article on a regular basis, correct?	19 they muted now.
20	A. Yes, I do.	20 BY MS. GAFKEN:
21	Q. Could you describe what a regular basis means?	21 Q. Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that
22	A. I have occasion to look at this multiple times a	the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0
23	week I would say probably. Not necessarily this	23 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years; do you recall
24	document, but the associated data that there's an	24 that testimony?
25	excerpt provided in this exhibit starting on page 5, so	A. I don't specifically. If you referenced me to
	Page 56	Page 58
1		
1	that data that follows in this article.	1 that
2	that data that follows in this article. <b>Q. Understood.</b>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at</li> </ol>
2 3	that data that follows in this article. Q. Understood. So you weren't necessarily familiar with the	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at</li> <li>page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> </ol>
2 3 4	that data that follows in this article. Q. Understood. So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at</li> <li>page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	that data that follows in this article. Q. Understood. So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&P service?	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at</li> <li>page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at</li> <li>page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the</li> <li>response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57,</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at</li> <li>page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the</li> <li>response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57,</li> <li>lines 14 to 15.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy"</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at</li> <li>page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the</li> <li>response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57,</li> <li>lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout."</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the</li> </ol>
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout."</li> <li>And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public</li> <li>Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout."</li> <li>And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout."</li> <li>And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at</li> <li>page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the</li> <li>response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57,</li> <li>lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the</li> <li>question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout."</li> <li>And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public</li> <li>Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout."</li> <li>And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that</li> <li>Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public</li> <li>Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout."</li> <li>And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that period of time, an excerpt.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that</li> <li>Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years, and I was asking</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout." And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that period of time, an excerpt.</li> <li>Q. Could you please turn to page 3 of Cross-Exhibit</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that</li> <li>Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years, and I was asking whether you recalled that testimony.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout." And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that period of time, an excerpt.</li> <li>Q. Could you please turn to page 3 of Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that</li> <li>Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years, and I was asking whether you recalled that testimony.</li> <li>A. I do see that here now, yes. He has stated that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout." And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that period of time, an excerpt.</li> <li>Q. Could you please turn to page 3 of Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X?</li> <li>A. Sure. I'm there.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years, and I was asking whether you recalled that testimony.</li> <li>A. I do see that here now, yes. He has stated that on this page, that's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout." And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that period of time, an excerpt.</li> <li>Q. Could you please turn to page 3 of Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X?</li> <li>A. Sure. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. That okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years, and I was asking whether you recalled that testimony.</li> <li>A. I do see that here now, yes. He has stated that on this page, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout." And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that period of time, an excerpt.</li> <li>Q. Could you please turn to page 3 of Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X?</li> <li>A. Sure. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. That okay. Thank you. That page has two charts on it and the second</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years, and I was asking whether you recalled that testimony.</li> <li>A. I do see that here now, yes. He has stated that on this page, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>In your direct testimony or your rebuttal</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public</li> <li>Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout."</li> <li>And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that period of time, an excerpt.</li> <li>Q. Could you please turn to page 3 of Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X?</li> <li>A. Sure. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. That okay. Thank you.</li> <li>That page has two charts on it and the second chart purports to show the frequency of authorized gas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that</li> <li>Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years, and I was asking whether you recalled that testimony.</li> <li>A. I do see that here now, yes. He has stated that on this page, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>In your direct testimony or your rebuttal testimony, you do not present evidence that natural gas</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout." And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that period of time, an excerpt.</li> <li>Q. Could you please turn to page 3 of Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X?</li> <li>A. Sure. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. That okay. Thank you.</li> <li>That page has two charts on it and the second chart purports to show the frequency of authorized gas ROEs for 2020, correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that</li> <li>Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years, and I was asking whether you recalled that testimony.</li> <li>A. I do see that here now, yes. He has stated that on this page, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>In your direct testimony or your rebuttal testimony, you do not present evidence that natural gas companies are having difficulty raising capital,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that data that follows in this article.</li> <li>Q. Understood.</li> <li>So you weren't necessarily familiar with the article before seeing the data request, but you are familiar with the RRA data and the the S&amp;P service?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the attached article to the Public Counsel data request 78 is entitled "Authorized energy returns hit all-time low in 2020 amid COVID-19 fallout." And that article refers to the RRA RRA data that we've been talking about, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct, it does. Yes, as I referenced the data well, the data that would pertain to gas ROEs would be page 6 of that article for that period of time, an excerpt.</li> <li>Q. Could you please turn to page 3 of Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X?</li> <li>A. Sure. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. That okay. Thank you.</li> <li>That page has two charts on it and the second chart purports to show the frequency of authorized gas ROEs for 2020, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that</li> <li>Q. Sure. The reference would be Exhibit JRW-1T at page 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. The pages again? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Sure, no no problem. So Exhibit JRW-1T, the response testimony, and that reference is page 57, 57, lines 14 to 15.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you're there, I'm happy to repeat the question.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So my question was confirming that</li> <li>Dr. Woolridge for Public Counsel testified that the earned ROE for natural gas companies ranges from 8.0 percent to 9.0 percent in recent years, and I was asking whether you recalled that testimony.</li> <li>A. I do see that here now, yes. He has stated that on this page, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>In your direct testimony or your rebuttal testimony, you do not present evidence that natural gas companies are having difficulty raising capital, correct?</li> </ul>

8 (Pages 55 to 58)

<ul> <li>utilities, which would create difficulty raising</li> <li>capital. So 1 - I think that's an important factor.</li> <li>Containty my testimony discusses the dowing and bab with entries for</li> <li>concerns following COVID about the creating that the spread between</li> <li>autilities were already I think Standard &amp; Poor's</li> <li>and Joba Act concern. This Standard &amp; Poor's</li> <li>midicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had</li> <li>negative already I think Standard &amp; Poor's</li> <li>midicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had</li> <li>negative outlooks, and so there was greater concern with</li> <li>respect to COVID that that would create more financial</li> <li>instability. So I do think Thave addressed that issue</li> <li>Now - excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade</li> <li>has backersessed the capital markets in 2029?</li> <li>A. Now - excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade</li> <li>the down what excusily.</li> <li>G. Now - excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade</li> <li>the or poor would be deterry. (DEE?)</li> <li>A. Yes, Y. Caid you turn back to Cross-Exhibit</li> <li>A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.</li> <li>G. You want to look at the</li> <li>So to he spead - this action has data in it</li> <li>the state or page 4. and the page numbers on this.</li> <li>G. You want to look at the</li> <li>So to he spead - this action has data in it</li> <li>that in my rebutal for the first in projections that that in my rebutal for the first in projections that that the 25. So my testimony than</li> <li>that in the really reflective of what we as a 1.5. Dory testimony than</li> <li>that has the oreal transmise, the orgin numbers.</li> <li>So to be spead - this action the spead in the spear numbers.</li> <li>So to be spead - this action the spead in the spear numbers.</li> <li>So the spean untherse in that that could pretent tr</li></ul>		Page 59		Page 61
2       capital Sol I think that's an inportant factor.       2       0. Would you agree that the spende obveen         3       capital Sol I think that's an inportant factor.       3         4       beve occurred related to Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the       authorized natural gas ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield is at an al-time high?         7       regulated uitiny companies in addition to the Tax Cuts       authorized natural gas ROEs and the 30-year Treasury         9       uitlities were already I think Standard & Poor's and that 25 percent of the uitilies already had in my testimory yies.       5         10       so in the beginning of the year, we had thaged over time.         11       regated that 25 percent of the uitilies already had in my testimory yies.       5         12       p. Okay. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit       16         13       a. Now - excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade has accessed the capital markets in 2020?       17         14       A. Do nk would had too in know that actually.       10         15       a. Now - excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade has accessed the capital markets in 2020?       17         16       has accessed the capital markets in 2020?       17         17       A. I do not know that actually.       16         18       d. Orkey. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit       16         19       th	1		1	
3         Certainly my testimony discusses the downgrades that have courser detect or Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the concerns following COVID about the credit metrics for regulated utility companies in addition to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act concern. It's Standard & Poor's and         authorized natural gas ROEs and the 30-year Treasury will be were already -1 think Standard & Poor's indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had instability. Sol to think I have addressed that issue in my testimony, yes.         A         No. Again, I - 1 don't neores and the 30-year Treasury were already -1 think Standard & Poor's indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had instability. Sol to think I have addressed that issue in my testimony, yes.         So in the beginning of the year, we had Treasury by dividis that were about 2.25 percent for the 30-year preCOVID, and then the reasuries idd see a dealing just preCOVID, and then the reasuries idd see a dealing just preCOVID, and then the treasuries as a low point, and the an increasing steadly sing the about 30 percent increasing steadly sing the about the interest rates changed over the course of my the interest rates changed over the second my the interest rates changed over the course of my the interest rates changed over the course of my the interest rates changed over the course of my the cours				
4       have occurred related to Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. the       yield is at an al-time high?         5       concerns following COVID about the credit metrics for       regulated uility companies in addition to the Tax Cuts         7       and Jobs Act Fich raised concerns. Because many       significant things that happened in 2020 was how the -         9       uilities were aiready I think Standard & Poors       significant things that happened in 2020 was how the -         10       negative outlooks, and so there was greater concern with       significant things that happened in 2020 was how the -         11       respect to CV/D that that would creater more financial       is on the beginning of the year, we had Trassury         11       respect to CV/D that that would creater more financial       is on the beginning of the year, we had they         12       preCVID, and them the treasuries did sea decline just       is on hyleids that were about 2.29 parent for the 30-year         13       instability. So I do think I have addressed that issue       is       is         14       defined through to about August as a low point, and         15 <b>A</b> . Roag a is authorized electric, ROEs?       So - so I don' - I don't link that is the as all of. The         16 <b>A</b> . Baya is authorized electric, but the bottom one would       so the segand the -       So the segand that the year are the asset of page numbers on this.       So thes pread I sin this first q			1	
<ul> <li>concerns following COVID about the credit metrics for regulated utility companies in addition to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act concern. It's Standard &amp; Poor's and Moody's and Flich raised concerns. Because many utilities were airedy -1 think Standard &amp; Poor's indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had instability. So I do think I have addressed the tissue in my testimony, yes.</li> <li>A. Now - excuss me. Do you know whether Cascade A. Now - excuss me. Do you know whether Cascade the capital markets in 2020?</li> <li>A. I do not know that actually.</li> <li>A. Okay. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit</li> <li>A. Beg 4 is authorized electric ROEs?</li> <li>A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.</li> <li>C. You want to look at the</li> <li>Page 60</li> <li>A. I shart the page numbers I should follow?</li> <li>A. I shart the page numbers I should follow?</li> <li>A. I shart the page numbers I should follow?</li> <li>A. I shart the page numbers I should follow?</li> <li>A. I shart the page ROEs and Treasury yields</li> <li>a. You want to look at the</li> <li>Page 620</li> <li>A. I shart the page numbers I should follow?</li> <li>A. I shart the page numbers I should follow?</li> <li>A. New, server, Yeas, okay, I'm there.</li> <li>A. Okay, Yes, okay, I'm there.</li> <li>A. New, server, the the resent ressures, think AEE-7X, that con bor relig confusing with the page numbers.</li> <li>So looking at the second chart on page 4 of Exhibit AEE-7X, that cont proget to the the resent ressures, this - this chart in properts to show the spread the spicured in the show the resent in the show there was an unbers.</li> <li>So looking at the second chart on page 4 of Exhibit AEE-7X, that cont proget to the the resent ressures, this, whith we the actual the show there was an unbers.</li> <li>So looking at the second chart on page 4 of the torrelist</li></ul>			1	
6       regulated utily companies in addition to the Tax Cuts       6       to be true. This - this chard is old data, so I think         7       and Jobs Act concern. It's Standard & Poor's and       5       to be true. This - this chard is old data, so I think         9       utilities were alreadyI think Standard & Poor's and       5       this 's really important to recognize. One of the most significant things that happened in 220 was how the         9       utilities were alreadyI think Standard & Poor's and       5       So in the beginning of the year, we had Treasury         10       negative outlooks, and so there was greater concern with re-       9       So in the beginning of the year, we had Treasury         11       negative outlooks, and so there was greater concern with re-       10       So in the beginning of the year, we had Treasury         12       proCOVID, and then the treasuries did see a define just instability. So I do think I have addressed that issue       11         13       instability. So I do think I have addressed that issue       12       12         14       in on the wort that actually.       2021.       So - so I do neaving that happened in 2020 was how the         14       the on the wort that actually.       13       14       14         15       the on the wort that actually.       14       14       14         16       A. So the or othrese s			5	
7       and Jobs Act concern. It's Standard & Poor's and       7       that's really important to recognize. One of the most         8       Moody's and Fitch missed concerns. Because many       uillities were already1 think Standard & Poor's         10       indicated that 25 percent of the uillities already had       significant things that happened in 2020 was how the         11       body yelds that were about 22 5 percent for the 40-year       So in the beginning of the year, we had Treasury         12       respect to COVID that that would create more financial       instability. So 1d think I have addressed that issue         13       in Mov - excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade       fits the overall market in February and March, and they         13       Q. Now - excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade       fits the overall market in February and March, and they         14       A. Do now mat a clually.       So - so 1 don't - 1 ont'n link that's true as         14       A. Do not know that actually.       So - so 1 don't - 1 ont'n link that's true as         15       O. Now - excuse the cast of page numbers on this.       So there are three sets of page numbers on this.         15       O. You want to look at the       Page 62         16       A. Top right.       So the's nerget page numbers on this.         17       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       So the's nerget page numbers.     <	6	6	6	
8         Moody's and Fich raised concerns. Because many         indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had         indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had           11         indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had         indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had           12         respect to COVID that that would create more financial         indicated that 25 percent for the 30-year           13         instability. So 1 do think I have addressed that itsue         indicated that 25 percent for the 30-year           14         the overall market in the treasury is decided though to about Agust as a low point, and           15 <b>0.</b> Now - excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade           16         has accessed the capital markets in 2020?           17         A. 1 do not know that actually.           18 <b>0.</b> Okay. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit           19         A. Page 4 is authorized electric RDEs?           10         There should address natural gas companies.           12 <b>0.</b> You want to look at the -           12         Page 6 10           12         A. Is that the page numbers on this.           16         A. Is that the page numbers on this.           17         A. Is that the page numbers on this.           18         A. So it's - yeah, the exhibit number and page      <	7		7	
<ul> <li>utilities were already I think Standard &amp; Poors</li> <li>indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had</li> <li>negative outlooks, and so there was greater concern with</li> <li>respect to COVID that that would create more financial</li> <li>instability. So I do think I have addressed that issue</li> <li>in my testimory, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now - excuse</li> <li>A. I do not know that actually.</li> <li>A. Now - excuse mean transpace of the course of my</li> <li>A. Page 4 is authorized electric, ROEs?</li> <li>A. So there are three sets of page numbers in the course of my</li> <li>be -would address of page numbers of the course of my</li> <li>be -would address of page numbers of page numbers.</li> <li>A. Top right.</li> <li>A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?</li> <li>C. I think it's the top right so -</li> <li>A. Top right.</li> <li>A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.</li> <li>So looking at the second chart on page 4 of the summers.</li> <li>Be -would address of page numbers and page of the sumbers.</li> <li>Be -would address the course of the page for the sumbers of page numbers.</li> <li>Be -would address the course of the second chart on page 4 of the summer sum or my testimony, has been some change. I think with a thart page to numbers.</li> <li>Booking at the second chart on page 4 of the summer sum or my testimony, has been hat the the rease of the second chart on page 4 of the summer sum or my testimony has -</li> <li>that chart fight now.</li> <li>C. I think it's the top right so -</li> <li>So looking at the second chart on page 4 of the summer sum or my testimony has -</li> <li>then the substitue mile. I would be out of date. Whe seep to the resource set had be address and so year Teasaury yield fluctuates as - as you're isan the substitue withs. I would be out of date. Whe week entrease that we're seen in the is actually accurately in the seen in the is a that shown here.</li> <li>C. Okay, Take your of the seen the week seven in the is a poly sear the saury w</li></ul>	8	Moody's and Fitch raised concerns. Because many	8	
10       indicated that 25 percent of the utilities already had         11       negative outlooks, and so there was greater concern with         12       instability. So 1 do think I have addressed that issue         13       instability. So 1 do think I have addressed that issue         14       instability. So 1 do think I have addressed that issue         15       Q. Now - accuse me. Do you know whether Cascade         16       has accessed the capital markets in 2020?         17       A. 1 do not know that actually.         18       Q. Okay. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit         19       A. Page 4 is authorized electric ROES?         10       Fabre actic, but the bottom one would         21       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.         25       Q. You want to look at the -         26       You want to look at the -         27       A. Is that the page numbers i should follow?         2       A. Is that the page numbers i should follow?         3       A. Cop right.         4       A. So high, at the econd chart on page 4 of         5       C. Hink Kit's a fair point to say that the         7       A. Is that the page numbers on this.         26       A. So if's - yeak, the exhibit number and page         numbers.	9	utilities were already I think Standard & Poor's	9	
12       respect to COVID that that would create more financial         13       instability. So I do think I have addressed that issue         14       in my testimony, yes.         15       0. Now – excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade         16       has accessed the capital markets in 2020?         17       A. I do not know that actually.         18       0. Okay. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit         19       A. Page 4 is authorized electric ROEs?         10       There should be two charts on page 4, and the         12       There should be two charts on page 4, and the         12       D. There should be two charts on page 4, and the         12       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.         12       A. Is that the page numbers i should follow?         1       A. Is that the page numbers i should follow?         2       A. Is that the page numbers i should follow?         3       A. Is on fint.         4       A. So firs – yeah, the exhibit number and page         numbers.       A. Or kay. Yes, ich, if does purport to do that. It is         5       Now Ares, Keay. I'm there.         4       A. Is that the page numbers or the sources of the increase that diage and there wes an areyst registromy thas been nore my testimony than –         5       A. Or k	10		10	So in the beginning of the year, we had Treasury
<ul> <li>instability. So I do think I have addressed that issue</li> <li>in my testimony, yes.</li> <li>0. Now - excuse me, Do you know whether Cascade</li> <li>has accessed the capital markets in 2020?</li> <li>A. I do not know that actually.</li> <li>0. Okay. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit</li> <li>A. By day is authorized electric ROEs?</li> <li>0. There should be two charts on page 4, and the</li> <li>to pone would be etteric, but the bottom one would</li> <li>be - would address natural gas companies.</li> <li>A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.</li> <li>C. You want to look at the</li> <li>Page 60</li> <li>A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?</li> <li>Q. I think it's the top right so -</li> <li>A. Top right.</li> <li>A. Okay, Yes, okay. I'm there,</li> <li>C. That can be really confusing with the page numbers.</li> <li>So looking at the second chart on page 4 of</li> <li>Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread</li> <li>be - would addressen in a second chart on page 4 of</li> <li>Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>A. Nes, it it does purport to do that. It is</li> <li>quite out of date with respect to the recent trassuries,</li> <li>though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to</li> <li>the 30-year Treasury yield fuctuates as - as you've just</li> <li>testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen in a trasuries,</li> <li>though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to</li> <li>the so-year treasury yield over the last several months,</li> <li>this this chart would be prety out of date.</li> <li>You know, I think we've seen in a so year is an expectation for the increase that the forese that would be prety out of date.</li> <li>though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to</li> <li>this this chart would be prety out of date.</li> <li>the ab-year</li></ul>	11	negative outlooks, and so there was greater concern with	11	bond yields that were about 2.25 percent for the 30-year
14       in my testimony, yes.       14       declined through to about August as a low point, and         15       0. Now - excuss em. Do yok now whether Cascade       15         16       has accessed the capital markets in 200?       14         17       A. I do not know that actually.       15         18       0. Okay. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit       18         19       A. Page 4 is authorized electric ROEs?       18         10       There should be two charts on page 4, and the       10         12       be - would address natural gas companies.       14         14       A. Is that the page numbers on this.       24         26       Now - set, it is the pright so -       25         14       A. Is that the page numbers on this.       26         15       Now - Yes, okay. I'm there.       20         27       A. Is that the page numbers on this.       24         28       No Kay. Yes, okay. I'm there.       20         29       So los's - yesh, the exhibit number and page       7         19       Exhibit AEB-7X, that charp upports to show the spread       5         10       Tracary yield fluctuates as - as you've just       11         10       Tracary yield fluctuates as - as you've just       11	12	respect to COVID that that would create more financial	12	preCOVID, and then the treasuries did see a decline just
15       Q. Now - excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade has accessed the capital markets in 2020?       15       then they have been increasing steadily since then and have seen a pretty good run-up actually in 2021.         16       A. O kay. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit       16       have seen a pretty good run-up actually in 2021.         17       A. Page 4 is authorized electric ROEs?       18       of the current time. You know, if I was to look at how the interest rates changed over the course of my testimory, in my direct, the 30-year Treasury bond yield was at 1.31 percent; in my rebuttal for this first         18       of the current time yrebuttal for this first         19       the interest rates changed over the course of my testimory, in my direct, the 30-year Treasury bond yield was at 1.31 percent; in my rebuttal for this first         19       the interest rates changed over the course of my testimory, in my rebuttal for this first         10       Page 60         11       Page 60         12       So the spread – this article has data in it         13       A. Top right.         14       Q. So it's - yeah, the exhibit number and page numbers.         15       A. Okay, Yes, okay. I'm there.         16       Exhibit AEb-7X, that can be really confusing with the page numbers.         15       A. Okay, Yes, okay. I'm there.         16       Exhibit AEb-7X, that chachar purporis to show the spread in that is orteret?<	13	instability. So I do think I have addressed that issue	13	like the overall market in February and March, and they
16       has accessed the capital markets in 2020?       16       have seen a pretty good run-up actually in 2021.         17       A. I do not know that actually.       So - so I dorit - I don't think that's true as         19       A. Page 4 is authorized electric ROEs?       10         10       D. Okay. Could by out mb back to Cross-Exhibit       17         11       There should be two charts on page 4, and the       19         12       A. Page 4 is authorized electric, but the bottom one would       20         13       be - would be electric, but the bottom one would       22         24       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       23         25       Q. You want to look at the       23         Page 60         Page 62         Page	14	in my testimony, yes.	14	declined through to about August as a low point, and
17       A. I do not know that actually.       17       So - so I don't - I don't think that's true as of the current time. You know, If I was to look at how of the current time. You know, If i was to look at how of the current time. You know, It with were at 22 as of yesterdy if was at 2.2.         18       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       19       So the spread this article has data in it         20       You want to look at the       Page 60       Page 62         19       A. I be the pright so -       A. I be the pright so -       A. Top right.       Page 61         20       A. O hay. Yes, okay. I'm there.       Treasury yield fluctua	15	Q. Now excuse me. Do you know whether Cascade	15	then they have been increasing steadily since then and
18       Q. Okay. Could you turn back to Cross-Exhibit       18       of the current time. You know, if I was to look at how the interest rates changed over the course of my the interest reasurs interest interest changed over the course of my the interest reasurs interest interest changed over the current interestore changed changed chand interest chand were seend inthe the curr	16	has accessed the capital markets in 2020?	16	have seen a pretty good run-up actually in 2021.
19       AEB-7X and go to page 4.       19       the interest rates changed over the course of my         20       A. Page 4 is authorized electric, ROEs?       20       testimony, in my direct, the 30-year Treasury bond yield         21       Q. There should be two charts on page 4, and the       testimony, in my direct, the 30-year Treasury bond yield         22       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       20       testimony, in my rebutal for this first         23       Q. You want to look at the       20       So the spread that in the sast 1.31 percent; in this actial in the sast 1.32 and yesterday it was at 2.2.         24       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       21       So the spread that in it         25       Q. You want to look at the       23       So the spread that in it         25       A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?       1       market right now.         20       I think it's the top right so -       3       A. Top right.       3         3       A. Top right.       3       Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?         4       A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.       4       A. There has been some change. I         5       this kit's a fair point to say that the       -       than your witness who suggested that they were fairly         5       So looking at the second	17	,	17	So so I don't I don't think that's true as
20       A. Page 4 is authorized electric ROEs?       20       testimony, in my direct, the 30-year Treasury bond yield was at 1.51. The projections that I had in my rebuttal for this first quarter of 2021 was 1.82 and yesterday it was at 2.2.         21       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       24       So there are three sets of page numbers on this.         23       De - would address natural gas companies.       24       So the are three sets of page numbers on this.         24       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       24       So the spread this article has data in it that's not really reflective of what we see in the         Page 60         Page 60         Page 62         Page 60         Page 62         Page 62         Page 62         Page 60         Page 62         Page 62         Numbers.         A. Not hat the page numbers on this.         0         A. Not hat the page numbers on this.         Page 60         Page 62         Treasury yield functuation or the intreasury inder the page numbers.         Colspan= mambers.         So lookin	18		18	
21       Q. There should be two charts on page 4, and the       21       was at 1.31 percent; in my rebuttal it was at 1.61. The         22       be - would address natural gas companies.       23       quarter of 2021 was 1.82 and yesterday it was at 2.2.         24       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       24       So the spread this article has data in it         25       Q. You want to look at the       24       So the spread this article has data in it         26       You want to look at the       25       So the spread this article has data in it         26       You want to look at the       26       Page 62          A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?       1       market right now.       2         2       A. Top right.       3       Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?       4         3       A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.       6       4       4       5         9       So looking at the second chart on page 4 of       9       6       7       6         10       Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread       1       1       1       1       1         11       testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of       1       1       1       1         12       that	19		19	· · ·
22       top one would be electric, but the bottom one would       22       projections that I had in my rebuttal for this first         23       be - would address natural gas companies.       23       quarter of 2021 was 1.82 and yesterday it was at 2.2.         24       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       24       So the spread this article has data in it         25       Q. You want to look at the       25       That sho the top right so       26         1       A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?       1       market right now.       21         2       Q. I think it's the top right so       2       1       Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?         4       Q. So it's yeah, the exhibit number and page       1       Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?         4       Q. So it's yeah, the exhibit number and page       7       A. There has yes, there has been some change. I         7       Q. That can be really confusing with the page       7       stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was         8       numbers.       9       So looking at the second chart on page 4 of       1         11       Freasury yield fluctuates as - as you've just       1       testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of         12       is that correct?       A.       1	20	-	1	
23       be - would address natural gas companies.       23       quarter of 2021 was 1.82 and yesterday it was at 2.2.         24       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       24       So the spread this article has data in it that's not really reflective of what we see in the         25       Q. You want to look at the       Page 60       Page 62         26       1       A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?       1       market right now.         2       Q. I think it's the top right so -       A. Top right.       Q. So it's - yeah, the exhibit number and page numbers.       A. Os any Yes, okay. I'm there.       A. There has - yes, there has been some change. I         7       Q. That can be really confusing with the page numbers.       7       So looking at the second chart on page 4 of Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread the increase that did occur.       7       Q. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the 1         11       A. Yes, it - it does purport to do that. It is quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries, though. This looks like it's - it's kind of tough to the date. I's shim do fough to the date. I's - with shark that could potentially be 120       7       Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread that is pictured in this chart would be very out of date.         10       Treasury yield the was an expectation on the was an		•••		
24       A. So there are three sets of page numbers on this.       24       So the spread this article has data in it that's not really reflective of what we see in the         25       Q. You want to look at the       25       So the spread this article has data in it that's not really reflective of what we see in the         26       A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?       1       market right now.         2       A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?       1       market right now.         3       A. Top right.       3       A. Top right.       3         4       O. So it's - yeah, the exhibit number and page numbers.       5       There has - yes, there has been some change. I think actually that's been more my testimony than than your witness who suggested that they were fairly stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was an expectation for the increase that did occur.         9       So looking at the second chart on page 4 of       9       0. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the         11       Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread       10       Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just         12       is that correct?       0. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the         12       quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries, though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to       15         13       A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is olicit wit		•		
25       Q. You want to look at the       25       that's not really reflective of what we see in the         Page 60       Page 62         1       A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?       1         2       Q. I think it's the top right so       3         3       A. Top right.       2         4       Q. So it's yeah, the exhibit number and page       1         numbers.       A. Toke really confusing with the page       7         numbers.       7       A. That can be really confusing with the page       7         numbers.       8       sale at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was an expectation for the increase that did occur.         9       So looking at the second chart on page 4 of       9         10       Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread       10         11       A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is       13         12       is that correct?       12         13       A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is       13         14       quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,       14         15       thole, his looks like it's it's kind of tough to       15         16       tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be       16         17				
Page 60       Page 62         1       A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?       1       market right now.         2       Q. I think it's the top right so       2       Q. I think it's a fair point to say that the         3       A. Top right.       3       Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?         4       Q. So it's yeah, the exhibit number and page       3       Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?         5       numbers.       4       A. Toke nas yes, there has been some change. I         6       A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.       6       think actually that's been more my testimony han         6       A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.       7       stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was an expectation for the increase that did occur.         9       So looking at the second chart on page 4 of       9       Q. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the         10       Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread       10       Treasury yield fluctuates as - as you've just         11       between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields;       11       testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of         12       is that correct?       11       want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield         14       quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries, it is un			1	-
1       A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?       1       market right now.         2       Q. I think it's the top right so -       2       Q. I think it's a fair point to say that the         3       A. Top right.       3       Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?         4       Q. So it's - yeah, the exhibit number and page       A. There has - yes, there has been some change. I         5       numbers.       5         6       A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.       6         7       Q. That can be really confusing with the page       7         9       So looking at the second chart on page 4 of       9         0       Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread       1         11       between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields;       11         12       is that correct?       2       0. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the         13       A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is       13       want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield         14       quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,       14       compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread         15       though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to       15       between autaral ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.         16       tell	25	Q. Fou want to look at the	25	that's not really reflective of what we see in the
2Q. I think it's the top right so -2Q. I think it's a fair point to say that the3A. Top right.3Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?4Q. So it's - yeah, the exhibit number and page4A. There has - yes, there has been some change. I5numbers.56A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.657Q. That can be really confusing with the page7stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was8numbers.8an expectation for the increase that did occur.9So looking at the second chart on page 4 of9Q. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the10Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread10Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields;11testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is13want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you - have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but its not labeled, but it would be out of date.19A. Net specifically. As I said, though, the spread18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18Have you - have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but its not labeled, but it would be out of date.19		Page 60		Page 62
2Q. I think it's the top right so -2Q. I think it's a fair point to say that the3A. Top right.3Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?4Q. So it's - yeah, the exhibit number and page4A. There hasyes, there has been some change. I5numbers.56A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.6think actually that's been more my testimony than7Q. That can be really confusing with the page7stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was8numbers.8an expectation for the increase that did occur.9So looking at the second chart on page 4 of9Q. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the10Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread10Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields;11want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is13want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you - have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Net specifically. As I said, though, the spread18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18Have you - have looked at that's shown here.19the 30-year Treasury yie	1	A. Is that the page numbers I should follow?	1	market right now.
3A. Top right.3Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?4Q. So it's yeah, the exhibit number and page4A. There has yes, there has been some change. I5numbers.5think actually that's been more my testimony than6A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.6think actually that's been more my testimony than7Q. That can be really confusing with the page7stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was8numbers.8an expectation for the increase that did occur.9So looking at the second chart on page 4 of9Q. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the10Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread10Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields;11testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,11that that fluctuation over the last little while. I13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is13want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread15though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to15between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you - have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.1	2	Q. I think it's the top right so	2	-
5numbers.5think actually that's been more my testimony than6A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.6than your witness who suggested that they were fairly7Q. That can be really confusing with the page numbers.7stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was an expectation for the increase that did occur.9So looking at the second chart on page 4 of Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread9Q. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields; is that correct?10Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to to date with respect to the recent treasuries, though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be to 2021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.16Have you have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date. this this chart would be pretty out of date. You know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly amore than that. So this would be pretty out of date.10Q. Okay. But you haven't [Cross talking.]20Not know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the23A. Oh, I'm sorry.A. Oh, I'm sorry.	3	A. Top right.	3	Treasury yields do go up and down, correct?
6A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.6than your witness who suggested that they were fairly7Q. That can be really confusing with the page7stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was8numbers.8an expectation for the increase that did occur.9So looking at the second chart on page 4 of9Q. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the10Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread10Treasury yield fluctuates as as you're just11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields;11testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of12is that correct?12that that fluctuation over the last little while. I13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is13want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread15though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to15between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you - have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread18this this chart woul	4	Q. So it's yeah, the exhibit number and page	4	A. There has yes, there has been some change. I
7Q. That can be really confusing with the page numbers.7stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was an expectation for the increase that did occur.9So looking at the second chart on page 4 of Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields; is that correct?9Q. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields; is that correct?11testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of that that fluctuation over the last little while. I want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries, though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be to between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months, this this chart would be pretty out of date. this this chart would be pretty out of date. You this this chart would be pretty out of date. You this this chart would be pretty out of date. You this this chart would be pretty out of date. You this this chart would be pretty out of date.1019the 30-year Treasury we've seen Treasury the 30-year this chart would be pretty out of date. You know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year this chart would be pretty out of date.1120that that that's shown here.2121know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year this chart would	5	numbers.	5	think actually that's been more my testimony than
8numbers.8an expectation for the increase that did occur.9So looking at the second chart on page 4 of9Q. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the10Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread10Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields;11testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of12is that correct?12that that fluctuation over the last little while. I13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is13want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread15though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to15between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18that is pictured in this chart would be very old based19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date.10Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe i	6	A. Okay. Yes, okay. I'm there.	6	than your witness who suggested that they were fairly
9So looking at the second chart on page 4 of90. Okay. I'd like to stick with the idea that the10Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread10Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields;11testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of12is that correct?12that that fluctuation over the last little while. I13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is13want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread15though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to15between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18that is pictured in this chart would be very old based19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date.20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty		Q. That can be really confusing with the page	7	stable at 1.5. So my testimony has been that there was
10Exhibit AEB-7X, that chart purports to show the spread10Treasury yield fluctuates as as you've just11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields;11testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of12is that correct?12that that fluctuation over the last little while. I13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is13want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread15though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to15between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				
11between authorized natural gas ROEs and Treasury yields; is that correct?11testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of that that fluctuation over the last little while. I13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries, though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to1316tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be 2021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date. Obviously with the increase that we've seen in the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months, this this chart would be pretty out of date. You know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.11testified, it goes up and down, and we've seen kind of that that fluctuation over the last little while. I want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.18tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be tell. There is a hashmark that could be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread that is pictured in this chart would be very old based on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year20Q. Okay. But you haven't [Cross talking.]21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that			1	-
12is that correct?12that that fluctuation over the last little while. I13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is13want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread15though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to15between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18that is pictured in this chart would be very old based19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22A. Oh, I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that			1	
13A. Yes, it it does purport to do that. It is13want to focus the question on how that Treasury yield14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread15though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to15between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18that is pictured in this chart would be very old based19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry.24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				
14quite out of date with respect to the recent treasuries,14compares to authorized natural gas ROEs, so that spread15though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to15between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18that is pictured in this chart would be very old based19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				
15though. This looks like it's it's kind of tough to15between natural ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield.16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18that is pictured in this chart would be very old based19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				
16tell. There is a hashmark that could potentially be16Have you have looked at that or studied that ratio?172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18that is pictured in this chart would be very old based19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				
172021, but it's not labeled, but it would be out of date.17A. Not specifically. As I said, though, the spread18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18that is pictured in this chart would be very old based19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that		5		
18Obviously with the increase that we've seen in18that is pictured in this chart would be very old based19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months,19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				-
19the 30-year Treasury yield over the last several months, this this chart would be pretty out of date. You19on the data that's shown here.20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
20this this chart would be pretty out of date. You20Q. Okay. But you haven't21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the2424		-		
21know, in February we've seen Treasury the 30-year21[Cross talking.]22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				
22Treasury increase by 40-some-odd basis points, possibly22Q. I'm sorry.23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				
23more than that. So this would be pretty out of date.23A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not certain if this is24You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the24capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				
24 You know, I think we're at 2.2 as of yesterday for the 24 capturing averages. I believe it is, actually. So that				-
	24			
	25	yield on the 30-year Treasury, so this this chart	25	

9 (Pages 59 to 62)

	Page 63		Page 65
1	looking at the average over the year for 2020 and I just	1	response to that.
2	described what happened in 2020, I'm not sure that this	2	And then if you look further down, maybe in the
3	number makes a whole lot of sense.	3	9.25 to 9.49 percent range, Puget Sound Energy, the
4	Q. Okay. We can set aside the the chart for	4	that ROE was part of the consideration by the credit
5	now. What I actually want to ask about is what you	5	rating agencies for downgrading the outlook on Puget
6	what you studied or, you know, what what you know or	6	Sound Energy.
7	have analyzed. So trying to get at the concept versus	7	So I I look at the the what the rating
8	at the illustration.	8	agencies have to say, the credit the equity analysts,
9	I think I recall you testified that you haven't	9	a variety of other sources as well.
10	necessarily looked at the spread between the authorized	10	Q. So in your testimony at AEB-4, figure 2, have
11	ROEs and the 30-year Treasury yield; is that accurate?	11	you graphed a similar set of data to what you see in
12	A. Well, I have looked at in my risk premium	12	on page 6 of AEB-7X?
13	analysis I guess that's really over the bond yields,	13	A. Could we get the reference again? I'm sorry.
14	so not specifically, no, no.	14	Q. It's again your rebuttal testimony, AEB-4.
15	Q. Okay.	15	A. Yes.
16	MS. GAFKEN: Okay. Then then I have no	16	Q. At page 12, figure 2.
17	further questions. Thank you.	17	A. Yes, okay. Yes, I have. This data this is
18	JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by	18	basically the data we've just been discussing from
19	Cascade?	19	Exhibits 7X through November 2020 for the natural gas
20	MS. MCDOWELL: Yes, Your Honor.	20	distribution companies. So this shows all of the
21		21	authorized ROEs, and then I have also indicated where
22	EXAMINATION	22	the recommendations of the witnesses in this case fall
23	BY MS. MCDOWELL:	23	in comparison to that authorized ROE data.
24	Q. So, Ms. Bulkley, can you hear me okay?	24	So you can see that Public Counsel is at the
25	A. Yes, I can.	25	very bottom of this except for the 8.8s that I just
	Page 64		Page 66
1	Q. Okay, great.	1	described, which are lower but received downgrades.
2	So just wanting to follow up on a couple	2	Q. So were the utilities that you were just
3	questions on Cross-Exhibit AEB-7X, and first of all, are	3	discussing who received recently downgrades or negative
4	you familiar generally with market data from services	4	credit action, were those are those reflected in the
5 6	such as S&P and Value Line, is that generally the kind	5	lower dots on this scatter plot chart?
7	of information you monitor? A. Yes, it is.	0	MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to object. The topic
/	A. Tes. ILIS.	7	matter is going howard what I asked areas on
0		7	matter is going beyond what I asked cross on.
8	Q. And have you had occasion to review any other	8	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care
9	Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for		JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond?
9 10	Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?	8 9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about
9	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other</li> </ul>	8 9	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was
9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her
9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain
9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021,</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her
9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021, there have been some downgrades related to those ROEs.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the questions Ms. Gafken was asking about this data on page
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021, there have been some downgrades related to those ROEs. Particular, if you're looking at this exhibit</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the questions Ms. Gafken was asking about this data on page 6.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021, there have been some downgrades related to those ROEs. Particular, if you're looking at this exhibit that we have here, if you look at page 6 to this</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the questions Ms. Gafken was asking about this data on page 6. JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021, there have been some downgrades related to those ROEs. Particular, if you're looking at this exhibit that we have here, if you look at page 6 to this exhibit, which shows the authorized ROEs for gas</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the questions Ms. Gafken was asking about this data on page 6. JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question. A. Can I just ask you to repeat the question for
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021, there have been some downgrades related to those ROEs. Particular, if you're looking at this exhibit that we have here, if you look at page 6 to this exhibit, which shows the authorized ROEs for gas utilities for 2020, Consolidated Edison and NYSEG, RG&amp;E,</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the questions Ms. Gafken was asking about this data on page 6. JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question. A. Can I just ask you to repeat the question for me?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021, there have been some downgrades related to those ROEs. Particular, if you're looking at this exhibit that we have here, if you look at page 6 to this exhibit, which shows the authorized ROEs for gas utilities for 2020, Consolidated Edison and NYSEG, RG&amp;E, who are the low end of what was recently authorized, were downgraded by Moody's and S&amp;P in January of 2021. Southwest Gas, which their authorized ROE is</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the questions Ms. Gafken was asking about this data on page 6. JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question. A. Can I just ask you to repeat the question for me? BY MS. MCDOWELL:
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021, there have been some downgrades related to those ROEs. Particular, if you're looking at this exhibit that we have here, if you look at page 6 to this exhibit, which shows the authorized ROEs for gas utilities for 2020, Consolidated Edison and NYSEG, RG&amp;E, who are the low end of what was recently authorized, were downgraded by Moody's and S&amp;P in January of 2021. Southwest Gas, which their authorized ROE is shown a few lines down in the category of 9 percent to</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the questions Ms. Gafken was asking about this data on page 6. JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question. A. Can I just ask you to repeat the question for me? BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Sure. You indicated that certain of the results that are depicted on page 6 of Public Counsel's exhibit
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021, there have been some downgrades related to those ROEs. Particular, if you're looking at this exhibit that we have here, if you look at page 6 to this exhibit, which shows the authorized ROEs for gas utilities for 2020, Consolidated Edison and NYSEG, RG&amp;E, who are the low end of what was recently authorized, were downgraded by Moody's and S&amp;P in January of 2021. Southwest Gas, which their authorized ROE is shown a few lines down in the category of 9 percent to 9.24. They had a 9.1 that was issued fairly recently</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the questions Ms. Gafken was asking about this data on page 6. JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question. A. Can I just ask you to repeat the question for me? BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Sure. You indicated that certain of the results that are depicted on page 6 of Public Counsel's exhibit resulted in recent downgrades or negative credit action,
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had occasion to review any other such data that would reflect the ROE situation for utilities in January of 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes. So I would have looked other information that I read regularly would be how credit rating agencies have considered authorized ROEs for utilities. I and specifically in January of 2021, there have been some downgrades related to those ROEs. Particular, if you're looking at this exhibit that we have here, if you look at page 6 to this exhibit, which shows the authorized ROEs for gas utilities for 2020, Consolidated Edison and NYSEG, RG&amp;E, who are the low end of what was recently authorized, were downgraded by Moody's and S&amp;P in January of 2021. Southwest Gas, which their authorized ROE is shown a few lines down in the category of 9 percent to</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, would you care to respond? MS. MCDOWELL: Well, Ms. Gafken asked about RRA data that was in AEB-7X, and the witness was explaining that this data is also reflected in her chart. So I'm just explaining asking her to explain her chart. I think it's a natural follow-up to the questions Ms. Gafken was asking about this data on page 6. JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question. A. Can I just ask you to repeat the question for me? BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Sure. You indicated that certain of the results that are depicted on page 6 of Public Counsel's exhibit

10 (Pages 63 to 66)

	Page 67		Page 69
1	are those represented by certain of the the dots in	1	would would be affected. Certainly if you have a
2	the lower end of the range?	2	choice as an investor to invest in a risk-free asset
3	A. Yes, they are. So the the dots that would be	3	versus an asset that has greater risk, we often see that
4	at the lower end of this range the 8 the 8.8 dots	4	there's a rotation as Treasury bond yields increase that
5	that are shown, little tough to point them out, but if	5	a certain segment of investors will roll out of
6	you look just above the box that says Mr. Mullins'	6	utilities and into the Treasury bonds, which would
7	recommendation, which has a typo in that, there's a dot	7	affect the dividend yields and the DCF. And that would
8	that would be that would be that would be Con Ed.	8	also increase the DCF results.
9	And then the dot to the far right, similar similar	9	MS. MCDOWELL: That's all the questions I
10	plane basically as what I just described, these low end	10	have. Thank you very much.
11	results, that would be NYSEG, RG&E and then there are	11	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Stokes, you may proceed
12	there's another 2018 New York decision at 8.8 that's	12	with your planned cross-examination.
13	shown there as well at the low end.	13	MR. STOKES: We we waive cross.
14	Q. So, Ms. Bulkley, when Ms. Gafken asked you a	14	JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, okay.
15	question about the graphs on page 3 of her exhibit, you	15	In that case, Cascade may proceed with its
16	indicated that the graph reflected your DCF results in	16	cross of Staff's witness.
17	this case, can you explain what you meant by that?	17	MS. MCDOWELL: Your Honor, if I could just
18	A. Sure. So the graph basically says that the vast	18	have a moment to reshuffle my papers?
19	majority of the authorized ROEs are somewhere in that	19	JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. And,
20	you know, in that 9.49 to 9.99 range. And so if you	20	Ms. McDowell, I I believe we were were you first
21	were to look at my rebuttal testimony, the range that I	21	intending to address your questions to Parcell and then
22	established for if you just relied on the DCF, which I	22	to Dr. Woolridge and keeping those two separate? What
23	have relied on many models, but just looking and	23	was your plan for that?
24	focusing on the DCF results, the range there is between	24	MS. MCDOWELL: Yes, I I do have my
25	that 9.4 to 10.16 for the scenario where we adjusted the	25	examination will be separate for Mr. Parcell and
	Page 68		Page 70
1	Northwest Natural growth rate.		
		1	Dr. Woolridge, So the order I can proceed in
2	-	1 2	Dr. Woolridge. So the order I can proceed in whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell
2 3	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated	1 2 3	Dr. Woolridge. So the order I can proceed in whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.
	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you	2	whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell
3	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If	2 3	whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be
3 4	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you	2 3 4	whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.
3 4 5	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the	2 3 4 5	whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity
3 4 5 6	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those	2 3 4 5 6	whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.
3 4 5 6 7	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would	2 3 4 5 6 7	whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.
3 4 5 7 8	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.
3 4 5 7 8 9	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. E X A M I N A T I O N
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.     JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.     MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.     E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL:     Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?     A. Good morning, yes, I can.</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.     JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.     MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.     E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL:     Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?     A. Good morning, yes, I can.     Q. Excellent.</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent.</li> <li>So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent.</li> <li>So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect to your ROE recommendation?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent. So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And that's DCP-1T for the record</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect to your ROE recommendation? A. Sure. So the the the Treasury bond yields	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent.</li> <li>So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And that's DCP-1T for the record</li> <li>A. Yes, I am there. I'm sorry, I interrupted you.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. <b>Q.</b> So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect to your ROE recommendation? A. Sure. So the the the Treasury bond yields would be used in the CAPM analysis, and I think actually	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent.</li> <li>So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And that's DCP-1T for the record</li> <li>A. Yes, I am there. I'm sorry, I interrupted you.</li> <li>Q. No worries.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. <b>Q.</b> So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect to your ROE recommendation? A. Sure. So the the the Treasury bond yields would be used in the CAPM analysis, and I think actually all three witnesses filed a CAPM analysis and would need	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent.</li> <li>So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And that's DCP-1T for the record</li> <li>A. Yes, I am there. I'm sorry, I interrupted you.</li> <li>Q. No worries.</li> <li>There you indicate on pages on page 14, line</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect to your ROE recommendation? A. Sure. So the the the Treasury bond yields would be used in the CAPM analysis, and I think actually all three witnesses filed a CAPM analysis and would need to reflect those higher Treasury yields in there in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent.</li> <li>So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And that's DCP-1T for the record</li> <li>A. Yes, I am there. I'm sorry, I interrupted you.</li> <li>Q. No worries.</li> <li>There you indicate on pages on page 14, line</li> <li>1 and 2 that since the COVID-19 pandemic began in</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect to your ROE recommendation? A. Sure. So the the the Treasury bond yields would be used in the CAPM analysis, and I think actually all three witnesses filed a CAPM analysis and would need to reflect those higher Treasury yields in there in the analysis. So generally speaking, all else equal,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent.</li> <li>So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And that's DCP-1T for the record</li> <li>A. Yes, I am there. I'm sorry, I interrupted you.</li> <li>Q. No worries.</li> <li>There you indicate on pages on page 14, line</li> <li>1 and 2 that since the COVID-19 pandemic began in</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect to your ROE recommendation? A. Sure. So the the the Treasury bond yields would be used in the CAPM analysis, and I think actually all three witnesses filed a CAPM analysis and would need to reflect those higher Treasury yields in there in the analysis. So generally speaking, all else equal, the the CAPM numbers would be higher.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent. So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And that's DCP-1T for the record</li> <li>A. Yes, I am there. I'm sorry, I interrupted you.</li> <li>Q. No worries. There you indicate on pages on page 14, line</li> <li>1 and 2 that since the COVID-19 pandemic began in February of 2020, both long-term and short-term interest rates have declined and remained at historic lows; do</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. <b>Q.</b> So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect to your ROE recommendation? A. Sure. So the the the Treasury bond yields would be used in the CAPM analysis, and I think actually all three witnesses filed a CAPM analysis and would need to reflect those higher Treasury yields in there in the analysis. So generally speaking, all else equal, the the CAPM numbers would be higher. I also think that there is likely to be an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense. JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent. So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And that's DCP-1T for the record</li> <li>A. Yes, I am there. I'm sorry, I interrupted you.</li> <li>Q. No worries. There you indicate on pages on page 14, line</li> <li>1 and 2 that since the COVID-19 pandemic began in February of 2020, both long-term and short-term interest rates have declined and remained at historic lows; do you see that testimony?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And both myself and Dr. Woolridge have indicated that Cascade is higher risk, so you would think that you would be more towards the higher end of that range. If you were to look at the higher end of this range and the chart, the 9.5 to 9.74 or 9.75 to 9.99, those observations there, the the mid point of those would be the 9.8, which is the Company's recommendation. And that's sort of the midpoint of the range of my DCF results as well. So that's what I meant by that. Q. So the the last question set of questions I had for you were was with respect to your testimony on the increase in 30-year Treasury rates since you filed your rebuttal testimony in this case. Can you explain how those increases would impact the testimony that you filed in this case with respect to your ROE recommendation? A. Sure. So the the the Treasury bond yields would be used in the CAPM analysis, and I think actually all three witnesses filed a CAPM analysis and would need to reflect those higher Treasury yields in there in the analysis. So generally speaking, all else equal, the the CAPM numbers would be higher.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>whatever order you wish and can begin with Mr. Parcell if that makes sense.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: That that that would be good. After Parcell, I will allow Staff an opportunity for redirect.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. Can you see and hear me okay?</li> <li>A. Good morning, yes, I can.</li> <li>Q. Excellent.</li> <li>So can you turn to page 14 of your testimony?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And that's DCP-1T for the record</li> <li>A. Yes, I am there. I'm sorry, I interrupted you.</li> <li>Q. No worries.</li> <li>There you indicate on pages on page 14, line 1 and 2 that since the COVID-19 pandemic began in February of 2020, both long-term and short-term interest rates have declined and remained at historic lows; do</li> </ul>

11 (Pages 67 to 70)

	Page 71		Page 73
1	CHAIR DANNER: Ms. McDowell, I'm sorry, I	1	A. I will accept it.
2	don't. Can you tell me again what the exhibit is?	2	Q. So that would be an increase since your
3	MS. MCDOWELL: This is Mr. Parcell's	3	testimony was filed of 63 basis points; would you agree?
4	testimony, his response testimony, DCP-1T.	4	A. For that period, yes.
5	CHAIR DANNER: Thank you.	5	Q. So it's fair to say, isn't it, that current
6	MS. MCDOWELL: And I was just asking him	6	long-term rates have rebounded to approximately
7	about his testimony about long-term and short-term	7	pre-pandemic levels?
8	interest rates declining.	8	A. Yes.
9	BY MS. MCDOWELL:	9	Q. Now, I wanted to ask you some questions about
10	Q. So now, you filed your testimony in this case on	10	your Exhibit DCP-17X, which is the next exhibit in
11	November 19th, 2020; does that sound correct?	11	A. 17 you said?
12	A. Yes.	12	Q. Yeah, it's the next exhibit we provided.
13	Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we	13	A. Yes.
14	have provided, and specifically I'd like to direct your	14	Q. And this I'll represent to you is your testimony
15	attention to Exhibit DCP-16X.	15	filed in the the last time you filed testimony in a
16	A. Yes, I have that.	16	Cascade rate case. Do you recognize this testimony?
17	Q. All right. And I'll just take a moment, I'll	17	A. Yes, it's dated February 15th, 2018.
18	kind of pause for a moment to make sure everybody else	18	Q. And in that case, you recommended a 9.35 percent
19	has it. So this is Cross-Exhibit 16X.	19	ROE for Cascade; do you recall that?
20	And I'll represent to you that these are just	20	A. Yes, range of 9.2 to 9.5, that is correct.
21	interest rate strips from Treasury.gov that show both	21	Q. Now, can you turn to page 35 of that exhibit?
22	30-year and 10-year Treasury rates among other things.	22	A. Sure. I'm there.
23	Are you familiar with these Treasury rates?	23	Q. And there on on line 8 you report your DCF
24	A. Yes.	24	results, and those are between 9.1 to 9.3 percent; do
25	Q. So if you could turn to page 4 of this exhibit.	25	you see that?
1 2	A. 1T? Q. Yeah, so it would be no, it's page 4 of this	1 2	<ul><li>A. That's my recommendation in that case, yes.</li><li>Q. So and that recommendation included your highest</li></ul>
3	cross-exhibit, 16X.	3	DCF rates and and exceeded the low and medium rates;
4	A. Oh, yes. Okay.	4	is that fair?
5	Q. So if you turn to that page and look at the rate	5	A. Yeah, those were in the mid 7s at that time, so
6 7	for November 19th for the 30-year Treasury rate, that number was 1.58 percent; is that correct?	7	I did not want to give consideration to 7.5 percent DCF
8	A. Correct.	8	rates in my recommendation, so I did not consider those in that case.
° 9	Q. And if you go back to page 1 of that exhibit,	9	Q. So can you turn back to your testimony in this
10	which has rates year to date for 2021, and look at the	10	case, DCP-1T?
11	last date on there, February 18th, 2021, that rate is	11	A. Sure.
12	2.08 percent, correct?	12	Q. And I'd like to direct your attention to page 4.
13	A. Correct.	13	A. I have that.
14	Q. So between the time your testimony was filed and	14	Q. And here your DCF range, which is listed below
15	last Thursday when this cross-exhibit was filed, the	15	line 4, is from 9 percent to 10 percent; do you see
16	30-year rates were up by approximately 50 basis points;	16	that?
17	isn't that correct?	17	A. Yes, which by the way is almost identical to
18	A. Yes, during that during that period, that's	18	Ms. Bulkley's DCF results.
19	correct.	19	Q. You know, I was going to ask you that question,
20	Q. And did you hear Ms. Bulkley's testimony about	20	so thank you for anticipating that.
21	yesterday's rates of 2.21 percent for 30-year yields?	21	So your just to frame this, your DCP your
22	A. Yes.	22	DCF results in this case, the top of the range is 70
23	Q. And do you agree do you have you know,	23	basis points higher than in the 2018 general rate case,
24	agree with that number subject to check, are you	24	correct?
25	familiar with that number?	25	A. Repeat that, please.

12 (Pages 71 to 74)

1       Q. So your range in the 2018 Cascade rate case was       1       Q. So your historical range is higher in th         2       9.1 to 9.3 percent?       2       correct?         3       A. Yes.       3       A. I'm not I'm not quite following your         4       Q. And your range here is for your DCF model is       4       question. Can you be more specific?	s case,
2       9.1 to 9.3 percent?       2       correct?         3       A. Yes.       3       A. I'm not I'm not quite following your	
4 Q. And your range here is for your DCF model is 4 question. Can you be more specific?	
5 9 percent to 10 percent, correct? 5 Q. So your historical range in in the 201	8 case
6 A. Correct. 6 based on these numbers it looks like to me s	0.6 percent
7 Q. So your the top of the range in this case is 7 to 10.9 percent.	
8 70 basis points higher than it was in the 2018 8 A. In the current proceeding, yes.	
9 A. That is correct. 9 Q. So I'm directing your attention to page	69 of
10 Q general rate case, correct? 10 DCP-17X, which is your testimony in the 201	8 case.
11 A. Yes. 11 A. Yes.	
12 Q. So I wanted to ask you some questions about your 12 Q. And that is 9.6 percent to 10.9 percent	for your
13       CE model or comparable earnings model.       13       historical range, correct?	
14 A. Sure. 14 A. Correct.	
15 Q. Now, again, on page 4, you explained that you 15 Q. And that is lower than your historical r	ange in
16 rely on the midpoint of your comparable earnings results 16 this case, which we established was betwee	n 9.8 percent
17 to set the bottom of your range for Cascade in this 17 and 11.3 percent, correct?	
18 case; is that fair? 18 A. That's correct, but a company's been adv	ded in
19A. In part.19between those two cases, ONE Gas, which is	a spinoff I
20 Q. Along with your risk premium results, correct? 20 think from a company of ONEOK, and that the second seco	at accounts
A. That that is fair. 21 for a difference the addition of a company.	
22 Q. Okay. Now, can you turn to DCP-12, which has 22 Q. Okay. All right. So	
23 your calculations for your CE model. 23 A. In both cases, the latter of the two range	
A. Sure. I have that. 24 the latter of the two periods show the decline in	n earned
25Q. Now, you looked to both historical ROEs and25rates of return on equity.	
Page 76	Page 78
1 projected ROEs as a part of your calculations for this 1 Q. Okay. And your projected range is low	ver in this
2 model, correct? 2 case, correct?	
3 A. That is correct. 3 A. Yes, quite a bit.	
4 Q. And that's depicted on page 1 of DCP-12; is that 4 Q. And back to your exhibit in this case,	DCP-12 in
5 correct? 5 this case.	
6 A. That is correct also. 6 A. Yes.	
7 Q. And your historical range in this case, which I 7 Q. Now, your exhibit in this case shows the second s	hat vou
8 derived from looking at the 2002 to 2008 averages and 8 considered Spire in your calculations for th	
9 the 2009 to 2018 averages is from 9.8 percent to 11.3 9 correct?	,
10 percent; does that sound correct? 10 A. I include Spire in all of my analyses as of	lid
11 A. Yes, with the the latter period having lower 11 Mrs. Bulkley.	
12 returns. The the trend was downward between those 12 <b>Q. Okay. And in this case, that includes</b>	vour
13 two periods. It was roughly eleven eleven 11.3 13 projected ROEs include a result, an ROE of	
14 between 2002 and '8, and since that point in time, it's 14 Spire of 2 percent in 2020; do you see that?	
15 been less than 10 historically. 15 A. Yes.	
16 Q. Okay. So and then if you can bear with me for a 16 Q. And that's far lower than any other co	mpanv in
17 moment and turn back to your Exhibit 17X, which was your 17 the group, correct?	
18     testimony in the 2018 case.       18     A. Yes.	
19 A. Sure. Same schedule? 19 Q. And can you turn your to DCP-18X, Y	which is
20 Q. And yeah, same schedule, which is page 69 of 20 the next cross-examination exhibit in this st	
21 the exhibit. 21 marked; do you have that?	
22 A. Yes, I have that. 22 A. Yes, ma'am.	
23 Q. So your historical range in that case was 9.6 23 Q. And can you turn to page 2 of that exh	ibit,
24 percent to 10.9 percent; is that correct? 24 which is a Value Line report on Spire.	· <b>,</b>
25 A. Correct. 25 A. Yes.	

13 (Pages 75 to 78)

	Page 79	Page 81
1	Q. And in the text, I'll represent to you that it	1 recognize that as the testimony you filed in the PSE
2	explains that the 2 percent result was related to a	2 case?
3	COVID impairment in 2020 that caused Spire's results to	3 A. Yes.
4	tumble by approximately 70 percent. Are you familiar	4 Q. And that testimony was filed approximately one
5	with those circumstances related to Spire?	5 year in advance of the testimony you filed in this case,
6	A. Not specifically, but it's it's I mean,	6 correct?
7	every company has its own unique characteristics. For	7 A. Yes, November 22nd, 2019.
8	example, New Jersey Resources has a 17.8 percent in	8 Q. So can you turn to page 32 of that testimony,
9	2018. They got their own reasons for that. So I'm not	9 please?
10	going to throw out a 2.0 for Spire and keep a 17.8 for	10 A. Thirty-what?
11	South Jersey, that's inappropriate and incon	11 <b>Q. 32.</b>
12	inconsistent.	12 A. 32, sure.
13	Q. But wouldn't you agree that an impairment is a	13 <b>Q. Now</b>
14	book accounting issue and not a market value issue?	14 A. I have that.
15	A. Yes, but it's it's part of the process of	15 Q. Thank you.
16	of the calculate and returns on equity.	16 And on line 13, you report your DCF results in
17	Q. Well, the presence of Spire caused a significant	17 that case, correct?
18	reduction in your projected ROEs, correct?	18 A. Did you say page 32?
19	A. Not really, because if you look at DCP well,	19 Q. Page 32 of the exhibit, so it's not 32 of the
20	DCP-18X and look at the returns on equity at the bottom	20 testimony. So you look at the page numbers at the top,
21	of your page, excluding Spire, the returns are still	page 32 of the exhibit, line 13. Do you have that?
22	eight and a half, nine and a half percent, which is my	A. Well, when you sent me this exhibit, I already
23	recommendation. So even if you took Spire out, it would	23 had a copy of my Puget Sound testimony, which I just
24	still be eight and a half to nine and a half.	24 pulled from my file.
25	Q. Well	25 <b>Q. I see.</b>
1 2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. I mean, your numbers show that.</li> <li>Q. Well, what my numbers show, I believe, is that the results would be a hundred basis points higher if you excluded Spire from your CE results, correct?</li> <li>A. But still in a range of eight and a half to nine</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. So it's on my page 19, but I have what you</li> <li>I have the same numbers you've got, so we can proceed.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I'm just not on page 32 of my copy, that's what</li> <li>I'm saving.</li> </ol>
6	and a half percent, which is my conclusion.	5 I'm saying. 6 <b>Q. That's fine. I</b>
7	Q. Well, you in your testimony, you indicated	7 A. But you want my DCF results and I am there,
8	that it was appropriate for cost of capital witnesses to	8 that's the main thing.
9	remove results that are truly outliers from their	9 <b>Q. Perfect.</b>
10	recommendations; do you recall that testimony?	10 So your DCF results in that case were a range of
11	A. For the historic earnings per share growth of	11 7.8 percent to 8.9 percent with a midpoint of 8.35
12	Northwest Natural I did, yes.	12 percent; is that correct?
13	Q. But you didn't do the same with Spire even	13 A. That is correct.
14	though it had a 2 percent ROE in the 2020 period?	14 Q. Okay. And that's a function of both increased
15	A. But, again, that that's only one of three	15 dividend yields in this case and increased growth rates
16	years and actually one of the 17 years. Also you	16 in 2020 as compared to 2019, correct?
17	mentioned a hundred basis points. If you look at the	17 A. Say it again, please.
18	medians, the medians change is no change for well,	18 Q. So those that change in the DCF result is a
19	.3 percent 2020, no change in '21, and .3 in '23 to '25.	19 function in part of both increased dividend yields and
20	So there is no substantial impact of removing Spire from	20 increased growth rates in 2020 as compared to 2019,
21	my recommendation as as I view this chart.	21 correct?
22	Q. So you mentioned the PSE case, you were a	A. No. Puget my proxy group was a group of
23	witness in that case, correct?	23 electric companies, not gas companies. So when you
24	A. Yes, that is correct.	<sup>24</sup> when you ask me a question about change in yields and
25	Q. And can you turn to Exhibit 19X. And do you	growth rates, that implies to me that that you're

14 (Pages 79 to 82)

	Page 83		Page 85
1	thinking that that's a change in the same companies. It	1	that's what I would call the COVID bump or the COVID
2	is not. It's the same process applied in different	2	factor. Even Cascade has has recommended a great
3	types of proxy companies.	3	reduction return of equity because of the COVID. And
4	Q. I see. I see.	4	I'm certainly not going to recommend an increase in it.
5	So you're saying that you did not necessarily	5	Q. So and even though your DCF results are so much
6	look at a gas proxy group in the Puget case, you looked	6	higher than in the PSE case, your recommendation in this
7	at an electric proxy group?	7	case is approximately the same as that case, correct?
8	A. Yeah. Well, electric a combination of gas	8	A. Yes, but but flip-flop. At the same time the
9	and electric, but I did not use a gas proxy group in the	9	DCF went up, if you look at the at the change in
10	Puget case, that is correct.	10	perspective returns on equity over the past year,
11	Q. But you used a combination of gas and electric	11	they've come down substantially. And you asked me about
12	companies; is that correct?	12	I believe the prior Cascade case, the perspective
13	A. When I say "combination," I mean companies that	13	returns of equity in the last case was nine and a half
14	have both operations. I did not use any pure gas	14	to ten and a half. Eight and a half, nine and a half.
15	distribution companies.	15	That's a hundred basis points. So it's it's a
16	Q. Got it, okay.	16	flip-flop. DCF appears to go up a hundred basis points
17	A. For example, Avista would be a combination	17	and (inaudible) has come down a hundred basis points.
18	company, it does both. Whereas Cascade is just a	18	Was that not surprising?
19	distribution company.	19	Q. So you you basically
20	Q. So that's that's a helpful clarification.	20	A. Those those methods work.
21	And just to go back to the results, your DCF	21	Q. You're basically saying that you're relying in
22	midpoint in the Puget case was 115 basis points higher	22	this case on your comparable earnings results whereas in
23	here than in the PSE case, correct?	23	the last case you relied more on your DCF results
24	A. Say it say again, please.	24	A. No.
25	Q. Your DCF midpoint in this case is 115 basis	25	Q is that fair?
	Page 84		Page 86
1	points higher than it was in the PSE case one year ago,		
	p	1	A. Not not at all. Not at all. What I'm saying
2	correct?	1 2	A. Not not at all. Not at all. What I'm saying is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was
2 3			is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case,
	<b>correct?</b> A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.	2	is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was
3	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's</li> <li>115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's</li> </ul>	2 3	is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case,
3 4	<b>correct?</b> A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.	2 3 4	is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my
3 4 5	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's</li> <li>115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.
3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question.</li> <li>What you what you what you find in the past year</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question.</li> <li>What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case, Southwest Gas in Arizona and the proxy group I use is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent return on equity. The Commission authorized a 9.1</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case, Southwest Gas in Arizona and the proxy group I use is the same as this case. And I used the last three months</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent return on equity. The Commission authorized a 9.1 percent return on equity and it gave them a 20 basis</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case, Southwest Gas in Arizona and the proxy group I use is the same as this case. And I used the last three months of 2019. In that period, since then, the dividend</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent return on equity. The Commission authorized a 9.1 percent return on equity and it gave them a 20 basis point adjustment for something.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case, Southwest Gas in Arizona and the proxy group I use is the same as this case. And I used the last three months of 2019. In that period, since then, the dividend yields went up by a hundred basis points, but the growth</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent return on equity and it gave them a 20 basis point adjustment for something.</li> <li>After that after that case came by the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case, Southwest Gas in Arizona and the proxy group I use is the same as this case. And I used the last three months of 2019. In that period, since then, the dividend yields went up by a hundred basis points, but the growth rates stayed basically the same. So all that change in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent return on equity and it gave them a 20 basis point adjustment for something.</li> <li>After that after that case came by the way, the authorized return for them in in the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case, Southwest Gas in Arizona and the proxy group I use is the same as this case. And I used the last three months of 2019. In that period, since then, the dividend yields went up by a hundred basis points, but the growth</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent return on equity and it gave them a 20 basis point adjustment for something.</li> <li>After that after that case came by the way, the authorized return for them in in the jurisdiction of Nevada has been 9.25 for a number of</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case, Southwest Gas in Arizona and the proxy group I use is the same as this case. And I used the last three months of 2019. In that period, since then, the dividend yields went up by a hundred basis points, but the growth rates stayed basically the same. So all that change in DCF apparent cost rates is accounted for by change of stock prices, which people like Van Line, for example,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent return on equity and it gave them a 20 basis point adjustment for something.</li> <li>After that after that case came by the way, the authorized return for them in in the jurisdiction of Nevada has been 9.25 for a number of years. After that, as Mrs. Bulkley indicated, the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case, Southwest Gas in Arizona and the proxy group I use is the same as this case. And I used the last three months of 2019. In that period, since then, the dividend yields went up by a hundred basis points, but the growth rates stayed basically the same. So all that change in DCF apparent cost rates is accounted for by change of stock prices, which people like Van Line, for example, have indicated is reflective of the COVID situation.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent return on equity and it gave them a 20 basis point adjustment for something.</li> <li>After that after that case came by the way, the authorized return for them in in the jurisdiction of Nevada has been 9.25 for a number of years. After that, as Mrs. Bulkley indicated, the not Standard &amp; Poor's, but Moody's did change the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Well, Puget was 8.35 and nine 9.5. That's 115, that is correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And wouldn't you agree that it's important to consider such a large swing in the DCF results in formulating your ROE recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. It would. I'm so glad you asked that question. What you what you what you find in the past year for natural gas distribution utilities is that the dividend yield, for this group of proxy at least, has increased over the between 2020 and 2020 between 2019 and 2020 by a hundred hundred basis points, the yield.</li> <li>For example, I was in a an LDC case, Southwest Gas in Arizona and the proxy group I use is the same as this case. And I used the last three months of 2019. In that period, since then, the dividend yields went up by a hundred basis points, but the growth rates stayed basically the same. So all that change in DCF apparent cost rates is accounted for by change of stock prices, which people like Van Line, for example,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>is, in the last case my upper end was DCF low end was DCF, upper end was comparable earnings. In this case, my upper end of DCF and my lower end is prorate and my new method risk premium.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you mentioned the Southwest Gas case, is that the same case that Ms. Bulkley testified that Southwest Gas received a negative earned credit response to; are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. Would you be offended I recast your question so I can answer it?</li> <li>Q. Well, I could try to reask the question.</li> <li>A. I'm not I'm not being smart. I'm just trying to get along here. In the Southwest Gas case, I recommended a return on equity and I was a witness of the Staff in that case. I recommended a 9.3 percent return on equity and it gave them a 20 basis point adjustment for something.</li> <li>After that after that case came by the way, the authorized return for them in in the jurisdiction of Nevada has been 9.25 for a number of years. After that, as Mrs. Bulkley indicated, the</li> </ul>

15 (Pages 83 to 86)

	Page 87	Page 89
1	what I think you asked me and I	1 your analysis that only your DCF midpoint supports your
2	Q. Correct.	2 9.25 percent recommendation?
3	A apologize for redoing the question. I'm not	3 A. If you're trying to find a number in my DCF that
4	trying to be smart with you, I'm just trying to move	4 matches 9.25, the answer to that question is yes, but
5	this along so to speak. So that's what really happened.	5 that's not how I got my 9.25.
б	Q. All right. I appreciate	6 Q. Okay. And the focus of my question is whether
7	A. Didn't mean to be I apologize	7 you were aware of Dr. Woolridge's testimony on that
8	[Cross talking.]	8 point.
9	A I hope I didn't.	9 A. Yes, I saw that.
10	Q. No, I appreciate your response.	10 Q. Okay. If you could turn to your response
11	MS. MCDOWELL: And that's all the questions	11 testimony, which is Exhibit DCP-1T and go to page 32.
12	I have for Mr. Parcell.	12 A. 32?
13	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	13 <b>Q. 32, lines 1 and 2.</b>
14 15	Do we have any redirect by Staff?	14 A. Yes, I have that.
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No	15 Q. There you state that you believe a range of 9.0
$10 \\ 17$	redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Gafken, you	16 percent to 10.0 percent with a 9.5 percent midpoint 17 represents the current DCF-derived ROE for your proxy
18	may proceed with your cross-examination of Staff's	17represents the current DCF-derived ROE for your proxy18group, correct?
19	witness.	19 A. Correct.
20	MS. GAFKEN: Thank you.	20 <b>Q.</b> So staying with Exhibit DCP-1T, could you turn
21	NO. OATREN. Thank you.	21 back to page 31 and go to lines 17 and 18?
22	EXAMINATION	22 A. Yes.
23	BY MS. GAFKEN:	23 Q. There you state that the DCF rates resulting
24	Q. Good morning, Mr. Parcell. I am Lisa Gafken,	24 from the analysis of the proxy group falls into a wide
25	and I'm the attorney for Public Counsel today.	range between 7.0 percent and 10.9 percent, correct?
	Page 88	Page 90
1	A. Well, good afternoon my time.	Page 90 1 A. Correct.
2	<ul><li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li><li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm</li></ul>	1       A. Correct.         2       Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle
2 3	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> </ol>
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> <li>A. His rebuttal to me you're saying, right?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> <li>Q. But when we're talking about the means and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> <li>A. His rebuttal to me you're saying, right?</li> <li>Q. Correct.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> <li>Q. But when we're talking about the means and</li> <li>mediums medians of the results, you would you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> <li>A. His rebuttal to me you're saying, right?</li> <li>Q. Correct.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> <li>Q. But when we're talking about the means and</li> <li>mediums medians of the results, you would you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> <li>A. His rebuttal to me you're saying, right?</li> <li>Q. Correct.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE for this case is 9.25</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> <li>Q. But when we're talking about the means and</li> <li>mediums medians of the results, you would you</li> <li>would look at all of the DCF ROEs and not just the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one. So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> <li>A. His rebuttal to me you're saying, right?</li> <li>Q. Correct.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE for this case is 9.25 percent, correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> <li>Q. But when we're talking about the means and</li> <li>mediums medians of the results, you would you</li> <li>would look at all of the DCF ROEs and not just the</li> <li>highest ones?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> <li>A. His rebuttal to me you're saying, right?</li> <li>Q. Correct.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE for this case is 9.25 percent, correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> <li>Q. But when we're talking about the means and</li> <li>mediums medians of the results, you would you</li> <li>would look at all of the DCF ROEs and not just the</li> <li>highest ones?</li> <li>A. I don't look at those below 9 and I don't look</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> <li>A. His rebuttal to me you're saying, right?</li> <li>Q. Correct.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE for this case is 9.25 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of Dr. Woolridge's critique of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> <li>Q. But when we're talking about the means and</li> <li>mediums medians of the results, you would you</li> <li>would look at all of the DCF ROEs and not just the</li> <li>highest ones?</li> <li>A. I don't look at those below 9 and I don't look</li> <li>above 10. You you could mathematically take the ones</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> <li>A. His rebuttal to me you're saying, right?</li> <li>Q. Correct.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE for this case is 9.25 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of Dr. Woolridge's critique of your analysis that only your DCF midpoint supports your 9.25 percent recommendation?</li> <li>A. Repeat that, please.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> <li>Q. But when we're talking about the means and</li> <li>mediums medians of the results, you would you</li> <li>would look at all of the DCF ROEs and not just the</li> <li>highest ones?</li> <li>A. I don't look at those below 9 and I don't look</li> <li>above 10. You you could mathematically take the ones</li> <li>between 9 and 10 to look at mean and median, but I did</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Well, good afternoon my time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. Good afternoon your time. I'm just bear with me just a moment. I'm getting my screen back in order. Okay. My first question really is just a foundational one.</li> <li>So, Mr. Parcell, you you conducted a DCF analysis in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. That is true.</li> <li>Q. In your engagement in this case, did you review Dr. Woolridge's testimony for Public Counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. In particular, did you review Dr. Woolridge's cross-answering testimony, which was Exhibit JRW-14T?</li> <li>A. His rebuttal to me you're saying, right?</li> <li>Q. Correct.</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE for this case is 9.25 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of Dr. Woolridge's critique of your analysis that only your DCF midpoint supports your 9.25 percent recommendation?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To calculate the midpoint, you find the middle</li> <li>of the range defined by two data points, the lowest and</li> <li>the highest individual DCF ROEs in the range; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The calculating the mean or median would use all</li> <li>DCF ROEs and not just the high and low from the range,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Right. The range is derived from using means</li> <li>and medians as shown on my DCP-10 I think DCP-9. No,</li> <li>I'm sorry. Yes, DCP-9, page 5, I use means and medians</li> <li>to develop the numbers that go into developing the 9 and</li> <li>10 percent. So I did use means and medians.</li> <li>Q. But when we're talking about the means and</li> <li>mediums medians of the results, you would you</li> <li>would look at all of the DCF ROEs and not just the</li> <li>highest ones?</li> <li>A. I don't look at those below 9 and I don't look</li> <li>above 10. You you could mathematically take the ones</li> <li>between 9 and 10 to look at mean and median, but I did</li> <li>not do that.</li> </ul>

16 (Pages 87 to 90)

	Page 91		Page 93
1	Q. The mean and median DCF results are 8.8 percent	1	muted unless they're going to speak.
2	and 9.0 percent respectively, correct?	2	MS. MCDOWELL: So I'm still getting
3	A. Yes, that that uses all the growth rates,	3	feedback. All right. Let me try to is that better?
4	correct.	4	No, I still hear it. Others hear it too? Let me try
5	Q. Okay. If you could turn to page 4 of Exhibit	5	let me try to do it without my mic. Is that better?
6	DCP-1T and go to line 4.	6	JUDGE HOWARD: Dr. Woolridge, are you using
7	A. Page 4, line 4, yes.	7	any attached microphones or speakers that might be
8	Q. There you present your results in chart form,	8	causing a little bit of feedback?
9	correct?	9	DR. WOOLRIDGE: No, nothing.
10	A. Correct.	10	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.
11	Q. Your CAPM results indicate ROEs of 6.0 percent	11	MS. MCDOWELL: I don't think it's on my end,
12	and 6.4 percent with a midpoint of 6.2 percent, correct?	12	but is it I guess I'll just leave it up to you, Your
13	A. Correct.	13	Honor, if we want to try to reestablish the connection
14	Q. In in your analysis, you you gave	14	in some way or try to bear with it.
15	essentially no weight to your CAPM results; is that	15	JUDGE HOWARD: It seems to be going away.
16	correct?	16	Can the court reporter follow now? Is it sufficient?
17	A. That is correct.	17	THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, that's much better
18	Q. The results of your comparable earnings and risk	18	now, thank you.
19	premium approaches both indicate a 9.0 ROE. How much	19	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully it just
20	weight did you give these approaches?	20	stays away. I think we can hear you, but it's a bit of
21	A. I didn't weight them, per se. For example, I	21	an odd sound. So you may you may proceed.
22	used my three methodologies that I relied upon to	22	MS. MCDOWELL: All right. And can people
23 24	make my recommendation for DCF, which is 9.5, CE, which	23 24	just let me know if it becomes unintelligible? I can
24	is 9.0, and risk premium, which is 9.0, I used those to develop a range. If I average those three, I get 9.17.	25	hear it again.
20		25	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, the court reporter can
	Page 92		Page 94
1	But I use I didn't average them to get my	1	certainly feel free to to indicate if it becomes
2	recommendation. I just took the the range they	2	difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't
2 3	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I	2 3	difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's
2 3 4	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though.	2 3 4	difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.
2 3 4 5	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have	2 3 4 5	difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need
2 3 4 5 6	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions.	2 3 4 5 6	difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.
2 3 4 5 6 7	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by	2 3 4 5 6 7	difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers. MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio. BY MS. MCDOWELL:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. EXAMINATION	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL:	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. EXAMINATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we have prefiled for you and specifically JRW-16X. Do you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Dr. Woolridge. Can you see and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we have prefiled for you and specifically JRW-16X. Do you have that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Dr. Woolridge. Can you see and hear me? So I cannot hear you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we have prefiled for you and specifically JRW-16X. Do you have that?</li> <li>A. Which one is that? I the ones I have are not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Dr. Woolridge. Can you see and hear me? So I cannot hear you. A. Here I I I said good afternoon on the East	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we have prefiled for you and specifically JRW-16X. Do you have that?</li> <li>A. Which one is that? I the ones I have are not numbered.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Dr. Woolridge. Can you see and hear me? So I cannot hear you. A. Here I I I said good afternoon on the East Coast, but you're right, I didn't have my mic on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we have prefiled for you and specifically JRW-16X. Do you have that?</li> <li>A. Which one is that? I the ones I have are not numbered.</li> <li>Q. Okay. This is the your response to Cascade's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Dr. Woolridge. Can you see and hear me? So I cannot hear you. A. Here I I I said good afternoon on the East Coast, but you're right, I didn't have my mic on. Q. Okay. All right. So you can hear and see me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we have prefiled for you and specifically JRW-16X. Do you have that?</li> <li>A. Which one is that? I the ones I have are not numbered.</li> <li>Q. Okay. This is the your response to Cascade's data request 5.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Dr. Woolridge. Can you see and hear me? So I cannot hear you. A. Here I I I said good afternoon on the East Coast, but you're right, I didn't have my mic on. Q. Okay. All right. So you can hear and see me and I'm I can hear you now. There's a little bit of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we have prefiled for you and specifically JRW-16X. Do you have that?</li> <li>A. Which one is that? I the ones I have are not numbered.</li> <li>Q. Okay. This is the your response to Cascade's data request 5. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: You're muted,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Dr. Woolridge. Can you see and hear me? So I cannot hear you. A. Here I I I said good afternoon on the East Coast, but you're right, I didn't have my mic on. Q. Okay. All right. So you can hear and see me and I'm I can hear you now. There's a little bit of feedback. I don't MS. MCDOWELL: Is anybody else hearing that? JUDGE HOWARD: I am hearing it as well. Can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we have prefiled for you and specifically JRW-16X. Do you have that?</li> <li>A. Which one is that? I the ones I have are not numbered.</li> <li>Q. Okay. This is the your response to Cascade's data request 5.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: You're muted, Mr. Woolridge.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think it might be helpful if Mr. Woolridge can mute his microphone when</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	recommendation. I just took the the range they created, which is 9.95 and the midpoint's 9.25. Had I used the average, it would have been 9.17, though. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Mr. Parcell. I have no further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by Staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. No redirect. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, you may proceed to cross-examine Dr. Woolridge. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. MCDOWELL: Q. Good morning, Dr. Woolridge. Can you see and hear me? So I cannot hear you. A. Here I I I said good afternoon on the East Coast, but you're right, I didn't have my mic on. Q. Okay. All right. So you can hear and see me and I'm I can hear you now. There's a little bit of feedback. I don't MS. MCDOWELL: Is anybody else hearing that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>difficult. Hopefully this goes away shortly. I don't want it to I don't want it to derail anything. Let's cross our fingers.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. Just advise if I need to stop and regroup in terms of the audio.</li> <li>BY MS. MCDOWELL:</li> <li>Q. So, again, good morning, slash, good afternoon, Dr. Woolridge.</li> <li>A. Good morning, good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. So your recommended ROE in this case is 9.0 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And can you turn to the cross-exhibits that we have prefiled for you and specifically JRW-16X. Do you have that?</li> <li>A. Which one is that? I the ones I have are not numbered.</li> <li>Q. Okay. This is the your response to Cascade's data request 5.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: You're muted, Mr. Woolridge.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think it might be</li> </ul>

17 (Pages 91 to 94)

	Page 95		Page 97
1	tedious for him, but that might address the feedback	1	A. Yes.
2	issue we're hearing.	2	Q. And there on line 9, you indicate that Cascade's
3	BY MS. MCDOWELL:	3	risk level is at the high end of the gas proxy group; is
4	Q. So, Dr. Woolridge, are you looking for the	4	that correct?
5	exhibit right now?	5	A. On page 4, line 9.
6	A. I have it. It's in front of me.	6	Q. Yes. So
7	Q. Okay. So there you establish that the	7	A. I agree I do state that. I guess I don't see it
8	recommended ROE in this case is lower than average but	8	on page 4, line 9 of my testimony
9	warranted because in your opinion equity rates declined	9	Q. You know
10	in 2020. Is that a fair summary of your response to	10	[Cross talking.]
11	that data request?	11	Q I just want to be sure, I'm working off of
12	A. Well, yeah, I mean, equity rates have been	12	your revised testimony, revised you filed revised
13	declining, authorized ROEs have been declining for	13	testimony November 24th, 2020. Is that the document
14	over time, and part of that is a lower capital cost and	14	that you have?
15	that sort of thing. I I I said that I think it	15	A. I don't think so. I'm not sure. I had what I
16	has been slow to adjust to the lower interest rates	16	thought I had filed as 1T.
17	we've seen, and that's why you see the the larger	17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just to be sure, I
18	spread between authorized ROEs and 30-year Treasury	18	have two sets of numbers on the bottom of the page. One
19	yields. So it's been slow to adjust to the lower	19	shows a single digit and the other shows page X of 94.
20	capital cost of recent years including 2020.	20	And so, Ms. McDowell, are you looking at the the page
21	Q. In your below average ROE recommendation	21	4 of 94 reference?
22	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McDowell, I hate I	22	MS. MCDOWELL: I am looking at page 4 of 92.
23	hate to interrupt you in the middle of a question but	23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Which would be
24	MS. MCDOWELL: No problem.	24	page 8 of the single digit, right?
25	JUDGE HOWARD: it's just I don't don't	25	MS. MCDOWELL: So I'm just trying to
	Page 96		Page 98
1	want your cross to be derailed by technical issues.	1	would it be helpful if I printed out a different version
2	MS. MCDOWELL: I appreciate that.	2	of this testimony? I was thinking I was working off the
3	JUDGE HOWARD: So, Mr. Woolridge, one option	3	most recent version.
4	I'm hearing from our IT staff might be if you can reduce	4	MS. GAFKEN: I may be able to help with
5	your speaker volume a little bit. That might be to	5	this, Ms. McDowell. You're looking at 1TR, so the
6	where you can still hear the questions adequately, that	6	revised version of it?
7	might be preventing the feedback. And then and then	7	MS. MCDOWELL: Yes.
8	you might have to be quick with the mute and unmute	8	MS. GAFKEN: Let me it's 96 pages, right?
9	feature. We're all we're all making due with the	9	That's the one that you're looking at?
10	virtual setting.	10	MS. MCDOWELL: It's 92 pages.
11	Okay. Ms. McDowell, would you like to	11	MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I was I think it's 96
12	DR. WOOLRIDGE: I reduced the volume.	12	was so I'm looking at an electronic copy.
13	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. That sounds great.	13	MS. MCDOWELL: I see.
14	MS. MCDOWELL: That sounds better to me.	14	MS. GAFKEN: Let me let me take just a
15	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Smith, for	15	moment and email that over to Dr. Woolridge. I I'm
16	that.	16	sure that he has the testimony, but just to see if we
17	Ms. McDowell, you may proceed.	17	can help with the page numbering issue. I think that
18	DR. WOOLRIDGE: Sorry, I didn't notice I was	18	that may solve the problem.
19	the culprit here. Sorry about that.	19	JUDGE HOWARD: I'll just add, I'm looking at
20	JUDGE HOWARD: Not a problem.	20 21	the Woolridge's revised testimony filed on November
21 22	MS. MCDOWELL: No worries. We're all learning this new format.	21	24th, and it appears to be page 8 of the PDF document,
22 23	BY MS. MCDOWELL:	22	but page 4 using the numbers on [sound interference.] MS. MCDOWELL: So it sounds like as soon as
23 24	Q. So I guess I just will reset by asking you to	23	Dr. Woolridge gets the most recent version from
24 25	turn to page 4 of your testimony in this case.	24	Ms. Gafken, and we're just looking at the bottom pages,
-			

18 (Pages 95 to 98)

	Page 99		Page 101
1	the way the hard copy is paginated as opposed to the	1	A. Well, in that case, it was both electric and gas
2	PDF, we'll all be on the literally and figuratively the	2	case. If you look at the numbers, they are very much
3	same page; is that right?	3	driven by the electric side of the business, which were
4	MS. GAFKEN: That is the hope.	4	indicating significantly lower ROEs. In fact, the
5	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. All right.	5	and so I would say that if I was you know, I
6	MS. GAFKEN: I'll have to say, this is a lot	6	haven't this is not an electric and gas case, but the
7	easier in person. Okay. I I have sent it by email,	7	reason it was 8.75 as much as anything was because of
8	so it should be floating through the interwebs now and	8	the electric side being so low.
9	arriving shortly. So let let us know when when	9	MS. MCDOWELL: Okay. So I'd offer 17X.
10	you have it, Dr. Woolridge.	10	MS. GAFKEN: I have no objection.
11	DR. WOOLRIDGE: I'm still waiting.	11	JUDGE HOWARD: I will admit this exhibit
12	MS. GAFKEN: I promise I sent it. I see it	12	into the record. Thank you.
13	in my email. It's on its way.	13	(Exhibit JRW-17X admitted.)
14	DR. WOOLRIDGE: It's arrived. Okay. I have	14	BY MS. MCDOWELL:
15	it.	15	Q. So can you turn to page 29 of your testimony in
16	A. So the question is about page 4, right?	16	this case. Again, just to make sure we are coordinated
17	Correct?	17	on our pages, this is 29, the marking on the bottom of
18	BY MS. MCDOWELL:	18	the page. And I wanted to just direct your attention to
19	Q. Right. I was asking you a question and the	19	line 17 where you state, (as read) Primarily I rely on
20	reference was page 4, line 9 where you indicate that	20	the DCF model; do you have that?
21	Cascade's risk level is at the high end of the gas proxy	21	A. That is correct.
22	group; do you see that?	22	Q. And just to summarize, I guess, that's the
23	A. Yes, I highlighted it there using their credit	23	question, that was your primary reference point in
24	rating. They're they're at the the high end of	24	developing your recommendation in this case for
25	the range for the the gas companies, and that's one	25	Cascade's ROE?
	Page 100		Page 102
1	reason why I used the high end of the range as well as I	1	A. Well, yeah, because I mean, my range was, what,
2	usually rely primarily on the DCF model.	2	7.3 to 9.0 and I picked the high end of the range, which
3	Q. All right. So can you turn to the next	3	reflects both the the use of the DCF model and the
4	cross-exhibit in this stack, JRW-17X; do you see that?	4	slightly higher, you know, the their risk level as
5	A. Yes, that's that's the testimony from from	5	indicated by their S&P ratings is the high level of this
6	the Puget case?	6	group.
7	Q. Yes, and that was the last time that you filed	7	Q. So an important input to the DCF model is a
8	cost of capital testimony in Washington, the Puget Sound	8	dividend yield, correct?
9	case in 2019; is that correct?	9	A. Yes.
10	A. Yes, I believe so, yes.	10	Q. And can you turn to page 26 of your testimony,
11	Q. And that testimony was filed on	11	please?
12	November 22nd, 2019; does that sound correct?	12	A. Yes.
13	A. Yes.	13	Q. And there on line 21, you discuss your dividend
14	Q. Okay. And in that case, you were testifying on	14	yields with reference to your Exhibit JRW-6; do you see
15	Puget's cost of equity in its 2020 rate year, correct?	15	that?
16	A. That is correct.	16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Now, your ROE recommendation in that case was	17	Q. And you indicate that dividend yields for the
18	8.75 percent, correct?	18	gas group decline from 5.8 to 3.1 percent in the years
19	A. Yes.	19	2000 to 2007, increased to about 4 percent in 2009, and
20	Q. And your ROE recommendation in this case is 25	20	have declined steadily since that time, and I'm now on
21	basis points higher, correct?	21	the top of page 27. The average dividend yield has been
		22	in the 2.7 to 2.9 percent range for the past three
22	A. That's correct.	1	
23	Q. So if equity costs were actually declining in	23	years; do you see that?
23 24	Q. So if equity costs were actually declining in 2020, wouldn't you have recommended a lower ROE in this	23 24	years; do you see that? A. Yes, I do. And that's that's very much I
23	Q. So if equity costs were actually declining in	23	years; do you see that?

19 (Pages 99 to 102)

	Page 103		Page 105
1	COVID bump for the dividend yields of the gas companies,	1	Q. And I wanted to direct your attention to page 2
2	and I think the difference between what you saw there	2	where you have a chart of dividend yields.
3	and what you see now is Mr. Parcell's COVID bump.	3	A. Yes.
4	Q. So you anticipated my next question because	4	Q. So using those numbers, the 3.65 or 3.7 numbers,
5	isn't it true in this case that you used a 3.65 percent	5	isn't it true that you have to go back to 2012 to find
6	dividend yield, correct?	6	dividend yields at that level?
7	A. Yes.	7	A. Yes, that's true. It looks I mean, let me
8	Q. And in your testimony on page 33, line 20 to 22,	8	that's I would agree that's probably about right.
9	you explain how you derived that number.	9	Q. Okay. And then can you turn back to your
10	A. Is it in this testimony or the old testimony?	10	response testimony at page 5?
11	Q. Yes, in this testimony, page 33.	11	A. Yes.
12	A. Okay.	12	Q. And there you have a figure that shows
13	Q. Lines 20 to 22.	13	authorized ROEs, and if you look in the 2012 range, all
14	A. Yes.	14	of the ROEs at the time period were in the 9.8 range,
15	Q. And there you indicate you used that number	15	weren't they?
16	because it was the midpoint between the 30-day and	16	A. Yeah, I mean, but obviously the equity cost rate
17	90-day medians	17	is a function not only of the dividend yield, but also
18	A. Yes.	18	the growth rate. And so if you look and it's a
19	Q is that correct?	19	function of the CAPM numbers as well. But no, I agree,
20	A. Yes.	20	you're right, the dividend yields are back when it was
21	Q. Okay. So can you turn to page or to your	21	9.8, but as it turns out, obviously it's a function of
22	Exhibit JRW-8?	22	both dividend yield and growth.
23	A. Yes.	23	Q. All right. Can you turn to page 56 of your
24	Q. So page 2 has those numbers, and isn't it true	24	response testimony?
25	that the median for the 30-day and the 90-day yields are	25	A. Yes, I'm there.
	Page 104		Page 106
1	both 3.7 percent?	1	Q. And is this part of your testimony you summarize
2	A. Yeah, I mean, and there's a mean number 3.65.	2	why a 9.0 percent ROE is fair and appropriate for
3	So when I look at those, I look at the means and medians	3	Cascade, and specifically at lines 12 through 13, you
4	and that's where I got the 3.65.	4	note that most notably the betas for gas companies have
5	Q. But that's not what you explained in your	5	been declining in recent years, which indicates that the
6	testimony, is it?	6	risk of the industry has declined; do you see that?
7	[Cross talking.]	7	A. Yeah, and they they were declining up until
8	A. Yeah, it probably should include it should	8	March of this year and they've they've gone up some
9	include the means as well as the means that you know,	9	because of the developments I discuss in my testimony.
10	they're all pretty close there. So it should have	10	Q. All right. So let's back up just a moment and
11	included both the means and the medians.	11	turn to page 44, line 2, where you discuss betas.
12	Q. So based on the medians as you explained, the	12	A. Yes.
13	the dividend yield would be 3.7 percent, correct?	13	Q. And just to make sure we're all understanding
14	A. Yes, that's correct.	14	what we're talking about here, you explain what betas
15	Q. And at either of those numbers, 3.65 or 3.7,	15	are and how they work. And just to summarize, I'll just
16	would you accept subject to check that that is more than	16	ask you if you agree with this summary, that beta is a
	a hundred basis points higher than the 2.60 dividend	17	measure of the systemic risk of the stock; is that
17			correct?
17 18	yield you used in PSE's gas proxy group last year for	18	
	yield you used in PSE's gas proxy group last year for your DCF results?	18	A. Yes.
18			
18 19	your DCF results?	19	A. Yes.
18 19 20	your DCF results? A. Yeah, yes. That was I think two years ago, yes.	19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that a beta less than one means a less</li> </ul>
18 19 20 21	<ul><li>your DCF results?</li><li>A. Yeah, yes. That was I think two years ago, yes.</li><li>Q. Your testimony was filed a year prior to your</li></ul>	19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that a beta less than one means a less</li> <li>that the stock is less risky than market and a beta over</li> </ul>
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>your DCF results?</li> <li>A. Yeah, yes. That was I think two years ago, yes.</li> <li>Q. Your testimony was filed a year prior to your testimony in this case, correct?</li> </ul>	19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that a beta less than one means a less</li> <li>that the stock is less risky than market and a beta over</li> <li>one means that it's more risky than market; is that</li> </ul>
18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>your DCF results?</li> <li>A. Yeah, yes. That was I think two years ago, yes.</li> <li>Q. Your testimony was filed a year prior to your testimony in this case, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that a beta less than one means a less that the stock is less risky than market and a beta over one means that it's more risky than market; is that correct?</li> </ul>

20 (Pages 103 to 106)

	Page 107	Page 109
1	correct?	1 the betas have gone up for the low-risk business but
2	A. That's correct.	2 also the average industry beta is 1.1 and that's because
3	Q. So I want to ask you a question about your	3 in the market, the average beta is 1.0.
4	back to your Exhibit 17X on if you could turn to page	4 So these things are elevated in part because
5	27 of that exhibit.	5 they're they're computed use in the New York Stock
6	A. 27?	<ul> <li>6 Exchange index, they're adjusted betas, so they're not</li> </ul>
7	Q. Yeah, just let me let me make sure I it's	7 the raw betas, they adjust these, and so but still the
8	basically page 27 at the top, so it's the exhibit	8 utilities are among the lowest risk industries. It's
9	markings at the top.	<ul> <li>9 just the way Value Line measures beta the the numbers</li> </ul>
10	A. Okay.	10 have changed because of the volatility in March and
11	Q. And on line 22, you state that beta, quote,	11 April.
12	according to modern capital market theory is the only	12 Q. And you use the Value Line numbers
13	relevant measure of investment risk; do you see that?	13 A. I
14	A. Yes, I do.	14 Q in your testimony, correct?
15	Q. Now, I noticed you omitted a similar statement	15 A. Yes, I am. I'm looking because because
16	from your Cascade testimony, and I just wanted to ask	16 the New York Stock Exchange is not the market index and
17	you, is that because gas utilities betas have risen	17 that's just you know, you you look at the
18	sharply in 2020?	18 different sources of beta, Yahoo and others, they use
19	A. No, no, not at all. That was I don't know	19 different indexes. They use monthly returns, they use
20	why it was omitted. No, I no, and I discuss the gas	20 weekly returns, and that sort of thing and they get
21	utility base going up this year, and I explain that, you	21 different betas.
22	know, a lot of it has to do with how Value Line computes	22 But I I still use and my I'm looking at
23	data because they don't use the overall market, they use	23 the issue, but two things I'd say; the betas have gone
24	a New York Stock Exchange index. And if you look at	24 up, and the second thing is that that, again, they
25	if you you know, if you look at if you go back and	<ul> <li>all of them have the low low beta industries. But</li> </ul>
	Page 108	Page 110
1	look at my beta study, which I put together on page 4 of	1 and it really I mean, it really highlights on other
2	Exhibit JRW-6, I believe, right? Yeah, I go through	2 factors that you know, what's your market risk
3	there and I show you the rankings of the betas for all	3 premium because that's related to beta. And obviously
4	the different industries and the betas have gone up.	4 we have much different opinions about how you you
5	But	5 know, Ms. Bulkley's market risk premium of, what, 12 or
6	Q. So can I just stop you because I	6 13 percent, I mean, 12 percent is, you know, really
7	A the bottom.	7 blows up her CAPM numbers because
8	Q. I think you're are you on JR I just want	8 Q. So can I just
9	to be sure I've got the right exhibit that you're	9 [Cross talking.]
10	referring to. Are you discussing Exhibit 9	10 Q. All right. I'd like to just get back to asking
11	A. JRW page 4 of Exhibit JRW-6.	11 you a question about the betas that you used in the PSE
12	Q. Okay. I'm with you.	12 <b>case.</b>
13	A. Now, I do this annual when I I do it every	13Can you turn to page 46 of your Exhibit 17X and
14	six months, I update the Value Line betas for different	14 line 20; do you have that?
15	industries. Now, the betas for the utilities are still	15 A. Page 46 of 17X; is that correct?
16	at very much at the bottom ends of all the different	16 Q. That's correct. And, again, it's the exhibit
17	industries.	17 markings at the top.
18	As it turns out, the betas of all the low risk	18 A. Yep.
19	industries like food processing, that sort of thing,	19 <b>Q. And line 20.</b>
20	have all gone up. And a big part of that is the index,	20 So you used a beta of 65 for your gas utility
21	the New York Stock Exchange index. And of course the	21 proxy group in the PSE case, correct?
22	reason what that omits are all the tech companies and	22 A. Yes.
22		23 Q. And in this case, you used the median beta for
22	that's where a lot of the volatility, because most of	
23 24	that's where a lot of the volatility, because most of the tech companies are not the New York Stock Exchange,	24 your proxy group of 80; is that right?
23		-

21 (Pages 107 to 110)

	Page 111		Page 113
1	change in betas and part of you know, the issue is	1	1.5. Now they've gone up another 50, 60, 70 basis
2	big issue is you're using the New York Stock Exchange	2	points, I agree since since the time I filed since
3	index and not the the overall market. That's one of	3	this discussion point, yes.
4	the factors.	4	Q. Okay.
5	Q. And it's true, isn't it, that betas have	5	MS. MCDOWELL: Well, I think with that
6	continued to increase throughout this case?	6	answer, I that basically foreclosed a bunch of my
7	A. The betas have gone up, but all low the way	7	final questions. So that's all I have for you,
8	Value Line computes betas is all low industry betas have	8	Dr. Woolridge. I appreciate your time this morning or
9	gone up, and that's what I show in my study.	9	this afternoon for you.
10	Q. So back to your response testimony at page 56,	10	DR. WOOLRIDGE: Thank you.
11	so one of the bases for justifying your ROE in this case	11	JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect by
12	was declining betas. And wouldn't you agree that it's	12	Public Counsel?
13	problematic to justify your ROE recommendation on that	13	MS. GAFKEN: I have a little bit of
14	basis when the record here shows that betas have been	14	redirect, Your Honor.
15	increasing throughout 2020?	15	
16	A. Again, the betas have gone up. Historically	16	EXAMINATION
17	they're still below 1 as you'd expect the low. And, you	17	BY MS. GAFKEN:
18	know, it's part of the way Value Line does this. So	18	Q. Dr. Woolridge, you were asked some questions
19	this is just an observation. You know, they're low	19	about the equity rates declining over a period of time
20	they're still one of the lowest beta industries that	20	and how ROEs have been slow to adjust to that. Do you
21	Value Line computes betas for.	21	recall that line of questioning?
22	Q. So can you turn to your response testimony at	22	A. Yes.
23 24	page 11, and specifically I wanted to direct your attention to line 17 and 18 where you indicate that the	23 24	Q. Were you referring to COVID times or something different than COVID?
24	30-year yield has now come back to about 1.5 percent; do	25	A. Well, I'm talking about more general. I mean,
	Ju-year yield has now come back to about 1.5 percent, do	2.5	
	Page 112		Page 114
1	you see that?	1	obviously, I think like Ms. Bulkley talked a lot about
2	A. Yes, I yeah, that was as of when I filed my	2	well, interest rates have gone up a lot. If you look
3	testimony.	3	historically, Treasury rates of about 2 percent is
4	Q. And then in your cross-answering testimony,	4	historically low. I mean, we've only seen Treasury
5	which is JRW-14T; do you have that?	5	rates as low as this in the last two years. You go back
6	A. You know what, yeah, I will. Hold on. Give me	6	30, 40 years, Treasury rates have been much higher than
7	a second. Sorry, I did not Q. Of course.	7	this.
8	A have that pulled up. Sorry about that.	8	So this is kind of a long downward cycle. Yes, they've increased since November when I filed my
9 10	<b>Q. No worries.</b>	9 10	testimony. Does that change my recommendation, no.
11	A. Give me one minute here. Sorry, I I thought	11	Because look, historically 2 percent Treasury yields,
12	I had that. Go ahead. I'm yeah, I got okay.	12	you wouldn't believe that five or ten years ago.
13	Q. Okay. So can you turn to page 8 of that	13	So, you know, part of it's looking at the longer
14	testimony, please? Again, I'm at the bottom, page 8 of	14	timeframe and especially in its relation to authorized
15	22 is where I'm looking.	15	ROEs. We just haven't seen Treasury yields this low.
16	A. Okay.	16	Yeah, they bounce around by 30, 40 basis points, they're
17	Q. Okay. And on line 4 you state that interest	17	still well below where they've been over the last 30, 40
18	rates have stabilized in the 1.5 percent range, and,	18	years.
19	again, I assume you're referring to 30-year Treasury	19	Q. And when you're looking at the Treasury yield
20	rates?	20	in in looking at the ROE analysis, what what are
21	A. Yes.	21	you looking for; what are you comparing?
22	Q. Okay. And	22	A. Well, you're looking for kind of what is the
23	A. At the time. You know, they've declined and	23	relationship. Obviously interest rates are one driver
24	they've declined. I mean, they've come they they	24	of capital costs. I mean, I say in my testimony I
25	were stabilized there in the third quarter, so about	25	that I mean, in 2020, utilities rec they they
25			

22 (Pages 111 to 114)

	Page 115		Page 117
1	raised a record amount of capital despite all the issues	1	discussion about betas going up, the what what
2	we heard from Ms. Bulkley. They raised a record amount	2	happened in the Puget case versus this case, that sort
3	of capital. Why is that? Capital costs are low.	3	of thing, I'm still using the high end of the range
4	That's when utilities and other companies go to the	4	while I'm primarily on the DCF model, and dividends have
5	markets and raise capital.	5	gone up as Mr. Parcell covered in his his testimony
6	So utilities are having no trouble raising	6	and I use it.
7	capital and it's cheap capital, and that's because you	7	But, again, you're using a CAPM model. It's
8	haven't seen interest rates in capital costs this low in	8	it's not just the beta, it's also the market risk
9	literally decades, if ever.	9	premium. And if you're using a market risk premium
10	Q. You were asked a number of questions about beta	10	that's that's double digits, which no no published
11	and what's happening with beta. Do you recall that line	11	market risk premiums are double digits, you're going to
12	of questioning?	12	get a big number like Ms. Bulkley does.
13	A. Yes.	13	Q. So you were you were asked questions
14	Q. I guess generally, what is the impact of beta to	14	comparing your your testimony in the Puget Sound
15	cost of capital analysis?	15	Energy general rate case with this case. Did you use
16	A. Well, beta is a measure of relative risk	16	the same analytical tools for the Puget Sound Energy
17	relative to the market. And you're right, utility betas	17	general rate case as you did in this case?
18	have bumped up because how volatile they were in the	18	A. Yeah, and as I said, in that case, you know, the
19	March and April timeframe, especially when you use Value	19	electric utility numbers were really low, and that kind
20	Line, which measure them on a weekly basis.	20	of drove where the numbers were. On the risk level
21	Now, I've used Value Line. I've questioned	21	basis, you know, Puget Puget's credit ratings were
22	about whether I mean, especially given this recent	22	very much impacted by its parent's nearly \$2 billion in
23	change, but all of these low beta industries suddenly	23	debt at the corporate levels. So that really impacted
24	bumped up. The average beta for Value Line is well	24	the relative risk analysis there because of all the debt
25	is above 1. Why is that? Because they use the the	25	that Puget Energy has over Puget Sound Energy.
	Page 116		- 110
	Fage 110		Page 118
1	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the	1	Page 118 Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions,
1 2	5	1 2	
	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the		Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions,
2	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium.	2	Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first.
2 3	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my	2 3	Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to
2 3 4	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions,</li> <li>but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first.</li> <li>Did you employ the same methodologies to</li> <li>calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing.	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions,</li> <li>but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first.</li> <li>Did you employ the same methodologies to</li> <li>calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate</li> <li>case as you used in this case?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> </ul>
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in that study, but it's really key to understand the the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each other.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in that study, but it's really key to understand the the beta and the market risk premium are tied together in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each other.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in that study, but it's really key to understand the the beta and the market risk premium are tied together in getting an ROE.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each other.</li> <li>But, you know, for electric, for example, for electrics, you really to compare those to gas</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium. I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing. Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in that study, but it's really key to understand the the beta and the market risk premium are tied together in getting an ROE.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each other.</li> <li>But, you know, for electric, for example, for electrics, you really to compare those to gas companies, you really have to look at electric</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium.</li> <li>I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing.</li> <li>Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in that study, but it's really key to understand the the beta and the market risk premium are tied together in getting an ROE.</li> <li>Q. And you were asked quite a bit about the in the increase in betas over the last period since</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each other.</li> <li>But, you know, for electric, for example, for electrics, you really to compare those to gas companies, you really have to look at electric distribution companies and they are they are they</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium.</li> <li>I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing.</li> <li>Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in that study, but it's really key to understand the the beta and the market risk premium are tied together in getting an ROE.</li> <li>Q. And you were asked quite a bit about the inthe increase in betas over the last period since testimony has been filed. Does that impact your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each other.</li> <li>But, you know, for electric, for example, for electrics, you really to compare those to gas companies, you really have to look at electric distribution companies and they are they ar</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium.</li> <li>I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing.</li> <li>Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in that study, but it's really key to understand the the beta and the market risk premium are tied together in getting an ROE.</li> <li>Q. And you were asked quite a bit about the inthe increase in betas over the last period since testimony has been filed. Does that impact your recommendation in this case?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each other.</li> <li>But, you know, for electric, for example, for electrics, you really have to look at electric distribution companies and they are set.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium.</li> <li>I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing.</li> <li>Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in that study, but it's really key to understand the the beta and the market risk premium are tied together in getting an ROE.</li> <li>Q. And you were asked quite a bit about the in the increase in betas over the last period since testimony has been filed. Does that impact your recommendation in this case?</li> <li>A. No, I mean, I've I've I have used higher</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each other.</li> <li>But, you know, for electric, for example, for electrics, you really to compare those to gas companies, you really have to look at electric distribution companies and they are they are they are they are below what other electric utility authorized ROEs are.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade is a single fuel utility, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>New York Stock Exchange index, but it's also tied to the market risk premium.</li> <li>I mean, even with the higher beta, my my overall recommended rate of return is using CAPM is only 7.3 percent, but I use a a market-determined market risk premium that is used in the marketplace by investment firms and that sort of thing.</li> <li>Ms. Bulkley has a high her only the only number she produces that supports an ROE as high at 10.3 percent is her CAPM model, and as I lay out in detail, I mean, it's based on a totally unrealistic market risk premium that's much higher than any of the market risk premiums that are used in the marketplace by investment firms, which are published as part of studies and that sort of thing. Because she concuct [sic] she conduct her own study. And I've talked about the infirmities in that study, but it's really key to understand the the beta and the market risk premium are tied together in getting an ROE.</li> <li>Q. And you were asked quite a bit about the inthe increase in betas over the last period since testimony has been filed. Does that impact your recommendation in this case?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. You're anticipating one of my next questions, but I'm going to ask you a foundational question first. Did you employ the same methodologies to calculate ROE in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case as you used in this case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What accounts for some of the differences and similarities between the PSE case and this one? It feels a little well, I will stop there.</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, I I would say, I mean, again, the electric and gas you know, at the time the electric utility numbers were really low. I mean, I saw that in a number of states in terms of how these were looked at. You know, the you know, I put a graph in there of authorized ROEs for gas companies versus electric companies, and they've kind of mirrored each other.</li> <li>But, you know, for electric, for example, for electrics, you really have to look at electric distribution companies and they are set.</li> </ul>

23 (Pages 115 to 118)

	Page 119		Page 121
1	Q. You were asked to compare your analysis in	1	Q. Okay. You were asked a question about the
2	and the results of your analysis in the Puget case as	2	dividend yields and how in this case they are a hundred
3	you had in this case. Would you expect your numbers to	3	basis points over the amount that you found in the Puget
4	be exactly the same from case to case?	4	case. What impact did that have on this case?
5	A. Not necessarily. I mean, there's some I	5	A. Well, I mean, they they are higher, but you
6	mean, in all of these, and Ms. Bulkley or Mr. Parcell, I	6	also have to consider the growth rate to determine what
7	mean, there's some judgment used in terms of the the	7	the DCF equity cost rate is. So it's not one not in
8	approaches you use and the the amount of weight	8	one isolation, you have to look at both.
9	you're going to use on on one model versus another.	9	Q. Okay.
10	But a lot of it determine you know, is determined by	10	MS. GAFKEN: I think that's all that I have,
11	kind of you know, I I rely I state very much	11	Your Honor. Thank you.
12	I I I relied primarily on the DCF model, I you	12	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any
13	know, with different models, you get a big variance.	13	questions from the bench for the cost of capital panel
14	You know, there's a big variance in the in the	14	at this time?
15	differences between, say, Mr. Parcell or Ms. Bulkley's	15	CHAIR DANNER: No questions from me, thank
16	numbers between the the expected earnings versus risk	16	you.
17	premium, that sort of thing.	17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And none from me.
18	So I mean, the the the analyses are going	18	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hearing none, I would
19	to differ and different analysts are going to put weight	19	like to thank all the three witnesses on our panel for
20	on different things. And and part of the testimony	20	their testimony today and you are excused.
21	process I think is looking at what they're doing and	21	I think it would be a good time for us to
22	and questioning the inputs and what they use.	22	take a mid-morning break of ten minutes. So it's 11:08
23	Q. And from case to case, you're not necessarily	23	now, let's say we return here at approximately ten
24	using the identical time periods or proxy groups or all	24	minutes, at 11:20, we'll resume at 11:20. All right.
25	the various inputs, they're not identical from case to	25	We are off the record. Thank you.
	Page 120		Page 122
1	case, are they?	1	(A break was taken from
2	A. No, they're going to change, and the capital	2	11:08 a.m. to 11:21 a.m.)
3	market conditions are going to change. I mean,	3	JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record
4	obviously over the last year, the markets have changed	4	resuming after break, and now we will continue with the
5	quite a bit, but a lot of things that happened in the	5	individual witnesses in the order indicated on the
6	middle of COVID have you know, the market stock	6	parties' witness list.
7	market's back at a record high, the the you know,	7	No party has indicated cross-examination for
8	interest rates are still historically at extremely low	8	Cascade witness witness Nicole Kivisto or Tammy
9	levels despite their recent rise. So I mean, obviously	9	Nygard. Are there any questions from the bench for
10	you have to account for the capital market conditions	10	either Ms. Kivisto or Ms. Nygard at this time?
11	and that sort of thing.	11	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I believe go
12	Q. I have two different terms in my notes and I	12	ahead, Chair Danner.
13	just want to make that sure I've covered all my bases.	13	CHAIR DANNER: I was going to say I have
14	Dividend yields, are those the same as the	14	none for either witness. Thank you.
15	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic?	15	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for
15 16	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic? A. Dividend yield is the annual dividend divided by	15 16	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for Ms. Kivisto.
15 16 17	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic? A. Dividend yield is the annual dividend divided by the stock price. And it's a it's a you know, how	15 16 17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for Ms. Kivisto. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Kivisto, are you on the
15 16 17 18	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic? A. Dividend yield is the annual dividend divided by the stock price. And it's a it's a you know, how much cash dividend you have as an investor as compared	15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for Ms. Kivisto. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Kivisto, are you on the line?
15 16 17 18 19	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic? A. Dividend yield is the annual dividend divided by the stock price. And it's a it's a you know, how much cash dividend you have as an investor as compared to the price that's being paid in the marketplace. And,	15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for Ms. Kivisto. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Kivisto, are you on the line? MS. KIVISTO: I am. Can you hear me and see
15 16 17 18 19 20	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic? A. Dividend yield is the annual dividend divided by the stock price. And it's a it's a you know, how much cash dividend you have as an investor as compared to the price that's being paid in the marketplace. And, you know, utilities traditionally have had higher	15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for Ms. Kivisto. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Kivisto, are you on the line? MS. KIVISTO: I am. Can you hear me and see me?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic? A. Dividend yield is the annual dividend divided by the stock price. And it's a it's a you know, how much cash dividend you have as an investor as compared to the price that's being paid in the marketplace. And, you know, utilities traditionally have had higher dividend yields because they don't have the growth, but,	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for Ms. Kivisto. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Kivisto, are you on the line? MS. KIVISTO: I am. Can you hear me and see me? JUDGE HOWARD: I yes.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic? A. Dividend yield is the annual dividend divided by the stock price. And it's a it's a you know, how much cash dividend you have as an investor as compared to the price that's being paid in the marketplace. And, you know, utilities traditionally have had higher dividend yields because they don't have the growth, but, you know, the and they fell to very low levels and	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for Ms. Kivisto. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Kivisto, are you on the line? MS. KIVISTO: I am. Can you hear me and see me? JUDGE HOWARD: I yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I can hear you and
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic? A. Dividend yield is the annual dividend divided by the stock price. And it's a it's a you know, how much cash dividend you have as an investor as compared to the price that's being paid in the marketplace. And, you know, utilities traditionally have had higher dividend yields because they don't have the growth, but, you know, the and they fell to very low levels and now they've rebounded some. And so but you have to look	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for Ms. Kivisto. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Kivisto, are you on the line? MS. KIVISTO: I am. Can you hear me and see me? JUDGE HOWARD: I yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I can hear you and see you, yes.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dividend yields, are those the same as the Treasury yields or is that a different topic? A. Dividend yield is the annual dividend divided by the stock price. And it's a it's a you know, how much cash dividend you have as an investor as compared to the price that's being paid in the marketplace. And, you know, utilities traditionally have had higher dividend yields because they don't have the growth, but, you know, the and they fell to very low levels and	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a question for Ms. Kivisto. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Kivisto, are you on the line? MS. KIVISTO: I am. Can you hear me and see me? JUDGE HOWARD: I yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I can hear you and

	Page 123	Page 125
1	raise your right and hand I will swear you in?	1 <b>Q. Okay.</b>
2	(Nicole Kivisto sworn.)	2 A. Thank you.
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	3 Q. So does the Company at this point have a a
4	Ms. McDowell, are you would you be	4 written plan, a specific plan in place on how to
5	handling this witness?	5 complete this load study?
6	MS. MCDOWELL: I am, Your Honor.	6 A. Yes, we do. So between my original testimony
7	JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to just give	7 and my rebuttal testimony, we did have a slight change
8	her a brief introduction and then we will have the bench	<sup>8</sup> in terms of how we are going to collect the data. So as
9	questions?	9 we moved through the 2015 settlement agreement, there
10	MS. MCDOWELL: I will do that. Thank you so	10 has been obviously some changes, but the Company has
11	much.	11 been working in earnest, as reflected in my testimony,
12		12 in terms of developing how we're going to get the data.
13	EXAMINATION	13 I will acknowledge we've changed how we're going
14	BY MS. MCDOWELL:	14 to establish that. We started that we were going to get
15	Q. Ms. Kivisto, can you state and spell your first	15 the information at the City Gate level. We determined
16	name for the record?	16 as all-party settlement in the 2017 case that that was
17	A. Yes, Nicole Kivisto. Last name is spelled	17 not detailed enough to provide an adequate load study.
18	K-i-v-i-s-t-o.	18 So then we changed gears from that point forward, had
19	Q. And, Ms. Kivisto, how are you employed?	19 determined in the settlement how we would establish rate
20	A. I'm the president and CEO of Cascade Natural	20 design in future rate cases.
21	Gas.	And so where we're at today as you probably saw
22	Q. In that capacity, have you prepared testimony in	in my rebuttal, is we are installing a fixed network.
23	this proceeding?	And, you know, you may ask, then, why have we changed
24	A. I have.	along the way, and I just want the Commission to know
25	Q. And that is your direct testimony NAK-1T and	that we took this very seriously. And as we do with all
	Page 124	Page 126
1	Page 124 your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?	Page 126 1 of our capital costs and O&M, we want to make sure we're
1 2	your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T? A. That is correct.	
2 3	<ul><li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li><li>A. That is correct.</li><li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that</li></ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> </ul>
2 3 4	your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T? A. That is correct. Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?	<ol> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T? A. That is correct. Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony? A. I do not. Q. Okay. MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you. EXAMINATION	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T? A. That is correct. Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony? A. I do not. Q. Okay. MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>E X A MIN A TIO N</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this - so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>E X A MINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> <li>A. It is.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>E X A MINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> <li>timeline? Do you have something written, something that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>E X A MIN A TION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. So I have a question or two about the topic of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> <li>timeline? Do you have something written, something that</li> <li>we can ask for?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> <li>A. I t is.</li> <li>Q. So I have a question or two about the topic of the load study.</li> <li>A. Correct, yep.</li> <li>Q. So in your rebuttal, you provide a fair amount</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> <li>timeline? Do you have something written, something that</li> <li>we can ask for?</li> <li>A. Tangible. Yeah, we well, what we would have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> <li>A. I t is.</li> <li>Q. So I have a question or two about the topic of the load study.</li> <li>A. Correct, yep.</li> <li>Q. So in your rebuttal, you provide a fair amount of information about where you are on the load study</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> <li>timeline? Do you have something written, something that</li> <li>we can ask for?</li> <li>A. Tangible. Yeah, we well, what we would have</li> <li>is in our capital budgets, we've got the fixed network</li> <li>reflected. Obviously we spent some dollars in 2020,</li> <li>we've spend some dollars in twenty or we're spending</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> <li>A. I t is.</li> <li>Q. So I have a question or two about the topic of the load study.</li> <li>A. Correct, yep.</li> <li>Q. So in your rebuttal, you provide a fair amount of information about where you are on the load study project and an overview of how you're planning to</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> <li>timeline? Do you have something written, something that</li> <li>we can ask for?</li> <li>A. Tangible. Yeah, we well, what we would have</li> <li>is in our capital budgets, we've got the fixed network</li> <li>reflected. Obviously we spent some dollars in 2020,</li> <li>we've spend some dollars in twenty or we're spending</li> <li>dollars in 2021 and then 2022 as well. And what we have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. So I have a question or two about the topic of the load study.</li> <li>A. Correct, yep.</li> <li>Q. So in your rebuttal, you provide a fair amount of information about where you are on the load study project and an overview of how you're planning to collect the data. Do you want me to give you a specific</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> <li>timeline? Do you have something written, something that</li> <li>we can ask for?</li> <li>A. Tangible. Yeah, we well, what we would have</li> <li>is in our capital budgets, we've got the fixed network</li> <li>reflected. Obviously we spent some dollars in 2020,</li> <li>we've spend some dollars in twenty or we're spending</li> <li>dollars in 2021 and then 2022 as well. And what we have</li> <li>agreed to, then, as part of this plan, as you probably</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> <li>A. I t is.</li> <li>Q. So I have a question or two about the topic of the load study.</li> <li>A. Correct, yep.</li> <li>Q. So in your rebuttal, you provide a fair amount of information about where you are on the load study project and an overview of how you're planning to collect the data. Do you want me to give you a specific reference or are you familiar with this topic generally</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> <li>timeline? Do you have something written, something that</li> <li>we can ask for?</li> <li>A. Tangible. Yeah, we well, what we would have</li> <li>is in our capital budgets, we've got the fixed network</li> <li>reflected. Obviously we spent some dollars in 2020,</li> <li>we've spend some dollars in twenty or we're spending</li> <li>dollars in 2021 and then 2022 as well. And what we have</li> <li>agreed to, then, as part of this plan, as you probably</li> <li>saw also in my rebuttal, is we will meet with parties</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>your rebuttal testimony NAK-2T?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. MCDOWELL: That's all I have. This witness is available for Commission questions. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Good morning or good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto. It may be afternoon where you are now.</li> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. So I have a question or two about the topic of the load study.</li> <li>A. Correct, yep.</li> <li>Q. So in your rebuttal, you provide a fair amount of information about where you are on the load study project and an overview of how you're planning to collect the data. Do you want me to give you a specific</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>of our capital costs and O&amp;M, we want to make sure we're</li> <li>making the right decisions that are going to impact our</li> <li>customers.</li> <li>So we had evaluated various ways to collect this</li> <li>information originally that we thought would be under a</li> <li>shorter time period as well as less costly. Ultimately</li> <li>we ended up determining that the fixed network is the</li> <li>best way to go, and as of to date to the last time I saw</li> <li>it, we do have collectors installed collecting around 15</li> <li>percent of our customer data at this point.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for this so you made a change going</li> <li>to the fixed network, does the Company have a written</li> <li>plan, a work plan, for how this load study effort is</li> <li>going to go forward, for example, with dates or a</li> <li>timeline? Do you have something written, something that</li> <li>we can ask for?</li> <li>A. Tangible. Yeah, we well, what we would have</li> <li>is in our capital budgets, we've got the fixed network</li> <li>reflected. Obviously we spent some dollars in 2020,</li> <li>we've spend some dollars in twenty or we're spending</li> <li>dollars in 2021 and then 2022 as well. And what we have</li> <li>agreed to, then, as part of this plan, as you probably</li> </ul>

25 (Pages 123 to 126)

	Page 127		Page 129
-		-	
1	size is large enough.		parent holding company.
2	And at this point, I can't tell you with	2	So my question for you is, how do you feel we
3 4	certainty whether the sample size in terms of what we currently are collecting based on what's been installed	3	should evaluate Cascade, either should we treat them
4 5	to date is going to be large enough for a complete load	5	as a small company, should we treat them as part of a holding company, and since you are part of a larger
6	study. But the plan reflects that we would continue to	6	holding company, how how should we be evaluating
7	work with the parties to determine when and if we get	7	that?
8	the adequate information.	8	A. Yeah, I think it it kind of depends a little
9	So yes, there's earmarked dollars. We have a	9	bit in the context of what the suggestion is. So as we
10	team dedicated to rolling this out. We have installed	10	think about I guess in my mind how I think about pay
11	the collectors and hired contractors to help with the	11	as an example, is I have to be competitive with the
12	installation of the collectors. And so we've we've	12	local markets that Cascade serves and other utility
13	got a plan.	13	energy companies when I'm looking at pay comparisons for
14	Now, I don't know if I can tell you whether	14	my employees.
15	that we've got a summary written down somewhere that	15	As it relates to if you're talking about an
16	we could share with you. I would maybe defer to Mike	16	allocation of incentive, there are benefits to your
17	Parvinen to answer that specifically, but certainly I'm	17	point of being part of a larger corporation, and indeed
18	aware of the plan as it's been verbally stated to me and	18	we want to pass those benefits on down to our customers.
19	I have seen the dollars in our capital budget.	19	So I would argue that that is a positive in some cases
20	Q. Okay. So at this point, you're not aware of a	20	where we can, you know, you think about a centralized
21	specific written plan that I should follow up with with	21	service such as legal. We are benefitting from the
22	Mr. Parvinen to ask specifically if there is something	22	ability to use a legal department that supports multiple
23	that the Company has developed that includes all of	23	companies instead of just having a legal department to
24	these things you've talked about including timelines, et	24	support Cascade in its entirety. So I think there are
25	cetera?	25	certainly benefits where we see those, we pass those
	Page 128		Page 130
1	A. Yeah, Mike or Pat Darras may be able to answer	1	along.
2	that.	2	When you're talking about cost of capital
3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you very	3	specifically, I think, you know, Ann does a good job in
4	much. I don't know if my colleagues have any follow-up,	4	her testimony describing some of the unique risks of
5	but thank you very much. Appreciate it.	5	being a smaller company as it relates to the way that we
6	MS. KIVISTO: Thank you.	6	are regulated. You are regulating us as a utility in
7	COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Judge Howard, I do	7	Washington, and some of the things that make our utility
8	have several questions for Ms. Kivisto still.	8	in the state of Washington riskier than other larger
9	JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.	9	utilities is we serve a very rural nature, and there
10		10	is there's risk to that, there's added cost to that.
11 12	E X A M I N A T I O N BY COMMISSIONER BALASBAS:	11 12	And so to answer your question, I think you really have to look at it in the context of the various
13	Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Kivisto.	13	, ,
14	A. Good afternoon.	14	topics that are being brought forward. So I don't know if you have a follow-up to that or if that answers your
15	Q. So in in in the entire case that Cascade	15	question.
16	has presented here, there there seems to be, from	16	Q. No, I don't think I have a follow-up, but I
17	what I've read, a conflict between wanting to be treated	17	think what I understand your answer to be is that it
18	as a small company with greater risk and part of a	18	depends on the specific item you're talking about and
19	larger holding company. And so I'll give you two	19	that we should be evaluating Cascade either both as a
20	examples.	20	small company and as part of a larger holding company;
21	Witness Bulkley's testimony talks about	21	is that your is that your argument?
22	evaluating for cost of capital purposes Cascade as a	22	A. Yeah, depending on the topic. I think there's
23	small company. But in Witness Kaiser's testimony,	23	benefits of being part of a larger company. I believe
24	there's an argument that affiliate incentive	24	those should be passed along to our customers and
25	compensation is a benefit from being part of the larger	25	reflected in customer rates. But where we talk about

26 (Pages 127 to 130)

	Page 131		Page 133
1	the risks of being a smaller entity, those those are	1	Commissioner. I'm pretty sure I heard it over the other
2	real, and we we do serve a different customer base	2	voice there, but if I did not if I'm not answering by
3	than some of the larger utilities in this state.	3	the time I'm done, let me know.
4	Q. Okay. And maybe shifting topics just briefly	4	I think the question really relates to when will
5	here, I want to ask about one of the or one of the	5	Cascade come forward with a multiyear plan. So the
б	main arguments that that Cascade continually presents	6	first thing I would say in response to that is we have
7	in the rate cases that I have seen since I have been on	7	discussed it. So I want you to be aware and I will
8	the Commission in the last few years have been the	8	acknowledge that it has been discussed. The reason we
9	ongoing capital investments.	9	did not move forward with it in this particular case is
10	A. Yep.	10	because of the uncertainty that we were dealing with
11	Q. So and that of course I understand and and	11	with the COVID pandemic.
12	acknowledge that requires cash and other financing to	12	So at the time that we filed this case, there
13	to complete.	13	was discussions around whether that made sense, but
14	That said, based on your argument of looking at	14	to for a multiyear case to work, you need some
15	discrete instances of whether to be evaluated as a small	15	certainty around the capital you're going to deploy,
16	company or a larger company, where where do we see	16	what your operating costs are going to look like, et
17	the benefit of Cascade being part of a larger company	17	cetera, as you well know. And when we were in the midst
18	when it comes to that cash flow for capital projects?	18	of the pandemic, we just did not feel that we had enough
19	A. I would say the benefit of being part of a	19	comfort in terms of what we were going to do with
20	larger company when it comes to cash flow would be our	20	capital deployment, what was going to happen with our
21	equity raise ability. So differently than if we were	21	operating cost, et cetera.
22	standalone as Cascade by itself and we, to your point,	22	So do we think there is value in considering
23	needed to support the capital program we're supporting,	23	that? I I certainly do myself. Can I I but I
24	our debt is raised within Cascade's umbrella on its own.	24	also can't stand here and make a commitment in terms of
25	But on the equity side, we are able to deploy	25	will the next case that we file be a multiyear case
	Page 132		Page 134
1		1	
1	higher amounts of capital without external equity raise	1	because there's so many factors that go into that and
2	at times, I'm not saying all the time, because of the	2	one of them will be, of course, the outcome of this
3 4	benefit of being part of a larger organization and the cash flow provided from a larger organization. So I	3	case. And what is the outcome here and and then we
5	would say that's one benefit.	5	will go forward in terms of looking at the point where
6	Q. Okay. All right. And then my last question	6	we need to file another case do we have more certainty
7	relates to the frequency and timing of your rate	7	as we look to the future.
8	filings. And as you know, we have we have issued a	8	You mentioned the the capital, and I
9	policy statement regarding capital and used and useful	9	appreciate the comment on the higher capital and the
10	and the you know, there's discussions and ongoing	10	CapEx that we are spending here certainly is of
11	efforts to try to get utilities to consider multiyear	11	heightened levels in terms of our in my opinion our
12	rate plans in their filings.	12	obligation to provide safe and reliable service. It is
13	My question for you as the head of Cascade is,	13	a balancing act. Certainly we know that we're dealing
14	when are we going to see that? I mean, there is this	14	with customer impacts here, but we also know that we are
15	is the second case that I've seen in the last two years	15	obligated to provide safe, reliable service, and these
16	where there's an acknowledgement of the policy statement	16	replacement projects are critical.
17	that we issued, and I do not see that in your filing. I	17	And so we do have the need to continue to spend.
18	want to see when you're going to	18	You saw that in my testimony. So we will certainly
19	[Brief interruption.]	19	reevaluate whether multiyear makes sense at the time we
20	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm not sure who is speaking	20	look to another case.
21	right now, but they are not called to testify at this	21	COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank
22	point. So please keep your line muted for now.	22	you very much. I have no further questions.
23	Sorry, Ms. Kivisto, you may you may	23	JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further
24	answer.	24	questions from the bench for Ms. Kivisto?
25	A. Yeah, I think I captured your question,	25	. Okay. Hearing none, thank you for your

27 (Pages 131 to 134)

	Page 135		Page 137
1		1	Staff has indicated cross-examination for
2	testimony today. You are excused. MS. KIVISTO: Thank you.	2	this witness. You may proceed.
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Did we have any just to	3	MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, can you hear me?
4	check one more time, did we have any questions from the	4	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.
5	bench for Ms. Nygard?	5	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sorry, there was some
6	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No.	6	technical issue. I was just put on hold. I heard you
7	JUDGE HOWARD: Hearing none, the next	7	were just about to ask me to cross; is that correct?
8	witness on the agreed witness list is Patrick Darras for	8	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, that's right. You can
9	Cascade.	9	proceed
10	Mr. Darras, are you on the line? And am I	10	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you.
11	saying your last name correctly? I apologize if I'm	11	JUDGE HOWARD: examining Mr. Darras.
12	not.	12	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
13	MR. DARRAS: Yes, you pronounced that	13	
14	correctly. Can you hear and see me?	14	EXAMINATION
15	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, thank you. Please raise	15	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
16	your right hand and I will swear you in.	16	Q. Good morning, Mr. Darras. Can you hear me all
17	(Patrick Darras sworn.)	17	right?
18	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	18	A. Yes, I hear you fine.
19	Would Cascade like to introduce the witness?	19	Q. Okay. Mr. Darras, I'm going to be asking you to
20	MS. SCHOONOVER: Yes. Thank you, Judge	20	review Cross-Exhibits PCD-7X through PCD-14X as well as
21	Howard. This is Jordan Schoonover for Cascade.	21	your direct and rebuttal testimony and the exhibits that
22	Mr. Darras, can you hear me and see me?	22	you prefiled. Do you have those available?
23	MR. DARRAS: Yes, I can.	23	A. Yes, I do.
24	MS. SCHOONOVER: Perfect.	24	Q. Okay. Thank you.
25	/////	25	Mr. Darras, in Cascade's initial filing, how
	Page 136		Page 138
1	EXAMINATION	1	many line items were included in the Company's proposed
2	BY MS. SCHOONOVER:	2	pro forma plant adjustment?
3	Q. Could you please state your full name and spell	3	A. Are you referencing the initial testimony for
4	it for the record?	4	PCD-2? In which case
5	A. Yes, Patrick Darras. D, as in dog, a-r-r-a-s.	5	Q. Um sorry, go ahead.
6	Q. How are you employed, Mr. Darras?	6	A. With that one, there was I believe there was
7	A. I am the vice president of engineering operation	7	26 line items or projects and a total of 15 line items.
8	services for Cascade Natural Gas.	8	Q. Does that include the growth plant expense that
9	Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared direct	9	Cascade is proposing to include in the pro forma plant
10	and rebuttal testimony and exhibits in this proceeding?	10	adjustment?
11	A. Yes, I have.	11	A. It would include just the specific projects.
12	Q. And specifically, are those testimony and	12	Q. Okay. Could you turn to PCD-11X for me and let
13	exhibits numbered PCD-1T through PCD-6?	13	me know when you're there.
14	A. Yes, that is correct.	14	A. Okay.
15	Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to your	15	Q. Do you see column G of this exhibit?
16 17	prefiled testimony and exhibits? A. I do not.	16 17	A. Yes, I do. O And lot mo back up. What is this exhibit?
17 18	Q. If I were to ask you the same questions set	18	<ul><li>Q. And let me back up. What is this exhibit?</li><li>A. This exhibit is what Ms. Peters provided with</li></ul>
19	forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your	19	her testimony, NCP-6.
エノ	answers be the same?	20	Q. Okay. Thank you.
2.0			And this shows column G shows the proposed
20 21	A. Yes, they would.	21	
21	A. Yes, they would. <b>Q. Thank vou. Mr. Darras.</b>	21 22	
21 22	Q. Thank you, Mr. Darras.		adjustments related to each line item, correct?
21	-	22	adjustments related to each line item, correct? A. Yes, it does.
21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Thank you, Mr. Darras.</li> <li>MS. SCHOONOVER: This witness is available</li> </ul>	22 23	adjustments related to each line item, correct?

28 (Pages 135 to 138)

	Page 139	Page 141
1	items?	1 withdrawing its request for five of the 15 pro forma
2	A. I guess subject to check if we're talking the	2 discrete projects, correct?
3	entire document, it looks like there's a lot more than	3 A. Correct.
4	46 line items there unless I misunderstood the question.	4 Q. And when did Cascade make the non-Company
5	Q. Let me clarify.	5 parties aware that it was withdrawing those five of the
6	MS. SCHOONOVER: I was going to suggest to	6 15 discrete projects?
7	clarify what you mean by "line items." That might be	7 A. I'm not exactly sure which which document it
8	helpful.	8 would have been. It would have been one of the data
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: Let me rephrase.	9 requests I believe is where we updated that.
10	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:	10 Q. Okay. Could you turn to your rebuttal testimony
11	Q. Mr. Darras, in column G, there are only a few	11 on page 5 and let me know when you're there. That is
12	items that have proposed adjustment figures, correct?	12 PCD-3T and beginning lines 10 through 18.
13	A. Correct.	13 A. On page 5 did you say?
14	Q. All right. And would you accept that subject to	14 <b>Q. Yes.</b>
15	check there are about 46 items that have proposed	15 A. Okay. And then 10 through 18, I'm there.
16	adjustments related to them?	16 <b>Q.</b> All right. The question asked is, quote, Did
17	A. Yes, I would.	17 Cascade inform the parties regarding the plant delays
18	Q. Okay. All right. And as you mentioned, 15 of	18 before they filed the testimony?
19	those projects you describe in your rebuttal testimony	19 That question is referring to the delays in the
20	as discrete projects, correct?	20 Keene Richland Road Project and the Aberdeen Project,
21	A. I apologize, but you broke up for me at the	21 correct?
22	beginning of that.	22 A. Yes, it is.
23	Q. Okay. Yeah, 15 of those projects you describe	23 Q. And your answer to that question mentions the
24	in your rebuttal testimony as discrete projects,	response to Staff Data Request 89 and the revised
25	correct?	25 supplemental response to Staff Data Request 92, correct?
	Page 140	Page 142
1	A. Correct.	1 A. Yes, it does.
2	Q. Okay. And are you using the term "discrete	2 Q. Could you turn to Exhibit PCD-7X and let me know
3	project" as synonymous with specific project?	3 when you're there.
4	A. Yes, that would be my term specifically.	4 A. Okay.
5	Q. Okay. So for the purposes of of this	5 Q. And do you recognize this document?
6	testimony, I'm just going to refer to them as discrete	6 A. Yes, I do.
7	projects just to make sure we're using the same	7 Q. Is it the initial response to Staff Data Request
8	terminology.	8 <b>89?</b>
9	A. Sure.	9 A. Yes, it is.
10	Q. So at the time of the initial filing, how many	10 Q. And does that response indicate the date that it
11	of those 15 projects, discrete projects, were fully in	11 was prepared?
12	service?	12 A. Yes, it says August 27th.
13	A. At the time of the filing, I believe there was	13 Q. All right. And where in this DR response does
14	four that would have been in service, and when we say	14 it state that Cascade is no longer seeking to include
15	I guess that's the the clarification probably right	15 the Aberdeen and Richland Keene Road Projects in the pro
16	away that I need to. When I look at it, again, I'm	16 forma adjustment?
17	talking 15 discrete projects, and then there's a	17 A. I don't believe it does in this one.
18	multitude of projects underneath underneath those 15,	18 Q. Okay. And in your rebuttal testimony, you
19	which comes up to 26.	19 indicate that this was response was sent to the
20	So to say that of the 15 I would have to go back	20 Commission at Commission Staff, excuse me, on
21	and and look at that, but there there were four	21 September 9th, correct?
22	projects within those 15 discrete that were complete	22 A. Yes, I do.
23	prior to or in service prior to initial testimony.	23 Q. And sorry, could you please turn to PCD-AX
24	Q. Okay. Thank you.	24 with me and let me know when you're there.
25	And on rebuttal, you state that Cascade is	25 A. Okay.
	· •	

29 (Pages 139 to 142)

	Page 143	Page 145
1	Q. All right. What is PCD-8X; do you recognize	1 right you said page 9 of the
2	this document?	2 Q. Of your rebuttal testimony. Page 9, line 8.
3	A. Yes, I do.	3 A. Okay. What was your question?
4	Q. And what is it?	4 Q. Yes. So you are citing the Cross-Exhibit PCD-8X
5	A. It's Data Request No. 92.	5 as the document that informs the other parties that the
6	Q. All right. And this is a revised version,	6 Othello Gate Project was in service, correct?
7	correct?	7 A. Yes, I do.
8	A. Yes, I believe there there was several	8 Q. All right. And specifically on in footnote
9	revisions. This would have been the first revision, I	9 22, page 9 on your rebuttal testimony, you cite column I
10	believe.	10 of this response, correct?
11	Q. Okay. And referring to back to your rebuttal	11 A. Yes.
12	testimony, page 5, footnote 14, you state that although	12 Q. Isn't the title of column I Estimate In-Service
13	the DR response indicates it was prepared August 27th,	13 Date?
14	it was, in fact, prepared on October 27th; is that	14 A. And you're referencing the PCD-8X, correct?
15	accurate?	15 <b>Q. Yes.</b>
16	A. It was provided, yes, on October 27th.	16 A. Yes, it does say that.
17	Q. All right. And does this	17 Q. Okay. Does someone reading this response know
18	[Brief interruption.]	18 which dates are estimated in-service dates and which are
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: I'm sorry, if someone is	19 actual in-service dates?
20	speaking, if you can please mute yourself. Thank you.	20 A. I don't know that you you would know it. I
21	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:	guess when I look at it and you'll see that there are
22	Q. In attachment 1 of the DR response, where does	22 some dates that are after this was filed, so the
23	this document indicate that Cascade is no longer	assumption could be made that it's it's an estimated
24	including the Richland Keene Road and Aberdeen Projects	and an actual. Could it have been clarified differently
25	in its proposed pro forma?	25 on this form or this submittal, this revision, yes, it
	Page 144	Page 146
1		
1 2	Page 144 A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.	1 could have.
	A. I believe it would be identified it looks like	1 could have.
2	A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.	<ol> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> </ol>
2 3	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like</li> <li>in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like</li> <li>in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're</li> <li>no longer</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like</li> <li>in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're</li> <li>no longer</li> <li>[Cross talking.]</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> <li>explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>In your turning back to your rebuttal</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> <li>explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>In your turning back to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> <li>explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>In your turning back to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let</li> <li>me know when you're there.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> <li>explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>In your turning back to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let</li> <li>me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm there.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> <li>explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>In your turning back to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let</li> <li>me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> <li>explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>In your turning back to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let</li> <li>me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch</li> <li>project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> <li>explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>In your turning back to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let</li> <li>me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch</li> <li>project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now</li> <li>slightly higher as a result of the delayed material</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> <li>explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>In your turning back to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let</li> <li>me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch</li> <li>project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now</li> <li>slightly higher as a result of the delayed material</li> <li>charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that from its request, October 27th would be the first date</li> </ul>	1could have.2And I think if you were to refer to a later form3as we started to run in or find some of these4inconsistencies across these different forms is when we5chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help6explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.7Q. Okay. Thank you.8In your turning back to your rebuttal9testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let10me know when you're there.11A. Okay. I'm there.12Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch13project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now14slightly higher as a result of the delayed material15charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.16When were those material charges booked?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that from its request, October 27th would be the first date that Cascade informed the parties it was removing those</li> </ul>	1could have.2And I think if you were to refer to a later form3as we started to run in or find some of these4inconsistencies across these different forms is when we5chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help6explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.7Q. Okay. Thank you.8In your turning back to your rebuttal9testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let10me know when you're there.11A. Okay. I'm there.12Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch13project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now14slightly higher as a result of the delayed material15charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.16When were those material charges booked?17A. I don't have an exact date. What I do know is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that from its request, October 27th would be the first date that Cascade informed the parties it was removing those projects, correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>could have.</li> <li>And I think if you were to refer to a later form</li> <li>as we started to run in or find some of these</li> <li>inconsistencies across these different forms is when we</li> <li>chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help</li> <li>explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>In your turning back to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let</li> <li>me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch</li> <li>project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now</li> <li>slightly higher as a result of the delayed material</li> <li>charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.</li> <li>When were those material charges booked?</li> <li>A. I don't have an exact date. What I do know is</li> <li>that they were booked after the fact that we had</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that from its request, October 27th would be the first date that Cascade informed the parties it was removing those projects, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, subject to to check, I guess I would</li> </ul>	1could have.2And I think if you were to refer to a later form3as we started to run in or find some of these4inconsistencies across these different forms is when we5chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help6explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.7Q. Okay. Thank you.8In your turning back to your rebuttal9testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let10me know when you're there.11A. Okay. I'm there.12Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch13project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now14slightly higher as a result of the delayed material15charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.16When were those material charges booked?17A. I don't have an exact date. What I do know is18that they were booked after the fact that we had19originally quoted that that in-service date.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that from its request, October 27th would be the first date that Cascade informed the parties it was removing those projects, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, subject to to check, I guess I would I would not disagree with this at this point.</li> </ul>	1could have.2And I think if you were to refer to a later form3as we started to run in or find some of these4inconsistencies across these different forms is when we5chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help6explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.7Q. Okay. Thank you.8In your turning back to your rebuttal9testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let10me know when you're there.11A. Okay. I'm there.12Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch13project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now14slightly higher as a result of the delayed material15charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.16When were those material charges booked?17A. I don't have an exact date. What I do know is18that they were booked after the fact that we had19originally quoted that that in-service date.20And I think here is a good time for me to try
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that from its request, October 27th would be the first date that Cascade informed the parties it was removing those projects, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, subject to to check, I guess I would I would not disagree with this at this point.</li> <li>Q. And in your rebuttal testimony on page 9, you</li> </ul>	1could have.2And I think if you were to refer to a later form3as we started to run in or find some of these4inconsistencies across these different forms is when we5chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help6explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.7Q. Okay. Thank you.8In your turning back to your rebuttal9testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let10me know when you're there.11A. Okay. I'm there.12Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch13project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now14slightly higher as a result of the delayed material15charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.16When were those material charges booked?17A. I don't have an exact date. What I do know is18that they were booked after the fact that we had19originally quoted that that in-service date.20And I think here is a good time for me to try21and explain a little bit that the the different folks
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that from its request, October 27th would be the first date that Cascade informed the parties it was removing those projects, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, subject to to check, I guess I would I would not disagree with this at this point.</li> <li>Q. And in your rebuttal testimony on page 9, you cite that this supplemental DR as DR response as the</li> </ul>	1could have.2And I think if you were to refer to a later form3as we started to run in or find some of these4inconsistencies across these different forms is when we5chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help6explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.7Q. Okay. Thank you.8In your turning back to your rebuttal9testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let10me know when you're there.11A. Okay. I'm there.12Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch13project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now14slightly higher as a result of the delayed material15charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.16When were those material charges booked?17A. I don't have an exact date. What I do know is18that they were booked after the fact that we had19originally quoted that that in-service date.20And I think here is a good time for me to try21and explain a little bit that the the different folks22that were working on these forms and then the different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that from its request, October 27th would be the first date that Cascade informed the parties it was removing those projects, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, subject to to check, I guess I would I would not disagree with this at this point.</li> <li>Q. And in your rebuttal testimony on page 9, you cite that this supplemental DR as DR response as the documents that informs the other parties that the</li> </ul>	1could have.2And I think if you were to refer to a later form3as we started to run in or find some of these4inconsistencies across these different forms is when we5chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help6explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.7Q. Okay. Thank you.8In your turning back to your rebuttal9testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let10me know when you're there.11A. Okay. I'm there.12Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch13project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now14slightly higher as a result of the delayed material15charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.16When were those material charges booked?17A. I don't have an exact date. What I do know is18that they were booked after the fact that we had19originally quoted that that in-service date.20And I think here is a good time for me to try21and explain a little bit that the the different folks22that were working on these forms and then the different23way that we even internally looked at estimated versus
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I believe it would be identified it looks like in column G of that document.</li> <li>Q. Where in column G does it indicate that they're no longer [Cross talking.]</li> <li>A. Line No. 58.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Which is the Aberdeen Project that shows zero under the proposed adjustment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But it doesn't explicitly state that</li> <li>Cascade is removing this from their proposed pro forma adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Not in this document, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But assuming that the reader inferred from the zero that that Cascade was removing that from its request, October 27th would be the first date that Cascade informed the parties it was removing those projects, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, subject to to check, I guess I would I would not disagree with this at this point.</li> <li>Q. And in your rebuttal testimony on page 9, you cite that this supplemental DR as DR response as the</li> </ul>	1could have.2And I think if you were to refer to a later form3as we started to run in or find some of these4inconsistencies across these different forms is when we5chose to do our best to clarify some of those to help6explain where the inconsistencies were coming from.7Q. Okay. Thank you.8In your turning back to your rebuttal9testimony on page 12, line beginning on line 15, let10me know when you're there.11A. Okay. I'm there.12Q. You mentioned that the Bellingham eight-inch13project, you state that, quote, the final costs are now14slightly higher as a result of the delayed material15charges that were booked later in the year, end quote.16When were those material charges booked?17A. I don't have an exact date. What I do know is18that they were booked after the fact that we had19originally quoted that that in-service date.20And I think here is a good time for me to try21and explain a little bit that the the different folks22that were working on these forms and then the different

30 (Pages 143 to 146)

	Page 147		Page 149
1	would say that if you were to call up an engineer and	1	are there any similar material charges or any other
2	ask them what the in-service date is, if the gas is	2	project-related expenses that won't become known until
3	flowing in the pipe, they're going to say that it's in	3	later?
4	service. Depending on who asked for that information	4	A. To my knowledge, no, there isn't. And I think
5	and depending on who answered that information is where	5	the difference that I would try and point out in in
6	you're going to get the inconsistency that I I	6	the case of these is we did close the books December
7	believe or it's my opinion that we saw in these	7	31st. So even if there was a late material invoice that
8	different forms.	8	we discovered on one of those projects, it would not be
9	If you were to call the accounting group or the	9	included in this rate case.
10	regulatory group to ask what's the in-service date of	10	Q. All right. And turning back to your rebuttal
11	that same project, they're going to pull up our power	11	testimony on page 5, you note that Cascade delayed the
12	plant, which is our system that we track all of these	12	Aberdeen and Richland Keene Road Projects, quote, to
13	projects on, and they're going to see the latest and	13	reduce its capital budget in light of the ongoing
14	greatest, which is the estimated in-service date.	14	COVID-19 pandemic; is that right?
15	So there's probably more questions on	15	A. That is correct.
16	inconsistencies, but that's the best way I can try to	16	Q. When was the decision made to reduce the capital
17	explain that, is that we recognized there was	17	budget in light of the COVID-19?
18	inconsistencies. What I can say that stayed consistent	18	A. I don't know that I have specific date. I would
19	throughout my testimony and through rebuttal testimony	19	say we as a company as Ms. Kivisto just discussed
20	is the need and the prudence of the projects that we	20	previously was we we recognized the potential need to
21	chose. We also made it very clear during both that we	21	do this, a lot of uncertainty. When did we start
22	did anticipate that we would see potential changes in	22	looking at capital budgets and potential to trim, I
23	both the in-service date and the cost.	23	would say, you know, that March/April timeframe. When
24	Certainly, when you look at a year like we just	24	did we conclude that, I would say I don't know that we
25	had with the pandemic, I think that even raises to a	25	ever did. We continuously throughout the year really
	Page 148		Page 150
1	higher level. To me, I think we were quite fortunate to	1	evaluated all projects that were going on.
2	be able to complete the projects that we needed to be	2	From my perspective, I I looked at it as
3	able to continue to provide a safe, reliable service.	3	or I looked at all these projects as I testified as they
4	There was a lot of unknowns at the time that we did	4	were needed for the safety or reliability reasons.
5	initial testimony in June. When we filed that, we	5	And
6	there was just a lot of unknowns. We didn't even know	6	Q. Thank you.
7	if we could get contractors at that time.	7	So when was the decision made to delay the
8	So I'm not making excuses. Like I say, I	8	Aberdeen and Richland Keene Road Projects specifically?
-			
9	recognize and we recognized and we tried to clear it up	9	A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.
9 10	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you	9 10	<ul><li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li><li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing</li></ul>
9 10 11	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed	10 11	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in	10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then	10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with	10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are	10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and useful and in-service projects.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, does the record in this</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and useful and in-service projects. <b>Q. All right. So getting back specifically to the</b>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, does the record in this docket contain any contemporaneous documentation of the</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and useful and in-service projects. <b>Q. All right. So getting back specifically to the Bellingham Project, up until rebuttal testimony, Cascade</b>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, does the record in this docket contain any contemporaneous documentation of the decision-making process in which Cascade decided to</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and useful and in-service projects. Q. All right. So getting back specifically to the Bellingham Project, up until rebuttal testimony, Cascade was reporting the actuals for that project that ended up	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, does the record in this docket contain any contemporaneous documentation of the decision-making process in which Cascade decided to continue those ten projects but to delay the other two?</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and useful and in-service projects. Q. All right. So getting back specifically to the Bellingham Project, up until rebuttal testimony, Cascade was reporting the actuals for that project that ended up being incorrect; is that right?	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, does the record in this docket contain any contemporaneous documentation of the decision-making process in which Cascade decided to continue those ten projects but to delay the other two?</li> <li>A. I would say no other than in my testimony and</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and useful and in-service projects.</li> <li>Q. All right. So getting back specifically to the Bellingham Project, up until rebuttal testimony, Cascade was reporting the actuals for that project that ended up being incorrect; is that right?</li> <li>A. Ended up being incorrect, I would I would say</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, does the record in this docket contain any contemporaneous documentation of the decision-making process in which Cascade decided to continue those ten projects but to delay the other two?</li> <li>A. I would say no other than in my testimony and rebuttal, I continued to reference the need and the</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and useful and in-service projects.</li> <li>Q. All right. So getting back specifically to the Bellingham Project, up until rebuttal testimony, Cascade was reporting the actuals for that project that ended up being incorrect; is that right?</li> <li>A. Ended up being incorrect, I would I would say yes.</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, does the record in this docket contain any contemporaneous documentation of the decision-making process in which Cascade decided to continue those ten projects but to delay the other two?</li> <li>A. I would say no other than in my testimony and rebuttal, I continued to reference the need and the prudence of those projects based on the safety and</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and useful and in-service projects.</li> <li>Q. All right. So getting back specifically to the Bellingham Project, up until rebuttal testimony, Cascade was reporting the actuals for that project that ended up being incorrect; is that right?</li> <li>A. Ended up being incorrect, I would I would say yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for the other nine discrete projects</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, does the record in this docket contain any contemporaneous documentation of the decision-making process in which Cascade decided to continue those ten projects but to delay the other two?</li> <li>A. I would say no other than in my testimony and rebuttal, I continued to reference the need and the prudence of those projects based on the safety and reliability reason.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>specifically in rebuttal testimony, and I think if you were to look at some of the items that you just pointed out, those are cleared up to the best of our ability in both rebuttal testimony and the PCD is it 6. And then also if you look at PCD-6 and cross-reference that with the final MCG-15, those are exact numbers and those are what we closed out at the end of the year for used and useful and in-service projects.</li> <li>Q. All right. So getting back specifically to the Bellingham Project, up until rebuttal testimony, Cascade was reporting the actuals for that project that ended up being incorrect; is that right?</li> <li>A. Ended up being incorrect, I would I would say yes.</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I don't know that I've got that specific date.</li> <li>Q. Okay. On rebuttal, Cascade is still proposing to include ten discrete projects in the pro forma adjustment. Has Cascade submitted any exhibits demonstrating that the Company considered whether any of those projects could or should be delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>A. Not to my knowledge, we did not.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, does the record in this docket contain any contemporaneous documentation of the decision-making process in which Cascade decided to continue those ten projects but to delay the other two?</li> <li>A. I would say no other than in my testimony and rebuttal, I continued to reference the need and the prudence of those projects based on the safety and</li> </ul>

31 (Pages 147 to 150)

	Page 151		Page 153
1	contemporaneous documentation of that decision-making	1	encompass costs that are generally unplanned and outside
2	process?	2	the Company's control. While we know that we will incur
3	A. Not to my knowledge, no.	3	these costs over the course of the year, we do not know
4	Q. Okay. Now, I'd like to ask you some questions	4	exactly where or when. For this reason, the Company
5	on the blanket growth expenses that Cascade is proposing	5	cannot budget individually for specific projects if all
6	to include in pro forma.	6	within these blanket funding projects.
7	Cascade's position on these are that they're	7	
8	costs that are allowed under the Commission's used and	8	Based on your own description of these projects, can they really be considered programmatic?
9	useful policy because they would be considered	9	A. Again, I I would defer to Mr. Parvinen on
10	programmatic; is that a fair summary?	10	this. I'm not the expert when it comes to the intent of
	MS. SCHOONOVER: Excuse me, Counsel. Can	11	
11		12	what the that I line 19 says in the policy
12	you please provide a reference for the testimony you're		statement.
13 14	looking at? MR. CALLAGHAN: You know, I hadn't written	13 14	Q. All right. But your description in your
	-	15	rebuttal testimony that the blanket funding projects are
15	down a specific reference, but I would say, Mr. Darras, if you don't think that's an accurate summary, you're	16	generally unplanned and outside the Company's control is accurate; is that right?
16			
17	certainly welcome to say that.	17	A. Yes, that is correct.
18	MS. SCHOONOVER: I'm just wondering whether	18	Q. And your testimony describes all three types of
19	we might be getting into Mr. Parvinen's testimony rather	19	blanket expenses as related to customer growth, correct?
20	than Mr. Darras's. But if Mr. Darras has an answer, he	20	A. Yes, it does.
21	can certainly offer it.	21	Q. Could you turn to Exhibit PCD-11X on page 6 and
22	A. Yes, if you can repeat the question, please, and	22	let me know when you're there.
23	I think we're hung up on the programmatic, and I don't	23	A. Okay. What page is that again?
24 25	know that I am the right person to give the definition for programmatic based on the policy.	24 25	Q. It's the exhibit's page 6. So the page numbers
25	for programmatic based on the policy.	25	that are in the very top right corner of the document.
	Page 152		Page 154
1	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:	1	A. Okay. And page 6 of 6?
2	Q. All right. So have you read the used and the	2	Q. Yes. The last page, yes.
3	Commission's used and useful policy statement?	3	A. Okay.
4	A. Yes, I have read it.	4	Q. Number note 27 in this document, it says,
5	Q. Okay. And could you turn to PCD-10X on page 5,	5	quote, blanket growth work orders. These projects are
6	footnote 19 for me and let me know when you're there.	6	known to improve system dependability, i.e. gas
7	CHAIR DANNER: I'm sorry, Counsel, could you	7	deliverability, in an area without the specific intent
8	read that to me again?	8	to add known new customers. Some projects are
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, this is PCD-X10, which	9	construction of new systems, assets, mains, services, et
10	is the used and useful policy statement, and it is on	10	cetera, to deliver gas to known identified new
11	page 5, footnote 19.	11	customers.
12	CHAIR DANNER: Thank you.	12	Is note 27 an accurate description of the pro
13	A. Okay.	13	forma blanket growth expenses that Cascade is seeking to
14	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:	14	include in the pro forma adjustment?
15	Q. And footnote 19 says, quote, programmatic	15	MS. SCHOONOVER: I would just object that
16	investments are by their very nature investments made	16	this is not an exhibit to Mr. Darras's testimony. This
17	according to a schedule, plan, or method. Is that	17	is an exhibit to Ms. Peters' testimony.
18	accurate?	18	JUDGE HOWARD: You may proceed.
19	A. Yes, that's what it says.	19	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
20	Q. Okay. Could you turn to your rebuttal testimony	20	Q. Mr. Darras, would you like me to ask the
21	on page 16 and let me know when you're there.	21	question again?
22	Specifically beginning on line 15 of page 16.	22	A. Yes, please.
23	A. Okay.	23	Q. Okay. So on page 6 note 27 states, quote,
24	Q. All right. So you describe here blanket growth	24	blanket growth work orders. These projects are known to
25	projects, quote, these blanket funding projects	25	improve systems dependability, i.e. gas deliverability,
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

32 (Pages 151 to 154)

	Page 155	Page 157
1	in an area without the specific intent to add known new	1 Q. And this is the Data Response 92; is that right?
2	customers. Some projects are construction of new system	2 A. Yes, it is.
3	assets, mains, services, et cetera, to deliver gas to	3 Q. And you testified that the column G showing zero
4	known, slash, identified new customers.	4 dollars was how parties can understand that these
5	Is note 27 an accurate description of the pro	5 projects had been postponed; is that a fair statement of
6	forma blanket growth expenses that Cascade is seeking to	6 your testimony?
7	include in the pro forma adjustments?	7 A. Yes, it is.
8	A. It does seem to be, yes.	8 Q. And if we look at line No. I believe it is 58
9	Q. Okay. This description makes it sound like at	9 that you have referenced in your testimony, the Aberdeen
10	least some of these projects are not necessarily due to	10 Project, could you please read the in-service date in
11	customer growth, doesn't it?	11 column I in this data response?
12	A. It looks like it could be looked at that way,	12 A. It is the same date, 8/31/2021. The one
13	yes.	13 difference would be that this is an it's an estimated
14	Q. All right.	14 in-service date and the other documents show an actual
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: And actually, that's all I	15 in-service date.
16	have. Thank you, Your Honor.	16 Q. Okay. Do you recall the questions that
17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any	17 Mr. Callaghan asked you regarding when Cascade
18	redirect from Cascade?	18considered delaying or whether Cascade considered
19	MS. SCHOONOVER: Yes, just a few questions,	19 delaying the the ten discrete projects that were
20	Your Honor.	20 included in your rebuttal testimony?
21		21 A. Yes, I do.
22	EXAMINATION	22 Q. And you I believe you testified that the
23	BY MS. SCHOONOVER:	23 Company was considering whether projects could be
24	Q. Mr. Darras, do you recall when Mr. Callaghan was	delayed throughout both before your opening testimony
25	asking you about when you informed parties that certain	25 was filed and then throughout the case; is that is
	Page 156	Page 158
1	projects had been postponed?	1 that correct?
2	A. Yes, I do.	2 A. Yes, I believe I testified that we were
3	Q. Could you please turn back to Exhibit PCD-7X?	3 continually looking at all projects throughout the year.
4	A. Okay.	4 Q. Okay. So I think I just heard you say you were
5	Q. And this is the Data Request 89 that was	5 looking at all projects, would that include looking at
6	provided in August or September; is that correct?	6 the ten discrete projects that the Company decided to
7	A. Yes, it is.	7 move forward with and included in its rebuttal
8	Q. Could you please read us the actual in-service	8 testimony?
9	dates for the Aberdeen and Richland Keene Road Projects	9 A. Yes, it would.
10	that are provided in this data response?	10 Q. Okay. And I also wanted to ask you about the
11	A. Which projects?	11 blanket projects. Do you recall the questions about
11 12	Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high	12 whether those are unplanned?
12 13	Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.	<ul><li>12 whether those are unplanned?</li><li>13 A. Yes, I do.</li></ul>
12 13 14	<ul><li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li><li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual</li></ul>	<ol> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> </ol>
12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is, are the specific projects that you're completing</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is, are the specific projects that you're completing unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. 2021, yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> <li>are the specific projects that you're completing</li> <li>unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> <li>have blanket projects at all unplanned; does that make</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. 2021, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> <li>are the specific projects that you're completing</li> <li>unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> <li>have blanket projects at all unplanned; does that make</li> <li>sense?</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. 2021, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And then the Richland Keene Road Project, which</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> <li>are the specific projects that you're completing</li> <li>unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> <li>have blanket projects at all unplanned; does that make</li> <li>sense?</li> <li>A. Yes, I think so. I if the the fact that</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. 2021, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. And then the Richland Keene Road Project, which is the very next line, what is the actual in-service</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> <li>are the specific projects that you're completing</li> <li>unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> <li>have blanket projects at all unplanned; does that make</li> <li>sense?</li> <li>A. Yes, I think so. I if the the fact that</li> <li>we're considering our are there going to be unplanned</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. 2021, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And then the Richland Keene Road Project, which is the very next line, what is the actual in-service date there?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> <li>are the specific projects that you're completing</li> <li>unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> <li>have blanket projects at all unplanned; does that make</li> <li>sense?</li> <li>A. Yes, I think so. I if the the fact that</li> <li>we're considering our are there going to be unplanned</li> <li>blanket projects, yes, there are. Historically we've</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. 2021, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And then the Richland Keene Road Project, which is the very next line, what is the actual in-service date there?</li> <li>A. July 30th of 2021.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> <li>are the specific projects that you're completing</li> <li>unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> <li>have blanket projects at all unplanned; does that make</li> <li>sense?</li> <li>A. Yes, I think so. I if the the fact that</li> <li>we're considering our are there going to be unplanned</li> <li>blanket projects, yes, there are. Historically we've</li> <li>seen that, we've shown that. I pointed that out the</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. 2021, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And then the Richland Keene Road Project, which is the very next line, what is the actual in-service date there?</li> <li>A. July 30th of 2021.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could we also turn to Exhibit PCD-8X,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> <li>are the specific projects that you're completing</li> <li>unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> <li>have blanket projects at all unplanned; does that make</li> <li>sense?</li> <li>A. Yes, I think so. I if the the fact that</li> <li>we're considering our are there going to be unplanned</li> <li>blanket projects, yes, there are. Historically we've</li> <li>seen that, we've shown that. I pointed that out the</li> <li>last five years the significant dollars that we've</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. 2021, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And then the Richland Keene Road Project, which is the very next line, what is the actual in-service date there?</li> <li>A. July 30th of 2021.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could we also turn to Exhibit PCD-8X, please.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>12 whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>13 A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>14 Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> <li>15 are the specific projects that you're completing</li> <li>16 unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> <li>17 have blanket projects at all unplanned; does that make</li> <li>18 sense?</li> <li>19 A. Yes, I think so. I if the the fact that</li> <li>20 we're considering our are there going to be unplanned</li> <li>21 blanket projects, yes, there are. Historically we've</li> <li>22 seen that, we've shown that. I pointed that out the</li> <li>23 last five years the significant dollars that we've</li> <li>24 that the Company has spent on those those blanket</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Let's start with the Aberdeen 6-inch high pressure, which is section 5.</li> <li>A. Yes, that shows an in-service or an actual in-service date of 8/31/21.</li> <li>Q. Okay. 2021, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. 2021, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And then the Richland Keene Road Project, which is the very next line, what is the actual in-service date there?</li> <li>A. July 30th of 2021.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could we also turn to Exhibit PCD-8X,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>whether those are unplanned?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. And when you is it I guess my question is,</li> <li>are the specific projects that you're completing</li> <li>unplanned or are you is the fact that you're going to</li> <li>have blanket projects at all unplanned; does that make</li> <li>sense?</li> <li>A. Yes, I think so. I if the the fact that</li> <li>we're considering our are there going to be unplanned</li> <li>blanket projects, yes, there are. Historically we've</li> <li>seen that, we've shown that. I pointed that out the</li> <li>last five years the significant dollars that we've</li> </ul>

33 (Pages 155 to 158)

	Page 159	Page 161
1	20 million per year.	1 EXAMINATION
2	So is it significant, yes, it is. Are they	2 BY MS. BAIRD:
3	unplanned from an engineering perspective, I would say,	3 Q. Could you please state and spell your name for
4	yes, they are. Are they unplanned from a cost	4 the record?
5	perspective, no. We anticipate and history has shown us	5 A. My name is James Kaiser. That's K-a-i-s-e-r.
6	those will happen every year.	6 Q. Thank you, Mr. Kaiser.
7	Q. Okay.	7 How are you employed?
8	MS. SCHOONOVER: Thank you, Mr. Darras.	8 A. I'm employed by Cascade Natural Gas as the
9	That's all I have.	<sup>9</sup> director of human resources.
10	JUDGE HOWARD: I believe Public Counsel also	10 Q. And in that capacity, have you prepared
11	indicated cross for this witness, Ms. Gafken?	11 testimony and exhibits in this proceeding?
12	MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. We did indicated	12 A. I have.
13	cross for this witness, but we're we're going to	13 Q. And are those items labeled JEK-1CT through
14	waive cross today.	14 JEK-5C?
15	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Do we have any	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. And do you have any changes or corrections to</li> </ul>
16 17	questions from the bench for Mr. Darras? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I do not.	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any changes or corrections to</li> <li>your prefiled testimony?</li> </ul>
18		17 your premed testimony? 18 A. I do not.
19	JUDGE HOWARD: Hearing none, Mr. Darras, thank you for your testimony. You are excused.	10A. Fuo hol.19Q. If I ask the same questions today set out in
20	Our next witness would be James Kaiser for	20 your prefiled testimony, would your answers be the same?
21	Cascade, but I think right now might be a good time to	21 A. Yes.
22	take a 45-minute lunch break before we start the next	22 MS. BAIRD: This witness is available for
23	witness. Does that sound amenable to the Commissioners?	23 cross-examination.
24	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we would start	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Gafken, you may proceed.
25	up again at 1:00.	25 MS. GAFKEN: Thank you.
	Page 160	Page 162
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, yes. So we will take a	
2	45-minute lunch break and we will be off the record and returning at 1:00 p.m. We are off the record. Thank	2 BY MS. GAFKEN:
3 4	returning at 1.00 p.m. we are on the record. Thank	2 O Cood offernoon Mr. Keiser My neme is Lies
		3 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Kaiser. My name is Lisa 4 Gafken and Lam the attorney for Public Counsel today
5	you all.	4 Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.
5 6	you all. (A luncheon break was taken	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> </ul>
6	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.)	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> </ul>
	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> </ul>
6 7	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade.	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> </ul>
6 7 8	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade.	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right?	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly?	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would Cascade please introduce the witness?	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> <li>increase and lowered its 2021 and 2020 nonunion wage</li> <li>increases, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would Cascade please introduce the witness? MS. BAIRD: Yes, Your Honor. I am Shoshana	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> <li>increase and lowered its 2021 and 2020 nonunion wage</li> <li>increases, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. On page 2, lines 21 to 22, you state that</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would Cascade please introduce the witness? MS. BAIRD: Yes, Your Honor. I am Shoshana Baird. I am appearing here on behalf of Cascade.	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> <li>increase and lowered its 2021 and 2020 nonunion wage</li> <li>increases, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. On page 2, lines 21 to 22, you state that</li> <li>Cascade reduced 2020 wage increases from 4 point</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would Cascade please introduce the witness? MS. BAIRD: Yes, Your Honor. I am Shoshana Baird. I am appearing here on behalf of Cascade. Good morning, Mr. Kaiser. And am I correct	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> <li>increase and lowered its 2021 and 2020 nonunion wage</li> <li>increases, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. On page 2, lines 21 to 22, you state that</li> <li>Cascade reduced 2020 wage increases from 4 point</li> <li>sorry, 4 percent to 3.55 percent, correct?</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would Cascade please introduce the witness? MS. BAIRD: Yes, Your Honor. I am Shoshana Baird. I am appearing here on behalf of Cascade. Good morning, Mr. Kaiser. And am I correct to think you can hear and see me okay?	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> <li>increase and lowered its 2021 and 2020 nonunion wage</li> <li>increases, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. On page 2, lines 21 to 22, you state that</li> <li>Cascade reduced 2020 wage increases from 4 point</li> <li>sorry, 4 percent to 3.55 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would Cascade please introduce the witness? MS. BAIRD: Yes, Your Honor. I am Shoshana Baird. I am appearing here on behalf of Cascade. Good morning, Mr. Kaiser. And am I correct to think you can hear and see me okay? MR. KAISER: I can, thank you.	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> <li>increase and lowered its 2021 and 2020 nonunion wage</li> <li>increases, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. On page 2, lines 21 to 22, you state that</li> <li>Cascade reduced 2020 wage increases from 4 point</li> <li>sorry, 4 percent to 3.55 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that's that's for nonunion wages,</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would Cascade please introduce the witness? MS. BAIRD: Yes, Your Honor. I am Shoshana Baird. I am appearing here on behalf of Cascade. Good morning, Mr. Kaiser. And am I correct to think you can hear and see me okay? MR. KAISER: I can, thank you. MS. BAIRD: Great.	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> <li>increase and lowered its 2021 and 2020 nonunion wage</li> <li>increases, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. On page 2, lines 21 to 22, you state that</li> <li>Cascade reduced 2020 wage increases from 4 point</li> <li>sorry, 4 percent to 3.55 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that's that's for nonunion wages,</li> <li>correct?</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would Cascade please introduce the witness? MS. BAIRD: Yes, Your Honor. I am Shoshana Baird. I am appearing here on behalf of Cascade. Good morning, Mr. Kaiser. And am I correct to think you can hear and see me okay? MR. KAISER: I can, thank you. MS. BAIRD: Great.	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> <li>increase and lowered its 2021 and 2020 nonunion wage</li> <li>increases, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. On page 2, lines 21 to 22, you state that</li> <li>Cascade reduced 2020 wage increases from 4 point</li> <li>sorry, 4 percent to 3.55 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that's that's for nonunion wages,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that is for nonunion.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you all. (A luncheon break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Our next witness is James Kaiser for Cascade. Mr. Kaiser, I see you have your camera on, can you hear me all right? MR. KAISER: I can. Am I coming through clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Please raise your right hand and I will swear you in. (James Kaiser sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would Cascade please introduce the witness? MS. BAIRD: Yes, Your Honor. I am Shoshana Baird. I am appearing here on behalf of Cascade. Good morning, Mr. Kaiser. And am I correct to think you can hear and see me okay? MR. KAISER: I can, thank you. MS. BAIRD: Great.	<ul> <li>Gafken, and I am the attorney for Public Counsel today.</li> <li>If you would please turn to your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, which is JEK-1CT and go to page 2. Let me</li> <li>know when you're there.</li> <li>A. I am there.</li> <li>Q. Starting at line 15 and continuing onto page 3,</li> <li>you explain reductions Cascade made to its revenue</li> <li>requirement request with regard to union and nonunion</li> <li>employee wages, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Cascade has eliminated the 2021 union wage</li> <li>increase and lowered its 2021 and 2020 nonunion wage</li> <li>increases, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. On page 2, lines 21 to 22, you state that</li> <li>Cascade reduced 2020 wage increases from 4 point</li> <li>sorry, 4 percent to 3.55 percent, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that's that's for nonunion wages,</li> <li>correct?</li> </ul>

34 (Pages 159 to 162)

	Page 163	Page 165
1	Cascade reduced its 2021 nonunion wage increase from 3.5	1 A. I am there.
2	to 3.0 percent, correct?	2 Q. So Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X is Cascade's
3	A. The 2021 budget, yes, that's correct.	3 supplemental response to Public Counsel Data Request
4	Q. For 2020 union wages, Cascade negotiated a 3	4 No. 79, correct?
5	percent wage increase, correct?	5 A. That is correct.
6	A. Would you restate the question? Sorry.	6 Q. Please turn to page 1 of the exhibit. In the
7	Q. Of course.	7 original response the prose that's set out under
8	For so focusing on 2020 union wages, Cascade	8 response, the Company states the board of directors does
9	negotiated a 3 percent wage increase, correct?	9 not approve nonunion salary increases, correct?
10	A. That is correct. That was effective April 1.	10 A. Yes, nonunion salary increases are are
11	Q. Would you characterize the negotiated wage	11 approved by the the managing committee, essentially
12	increase such as the 2020 union wages to reflect the	12 vice president of the human resources, and the the
13	market rate for wages?	13 president of Cascade.
14	A. I would.	14 Q. And those decisions result in a a merit
15	Q. What classification of workers receive union	15 increase guideline being issued by human resources; is
16	wages?	16 that correct?
17	A. The majority of our positions that are part of	17 A. That is correct.
18	the Collective Bargaining Agreement would be our our	18 Q. Could you please turn to oh, I'm sorry. I
19	technical and and craft positions working in the	19 don't mean to cut you off.
20	field.	20 A. That's okay. It's all right. Proceed, please.
21	Q. And what classification of workers receive	21 Q. Okay. If you could turn to page 2 of
22	nonunion wages?	22 Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.
23	A. The group of nonunion employees would be your	A. I'm there.
24	nonexempt clerical-typetype positions, your	24 Q. Okay. For 2019, the merit increase guidelines
25	professional positions such as engineers, your	25 state that the overall budget for pay increases is 4
	Page 164	Page 166
1	management positions, and and directors.	1 percent, correct?
2	Q. During 2020, did did Cascade furlough any	2 A. The overall budget is 4 percent for 2019, yes.
3	workers?	3 Q. Okay. And then of that 4 percent, the managers
4		4 were allocated 2 mercant to work with correct?
F	A. No, we did not.	4 were allocated 3 percent to work with, correct?
5	Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?	5 A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.
б	<ul><li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li><li>A. We we</li></ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> </ul>
6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> </ul>
б	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you</li> <li>please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the question and, of course, in a virtual setting, it's hard</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li><b>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</b></li> <li>I don't have to break up those those steps. So I</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</li> <li>I don't have to break up those those steps. So I</li> <li>think you answered both two questions at once, so</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the question and, of course, in a virtual setting, it's hard to tell sometimes, but please direct any objections to me.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</li> <li>I don't have to break up those those steps. So I</li> <li>think you answered both two questions at once, so</li> <li>thank you for providing that that explanation.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the question and, of course, in a virtual setting, it's hard to tell sometimes, but please direct any objections to me.</li> <li>A. Thank you. We did not furlough any employees</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</li> <li>I don't have to break up those those steps. So I</li> <li>think you answered both two questions at once, so</li> <li>thank you for providing that that explanation.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the question and, of course, in a virtual setting, it's hard to tell sometimes, but please direct any objections to me.</li> <li>A. Thank you. We did not furlough any employees if in the in the terms of a reduction in force.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</li> <li>I don't have to break up those those steps. So I</li> <li>think you answered both two questions at once, so</li> <li>thank you for providing that that explanation.</li> <li>Let's see, let's go ahead and turn to page 5 of</li> <li>Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the question and, of course, in a virtual setting, it's hard to tell sometimes, but please direct any objections to me.</li> <li>A. Thank you. We did not furlough any employees if in the in the terms of a reduction in force. We did take other measures to delay filling some</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</li> <li>I don't have to break up those those steps. So I</li> <li>think you answered both two questions at once, so</li> <li>thank you for providing that that explanation.</li> <li>Let's see, let's go ahead and turn to page 5 of</li> <li>Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the question and, of course, in a virtual setting, it's hard to tell sometimes, but please direct any objections to me.</li> <li>A. Thank you. We did not furlough any employees if in the in the terms of a reduction in force.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</li> <li>I don't have to break up those those steps. So I</li> <li>think you answered both two questions at once, so</li> <li>thank you for providing that that explanation.</li> <li>Let's see, let's go ahead and turn to page 5 of</li> <li>Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. Okay. I am there.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the question and, of course, in a virtual setting, it's hard to tell sometimes, but please direct any objections to me.</li> <li>A. Thank you. We did not furlough any employees if in the in the terms of a reduction in force. We did take other measures to delay filling some positions or or or hold off and in that arena.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</li> <li>I don't have to break up those those steps. So I</li> <li>think you answered both two questions at once, so</li> <li>thank you for providing that that explanation.</li> <li>Let's see, let's go ahead and turn to page 5 of</li> <li>Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. Okay. I am there.</li> <li>Q. And that page begins with 2020 merit increase</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Did Cascade consider furloughing?</li> <li>A. We we MS. BAIRD: Objection. Ms. Gafken, can you please point to where in Mr. Kaiser's testimony you're referencing for your questions? MS. GAFKEN: So I do not have a citation for the concept of furloughing, but I am asking about the wage cost in general and factors that may go into that. MS. BAIRD: Okay. Your Honor, I believe you are muted if you are speaking. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I'll allow the question and, of course, in a virtual setting, it's hard to tell sometimes, but please direct any objections to me.</li> <li>A. Thank you. We did not furlough any employees if in the in the terms of a reduction in force. We did take other measures to delay filling some positions or or or hold off and in that arena. BY MS. GAFKEN:</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. You need to read further in in that exhibit.</li> <li>It does state managers will be given 3 percent of the</li> <li>budget to work with, HR will retain a half a percent to</li> <li>work with the vice presidents and address other</li> <li>compensation issues. Some organizations maintain two</li> <li>budgets; one is more the what I would call the merit</li> <li>budget, and then we have a separate promotional budget.</li> <li>We roll all that together and that guidance comes out</li> <li>once a year, and for 2019, that guidance was a total</li> <li>budget of 4 4 percent.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You anticipated my questions, and so</li> <li>I don't have to break up those those steps. So I</li> <li>think you answered both two questions at once, so</li> <li>thank you for providing that that explanation.</li> <li>Let's see, let's go ahead and turn to page 5 of</li> <li>Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. Okay. I am there.</li> <li>Q. And that page begins with 2020 merit increase</li> <li>guidelines, correct?</li> </ul>

35 (Pages 163 to 166)

	Page 167		Page 169
1	year, for the year 2020. So the overall budget for pay	1	that paragraph, an additional .5 percent has been
2	increases was 4 percent, correct?	2	reserved for a possible midyear review focused on
3	A. Yes, the overall budget was 4 percent. That's	3	affirmative action items, equity concerns, and
4	an all-inclusive budget that incorporates the salary	4	compression issues. So it's the same guidance, the
5	increase that we implement at the beginning of the	5	wording is slightly different than prior years, but
б	calendar year, and then there are dollars that are	6	Q. Right.
7	reserved for promotions as organization changes take	7	A and you will note that it is a reduced budget
8	place. We typically have a midyear review, and so there	8	from the prior two years.
9	are dollars received for that midyear review as well.	9	Q. Yeah, and that first sentence it starts with the
10	So the budget is 4 percent, but it's typically not spent	10	bolded language there, it says, (as read) Managers are
11	at the beginning of the year.	11	being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for
12	Q. And 3 percent of that 4 percent budget was the	12	annual salary increases, correct?
13	kind of the beginning of the year pay increases; is that	13	A. It is it is the same approach that we've
14	correct?	14	taken in the prior years. In prior years, it's it
15	A. No, 3 percent is is guidance as a starting	15	has it has it has stated that we have a 4 percent
16	place for the officers that they're encouraged because	16	budget to work with, this year the wording was slightly
17	each of the officer's departments vary in size, and if	17	different. I qualify that in that
18	you have a large department, it's much easier to stay	18	MS. GAFKEN: May I ask may I ask that the
19	within that 3 percent budget. If you have a smaller	19	witness be instructed to answer the question. I don't
20	department, it's harder to stay within that budget.	20	mean to be difficult, but I asked him to confirm the
21	So overall, we say try to stick within 3	21	language, and that's really all that my question was.
22	percent. Later in that memo, I believe it's in the	22	JUDGE HOWARD: I will I will agree with
23	second paragraph or third paragraph, I'd have to locate	23	that instruction. If you could focus on the specific
24	it for sure here, but it's let me pause and I'll find	24	question.
25	it. It's in the in the last sentence of the third	25	A. Would you repeat the question, please?
	Page 168		Page 170
1			
	paragraph, (as read) Any increase causing you to go over	1	BY MS. GAFKEN:
2	budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note	1 2	Q. Of course.
2 3	budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go		Q. Of course. Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021
3 4	budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.	2 3 4	Q. Of course. Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)
3 4 5	<ul><li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li><li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	Q. Of course. Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3
3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	Q. Of course. Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;
3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. Of course. Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for annual salary increases; is that correct?
3 4 5 7 8	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on managers.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> <li>managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> <li>managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> <li>managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to</li> <li>page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> <li>managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to</li> <li>page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Of course. Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Of course. Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> <li>managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to</li> <li>page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's</li> <li>incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the</li> <li>opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit, we now we're looking at 2021, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> <li>managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to</li> <li>page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's</li> <li>incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the</li> <li>opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the</li> <li>market average in a typical year, correct?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit, we now we're looking at 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, this would be the the guidance for 2021.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the market average in a typical year, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit, we now we're looking at 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, this would be the the guidance for 2021.</li> <li>Q. And the guidance, again, looking at page 8 of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> <li>managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to</li> <li>page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's</li> <li>incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the</li> <li>opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the</li> <li>market average in a typical year, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Please turn to page 18 and go to lines 20 to</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit, we now we're looking at 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, this would be the the guidance for 2021.</li> <li>Q. And the guidance, again, looking at page 8 of the exhibit, the guidance asked the manager or I'm</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the market average in a typical year, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Please turn to page 18 and go to lines 20 to twenty 20 to 21.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit, we now we're looking at 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, this would be the the guidance for 2021.</li> <li>Q. And the guidance asked the manager or I'm sorry, let me start that question again.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> <li>managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to</li> <li>page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's</li> <li>incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the</li> <li>opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the</li> <li>market average in a typical year, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Please turn to page 18 and go to lines 20 to</li> <li>twenty 20 to 21.</li> <li>A. Would you repeat that page, please?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit, we now we're looking at 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, this would be the the guidance for 2021.</li> <li>Q. And the guidance asked the manager or I'm sorry, let me start that question again.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the market average in a typical year, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Please turn to page 18 and go to lines 20 to twenty 20 to 21.</li> <li>A. Would you repeat that page, please?</li> <li>Q. 18.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit, we now we're looking at 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, this would be the the guidance for 2021.</li> <li>Q. And the guidance asked the manager or I'm sorry, let me start that question again.</li> <li>The guidance allocated 3 percent to the managers for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the market average in a typical year, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Please turn to page 18 and go to lines 20 to twenty 20 to 21.</li> <li>A. Would you repeat that page, please?</li> <li>Q. 18.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit, we now we're looking at 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, this would be the the guidance for 2021.</li> <li>Q. And the guidance, again, looking at page 8 of the exhibit, the guidance asked the manager or I'm sorry, let me start that question again.</li> <li>The guidance allocated 3 percent to the managers for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> <li>A. The guidance document paragraph 2 provides a 3</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021</li> <li>merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read)</li> <li>Managers are provided are being provided with a 3</li> <li>percent budget to work from for annual salary increases;</li> <li>is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on</li> <li>managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to</li> <li>page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's</li> <li>incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the</li> <li>opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the</li> <li>market average in a typical year, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Please turn to page 18 and go to lines 20 to</li> <li>twenty 20 to 21.</li> <li>A. Would you repeat that page, please?</li> <li>Q. 18.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So on page 18, lines 20 to 21, you</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>budget must be justified on the spreadsheet in the note section. So there are there are mechanisms to go beyond the 3 percent.</li> <li>Q. But the guidance asked managers to try to stay within that 3 percent range, right?</li> <li>A. The guidance asked managers to start at at the 3 percent, but it you have to go on and read in paragraph 2 the remaining 1 percent will be used to address compression, equity issues, affirmative action items, and promotions as well as the 2020 midyear review.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Could you please turn to page 8 of Cross-Exhibit JEK-6X.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So beginning on page 8 of the exhibit, we now we're looking at 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, this would be the the guidance for 2021.</li> <li>Q. And the guidance asked the manager or I'm sorry, let me start that question again.</li> <li>The guidance allocated 3 percent to the managers for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Of course.</li> <li>Looking at the second paragraph of the 2021 merit increase guidelines, the sentence reads, (as read) Managers are provided are being provided with a 3 percent budget to work from for annual salary increases; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is correct with the emphasis on managers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. Let's please turn to your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit JEK-1CT and go to page 4, lines 15 I'm sorry, lines 9 to 15.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Okay. There you testify that Cascade's incentive plan provides nonunion employees with the opportunity to receive total cash compensation at the market average in a typical year, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Please turn to page 18 and go to lines 20 to twenty 20 to 21.</li> <li>A. Would you repeat that page, please?</li> <li>Q. 18.</li> <li>A. I'm there.</li> </ul>

36 (Pages 167 to 170)

	Page 171		Page 173
1	was approximately 1.7 million, correct?	1	three-year rolling average.
2	A. Yes.	2	A. Sure.
3	Q. And that that test year incentive	3	Q. What three-year period would you suggest be used
4	compensation is higher than Cascade's five-year average	4	under your alternative proposal? Would 2016 to 2018 be
5	between 2014 and 2018; is that correct?	5	appropriate to compare to the test year of 2019?
6	A. I have not done personally that that	6	A. It it would be the the test year and the
7	calculation between the five-year average. We did meet	7	previous two years.
8	many of our we had a good year in meeting our goals	8	Q. Okay. So your your proposal would be to
9	in in 2019, so it was a it was a successful year	9	include the test year in the three-year average?
10	for payout under this plan.	10	A. Yes, again, that's that's a reflection of
11	Q. Okay. Could you turn to page 19 of JEK-1CT?	11	what our costs were as an organization. That's a more
12	A. Yes.	12	accurate picture of the near term for ratemaking
13	Q. And lines 5 to 11 it shows that the five-year	13	purposes.
14	average was approximately 1.1 million, correct?	14	Q. Have you calculated the three-year average under
15	A. Yes, that is that is correct, based on Public	15	your alternative proposal?
16	Counsel's proposal.	16	A. As I recall, that that number was right
17	Q. Okay. Could you turn while staying on page 19,	17	around 1.4 million, and that has been provided in other
18	and go to lines 20 to 21.	18	testimony.
19	A. I'm there.	19	Q. My next question really just asks about the
20	Q. In that portion of your testimony, you offer an	20	math.
21	alternative proposal of using a three-year rolling	21	If you use three years versus five years to
22	average if the Commission wishes to normalize incentive	22	calculate the average, you're using approximately 40
23	compensation, correct?	23	percent less data points to calculate that average,
24	A. Yes.	24	correct?
25	Q. And actually, let me ask a follow-up question to	25	A. I I I'm sorry, because you're tying in the
		1	
	Page 172		Page 174
1	something that you said earlier.	1	metrics, would you explain further what you're
2	something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly	2	metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?
2 3	something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there	2 3	metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points? Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm
2 3 4	something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.	2 3 4	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're</li> <li>referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm</li> <li>actually just asking about the difference between using</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program. Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a	2 3 4 5	metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points? Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth
2 3 4 5 6	something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program. Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?	2 3 4 5 6	metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points? Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of worth of data. That's about a 40 percent
2 3 4 5 6 7	something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program. Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year? A. If you look over time, it I would say	2 3 4 5 6 7	metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points? Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program. Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year? A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points? Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage</li> </ul>
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier. You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. It does fluctuate based on the on the goals</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. It does fluctuate based on the on the goals achieved. If I may say, our our incentive</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from Cascade?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. It does fluctuate based on the on the goals achieved. If I may say, our our incentive compensation targets, I mean, we are establishing those</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from Cascade?</li> <li>MS. BAIRD: Just a couple questions, Your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. It does fluctuate based on the on the goals achieved. If I may say, our our incentive compensation targets, I mean, we are establishing those incentive plan targets to be competitive with the labor</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from Cascade?</li> <li>MS. BAIRD: Just a couple questions, Your Honor.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. It does fluctuate based on the on the goals achieved. If I may say, our our incentive compensation targets, I mean, we are establishing those incentive plan targets to be competitive with the labor market. And you you you may have seen in our</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from Cascade?</li> <li>MS. BAIRD: Just a couple questions, Your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. It does fluctuate based on the on the goals achieved. If I may say, our our incentive compensation targets, I mean, we are establishing those incentive plan targets to be competitive with the labor market. And you you you may have seen in our compensation study that was also provided as an exhibit</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from Cascade?</li> <li>MS. BAIRD: Just a couple questions, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. It does fluctuate based on the on the goals achieved. If I may say, our our incentive compensation targets, I mean, we are establishing those incentive plan targets to be competitive with the labor market. And you you you may have seen in our compensation study that was also provided as an exhibit that we are conservative with our incentive compensation</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from Cascade?</li> <li>MS. BAIRD: Just a couple questions, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. It does fluctuate based on the on the goals achieved. If I may say, our our incentive compensation targets, I mean, we are establishing those incentive plan targets to be competitive with the labor market. And you you you may have seen in our compensation study that was also provided as an exhibit that we are conservative with our incentive compensation targets, and that was offered as an exhibit.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from Cascade?</li> <li>MS. BAIRD: Just a couple questions, Your Honor.</li> <li>E X A M I N A T I O N</li> <li>BY MS. BAIRD:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>something that you said earlier.</li> <li>You said in 2019, the Company was fairly successful in meeting targets and whatnot, and so there was quite a bit paid out of the incentive program.</li> <li>Would you say that it was a typical typical year or a better than average year?</li> <li>A. If you look over time, it it I would say it was a good year. We met many of our we met the majority of our goals and and those are all goals that are are the the logistics of the plan, the metrics and how the calculation and how things are paid do tie back to metrics that benefit our customer.</li> <li>Q. And the amount that Cascade pays out through its incentive compensation plan fluctuates from year to year, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. It does fluctuate based on the on the goals achieved. If I may say, our our incentive compensation targets, I mean, we are establishing those incentive plan targets to be competitive with the labor market. And you you you may have seen in our compensation study that was also provided as an exhibit that we are conservative with our incentive compensation</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>metrics, would you explain further what you're referencing there with the data points?</li> <li>Q. I'm actually not tying in the metrics. I'm actually just asking about the difference between using five years' worth of data verus using three years' worth of - worth of data. That's about a 40 percent reduction of the data that goes into the calculation; isn't that right?</li> <li>A. There is there is a reduction in a percentage of the data. But, again, the most I would testify that the most recent three years is a more accurate reflection of what our costs are for Cascade.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: I have no further questions for this witness.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from Cascade?</li> <li>MS. BAIRD: Just a couple questions, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.</li> </ul>

37 (Pages 171 to 174)

	Page 175		Page 177
1	and specifically on page 8 of that exhibit. Could you	1	for nonunion wage increases?
2	take a look at that for me, please?	2	A. We compare in different we have different
3	A. Yes, I'm there.	3	comparative groups that we look at. So it's going to
4	Q. And specifically I believe Ms. Gafken asked you	4	vary from year to year. At the time, those those
5	some questions about the bolded language that says, (as	5	those union contracts are preestablished, so we were in
6	read) Managers are being provided with a 3 percent	6	the midst of a three-year contract, and that was that
7	budget, and I I think you had begun a process of	7	was reasonable at that that time period. And so
8	providing some more explanation there, and I was	8	there is a difference in the surveys that we do for the
9	wondering if you could complete that explanation for me.	9	two groups.
10	I can jog your memory further if you do not recall.	10	Q. Okay.
11	A. Certainly. The the approach taken the	11	MS. BAIRD: Thank you, Mr. Kaiser. I have
12	language is slightly different, but the approach taken	12	no further questions.
13	in with the salary review guidance document that was	13	JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from
14	issued to the officers was very similar to past years.	14	the bench for Mr. Kaiser?
15	It identified the 3 percent budget that they had to work	15	Hearing none
16	with. If you go on into the memo, it does talk about	16	CHAIR DANNER: I have
17	any costs requiring you go over that budget or are	17	JUDGE HOWARD: Oh.
18	are possible.	18	CHAIR DANNER: I said I have none.
19	But but the other thing is that that we	19	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Chair Danner.
20	did pull back our our salary budget in 2021 from what	20	Sorry, I spoke over you a little bit.
21	we had historically done in in prior years by	21	Hearing no questions, Mr. Kaiser, thank you
22	one-half percent. And keeping in mind, I'm going to go	22	for your testimony. You are excused.
23	back to the pro minor [phonetic] compensation study,	23	MR. KAISER: Thank you.
24	if if you look at that study, it talks about our	24	JUDGE HOWARD: No party has indicated
25	conservative compensation, approaches to compensation,	25	cross-examination for the next four witnesses from
	Page 176		Page 178
1	and and the really the the median of our salary	1	Cascade. These are Maryalice Gresham, Isaac Myhrum,
2	ranges are somewhat behind others in the utility	2	Brian Robertson, or Pamela Archer. Are there any
3	industry because of of general industry benchmarking	3	questions from the bench for either Gresham, Myhrum,
4	that we do. And then also it did state that in the	4	Robertson, or Archer at this time?
5	incentive compensation as well, which I am going beyond	5	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have none.
6	your question, so I am going to stop there.	6	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hearing none, the last
7	Q. And I believe in your response I believe in	7	witness for Cascade is Michael Parvinen.
8	your response to Ms. Gafken, you had emphasized that	8	Mr. Parvinen, are you on the line?
9	that 3 percent in the bold language was specifically for	9	MR. PARVINEN: I am. Can you hear and see
10	managers, were you was that distinction focused on	10	me okay?
11	managers versus the Company or would you say that the	11	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Yes, thank you. Please
12	budget for the Company is different from what's in that	12	raise your right hand and I will swear you in.
13	bolded language?	13	(Michael Parvinen sworn.)
14	A. The budget for the Company is the the 3.5	14	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
15	percent. We want our managers to start out in in a	15	Cascade, you may introduce the witness.
16	more conservative approach. But there is the	16	MS. PEASE: Thank you. For the record, this
17	opportunity as long as we stay under that overall budget	17	is Jocelyn Pease with McDowell Rackner Gibson for
18	they they can go beyond the 3 percent.	18	Cascade.
19	Q. Okay. And I had one other question for you	19	
20	because early on you had gotten a couple of questions	20	EXAMINATION
21	about the union rate and the market rate for for	21	BY MS. PEASE:
22	labor. Are you recalling that line of questions?	22	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen.
23	A. Yes, yes.	23	A. Good afternoon.
24	Q. And specifically, would you say that the union	24 25	Q. Could you please state your full name and spell it for the record?
05			
25	rate for wage increases is the same as the market rate	25	

38 (Pages 175 to 178)

	Page 179	Page 181
1	A. Yes, Michael Parvinen, P-a-r-v, as in Victor,	1 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Pease.
2	i-n-e-n.	2 Let me know, Mr. Parvinen or Ms. Pease, if I continue to
3	Q. And, Mr. Parvinen, how are you employed?	3 break up.
4	A. I'm employed as the director of regulatory	4 BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
5	affairs for Cascade Natural Gas.	5 Q. Can you hear me okay?
6	Q. In that capacity, have you prepared testimony	6 A. Yes.
7	and exhibits in this proceeding?	7 Q. Okay. Mr. Parvinen, what was the rate effective
8	A. Yes, I have.	8 date of Cascade's last rate increase?
9	Q. And are those exhibits and testimony your direct	9 A. March 1st, 2020.
10	and rebuttal testimony MPP-1T and MPP-2T as well as	<b>Q.</b> And the Company reached a settlement agreement
11	Exhibits MPP-3 through MPP-6?	11 with the other parties in the last general rate case,
12	A. Yes.	12 correct?
13	Q. And do you have any corrections or changes to	13A. That's correct.
14	your prefiled testimony?	14 <b>Q.</b> And did the settlement agreement in that case
15	A. I do have two small corrections to make.	15 include a \$6.5 million increase to Cascade's overall
16	Q. Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Parvinen.	16 revenue requirement?
17	A. Okay. The first correction is on page 7 of my	17 A. Yes.
18 19	direct testimony, line 10, the first word on that line should have a space between the R and the A, so it	18 <b>Q.</b> And that agreement was filed jointly with the
20	should read "for a proposed."	19 Commission in September of 2019; is that accurate?
20	The second correction is in my rebuttal	<ul> <li>A. I don't recall the specific date the settlement</li> <li>was submitted, but that sounds right, so I would agree</li> </ul>
22	testimony on page 33, in footnote 92, the second line	21 was submitted, but that sounds right, so I would agree 22 to that.
23	where it where it shows Docket 190755, that should	23 Q. Okay. And did the Commission approve that
24	read 190775. And those are all my corrections.	24 settlement on February 3rd of 2020?
25	Q. Thank you.	25 A. Yes.
	-	
	Page 180	Daga 192
	idge 100	Page 182
1	And apart from those corrections, if I were to	1   Q. In the order approving the settlement, the
1 2		
	And apart from those corrections, if I were to	1 Q. In the order approving the settlement, the
2	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled	1Q. In the order approving the settlement, the2Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions
2 3	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you.	1Q. In the order approving the settlement, the2Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions3of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and4sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in5February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved
2 3 4 5 6	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would.	1Q. In the order approving the settlement, the2Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions3of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and4sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in5February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved6in that case were sufficient?
2 3 4 5 6 7	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination.	1Q. In the order approving the settlement, the2Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions3of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and4sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in5February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved6in that case were sufficient?7A. They were based on the information in status at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may	1Q. In the order approving the settlement, the2Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions3of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and4sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in5February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved6in that case were sufficient?7A. They were based on the information in status at8the time that the settlement was entered into and at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed.	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. EXAMINATION	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A MINATION BY MR. CALLAGHAN:	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right?	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right? A. I can, thank you.	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> <li>Company was actually under-earning in the three and a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right? A. I can, thank you. Q. All right. I'm going to refer you to	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> <li>Company was actually under-earning in the three and a</li> <li>half months since the last their last rate increase?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right? A. I can, thank you. Q. All right. I'm going to refer you to Cross-Exhibits MPP-7X through MPP-13X as well as your	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> <li>Company was actually under-earning in the three and a</li> <li>half months since the last their last rate increase?</li> <li>A. I believe we talked about it in testimony. I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right? A. I can, thank you. Q. All right. I'm going to refer you to	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> <li>Company was actually under-earning in the three and a</li> <li>half months since the last their last rate increase?</li> <li>A. I believe we talked about it in testimony. I</li> <li>can't remember I don't recall if we submitted any</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right? A. I can, thank you. Q. All right. I'm going to refer you to Cross-Exhibits MPP-7X through MPP-13X as well as your direct and rebuttal testimony, and do you have copies of	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> <li>Company was actually under-earning in the three and a</li> <li>half months since the last their last rate increase?</li> <li>A. I believe we talked about it in testimony. I</li> <li>can't remember I don't recall if we submitted any</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. EXAMINATION BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right? A. I can, thank you. Q. All right. I'm going to refer you to Cross-Exhibits MPP-7X through MPP-13X as well as your direct and rebuttal testimony, and do you have copies of those with you?	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> <li>Company was actually under-earning in the three and a</li> <li>half months since the last their last rate increase?</li> <li>A. I believe we talked about it in testimony. I</li> <li>can't remember I don't recall if we submitted any</li> <li>specific exhibits to that effect, but we certainly</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. EXAMINATION BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right? A. I can, thank you. Q. All right. I'm going to refer you to Cross-Exhibits MPP-7X through MPP-13X as well as your direct and rebuttal testimony, and do you have copies of those with you? A. I do.	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> <li>Company was actually under-earning in the three and a</li> <li>half months since the last their last rate increase?</li> <li>A. I believe we talked about it in testimony. I</li> <li>can't remember I don't recall if we submitted any</li> <li>specific exhibits to that effect, but we certainly</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right? A. I can, thank you. Q. All right. I'm going to refer you to Cross-Exhibits MPP-7X through MPP-13X as well as your direct and rebuttal testimony, and do you have copies of those with you? A. I do. Q. Okay.	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> <li>Company was actually under-earning in the three and a</li> <li>half months since the last their last rate increase?</li> <li>A. I believe we talked about it in testimony. I</li> <li>can't remember I don't recall if we submitted any</li> <li>specific exhibits to that effect, but we certainly</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And apart from those corrections, if I were to ask you the same questions set forth in your prefiled testimony today, would your answers be the same? A. They would. Q. Thank you. MS. PEASE: Thank you. This witness is available for cross-examination. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed. MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen. Can you hear me all right? A. I can, thank you. Q. All right. I'm going to refer you to Cross-Exhibits MPP-7X through MPP-13X as well as your direct and rebuttal testimony, and do you have copies of those with you? A. I do. Q. Okay. MS. PEASE: If I may If I may,	<ul> <li>Q. In the order approving the settlement, the</li> <li>Commission found that the rates, terms, and conditions</li> <li>of the settlement were fair, just, reasonable, and</li> <li>sufficient. At the time that the order was entered in</li> <li>February of 2020, do you agree that the rates approved</li> <li>in that case were sufficient?</li> <li>A. They were based on the information in status at</li> <li>the time that the settlement was entered into and at the</li> <li>time that order went into place, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. The initial filing in this docket was</li> <li>June 19th of 2020, about three and a half months after</li> <li>Cascade's last rate increase went into effect, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In the initial filing in this case, did Cascade</li> <li>submit any exhibits or testimony that demonstrated the</li> <li>Company was actually under-earning in the three and a</li> <li>half months since the last their last rate increase?</li> <li>A. I believe we talked about it in testimony. I</li> <li>can't remember I don't recall if we submitted any</li> <li>specific exhibits to that effect, but we certainly</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A identified in Ms. Kivisto's testimony and my</li> <li>testimony that that we were under-earning.</li> </ul>

39 (Pages 179 to 182)

	Page 183		Page 185
1	three months three and a half months between the rate	1	to the rate year, what are your results from a
2	increase and filing this case?	2	regulatory perspective, whether it's a restating or pro
3	A. Yes.	3	forma, typically don't matter; however, some of the
4	Q. Okay. Is there any testimony or exhibits in	4	adjustments that we showed as restating adjustments
5	Cascade's initial filing that reports Cascade's actual	5	could be considered pro formas.
6	revenues and actual expenses for the three months after	6	Let me give you an example or or explain that
7	it received the latest rate increase?	7	a little bit better.
8	A. Well, our initial testimony and results actually	8	Q. Mr. Parvinen, let me let me stop you there
9	showed the impact of the full full the impact of	9	just so I can get a follow-up question.
10	the rate case applied to our full test year in this rate	10	Using test year costs, did you calculate the
11	case, which was the 12 months ended December 31st, 2019,	11	rate of return that the new rates approved in March 2020
12	three months before the rates went into effect. But we	12	would produce with just restating adjustments, not the
13	did show the impacts of a full year of that rate	13	pro forma adjustments, and did Cascade provide a
14	increase.	14	calculation of that in this case?
15	Q. Okay. But my question was specifically whether	15	A. Directly, no. In Ms. Peters', Gresham's Exhibit
16	Cascade's initial filing included Cascade's actual	16	12, the restating adjustments are identified as R with a
17	revenues and actual expenses for the three months after	17	number and then the pro forma adjustments are identified
18	it received the latest increase, so March 2020, April,	18	as a P with a number.
19	and May 2020?	19	Q. Okay. Thank you.
20	A. No.	20	In your rebuttal testimony, you testify about
21	Q. Okay. In your rebuttal testimony, you claim	21	the Commission's recent used and useful policy statement
22	that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 percent rate of	22	published in Docket U-190531; is that correct?
23	return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase	23	A. Correct.
24	that went into effect in March 2020?	24	Q. Have you read the policy statement in its
25	MS. PEASE: Counsel, so I can follow, could	25	entirety?
	Page 184		Page 186
1	you provide that page reference?	1	A. I have, yes.
1 2	you provide that page reference? MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.	1 2	<ul><li>A. I have, yes.</li><li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was</li></ul>
			-
2	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.	2	Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was
2 3	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN:	2 3	Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW
2 3 4	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: <b>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this</b>	2 3 4	Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?
2 3 4 5	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9. A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9. A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question? Q. Yes. In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9. A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question? Q. Yes. In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9. A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question? Q. Yes. In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9. A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question? Q. Yes. In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9. A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question? Q. Yes. In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020? A. No, it does not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9. A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question? Q. Yes. In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020? A. No, it does not. Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9. A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question? Q. Yes. In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020? A. No, it does not. Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to those statutory amendments?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. I will say that many of those</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to those statutory amendments?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. I will say that many of those restating adjustments are from the definitions of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to those statutory amendments?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. In fact, doesn't the policy</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. I will say that many of those restating adjustments are from the definitions of restating and pro forma adjustments in in WAC or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to those statutory amendments?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. In fact, doesn't the policy statement indicate that for all pro forma adjustments,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. I will say that many of those restating adjustments are from the definitions of restating and pro forma adjustments in in WAC or in WAC, that the number of those adjustments could be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to those statutory amendments?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. In fact, doesn't the policy statement indicate that for all pro forma adjustments, both traditional or provisional, quote, the Commission's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. I will say that many of those restating adjustments are from the definitions of restating and pro forma adjustments in in WAC or in WAC, that the number of those adjustments could be construed as pro formas.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to those statutory amendments?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. In fact, doesn't the policy statement indicate that for all pro forma adjustments, both traditional or provisional, quote, the Commission's existing standards remain applicable?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. I will say that many of those restating adjustments are from the definitions of restating and pro forma adjustments in in WAC or in WAC, that the number of those adjustments could be construed as pro formas.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to those statutory amendments?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. In fact, doesn't the policy statement indicate that for all pro forma adjustments, both traditional or provisional, quote, the Commission's existing standards remain applicable?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. And I will note that there has</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. I will say that many of those restating adjustments are from the definitions of restating and pro forma adjustments in in WAC or in WAC, that the number of those adjustments could be construed as pro formas.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to those statutory amendments?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. In fact, doesn't the policy statement indicate that for all pro forma adjustments, both traditional or provisional, quote, the Commission's existing standards remain applicable?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. And I will note that there has been substantial changes and variations in in the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.</li> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, I guess you can turn to this too. This is Exhibit MPP-2T, page 7, lines 7 to 9.</li> <li>A. Yes, I'm there. So could you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>In your rebuttal testimony, you claim that Cascade is in fact earning a 5.56 rate percent rate of return. Does that 5.56 figure capture the rate increase that went into effect in March 2020?</li> <li>A. No, it does not.</li> <li>Q. Has Cascade presented a restated test year results of operations that takes into account the rate increase from the last GRC before accounting for the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. I will say that many of those restating adjustments are from the definitions of restating and pro forma adjustments in in WAC or in WAC, that the number of those adjustments could be construed as pro formas.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Does the policy statement indicate that it was issued in light of the statutory amendments made to RCW 80.04.250?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And could you turn to MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when you're there.</li> <li>A. What was that page number again, please?</li> <li>Q. Page 6.</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. I'm sorry, MPP-12X, my apologies.</li> <li>A. Very good. I thought I had my book labeled wrong. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. So did the Commission indicate in the policy statement that it was not going to revise its rules related to pro forma adjustments in response to those statutory amendments?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. In fact, doesn't the policy statement indicate that for all pro forma adjustments, both traditional or provisional, quote, the Commission's existing standards remain applicable?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does. And I will note that there has</li> </ul>

	Page 187		Page 189
1	order after order that that cases will be reviewed on	1	included in his direct testimony 70 pages of testimony
2	a case-by-case basis. And	2	supporting each project, the reasoning for the project,
3	Q. Thank you. And	3	the prudence determination information, what
4	A we do believe sorry, I just wanted to	4	considerations, alternative considerations
5	finish that thought is that, we do believe we met all of	5	MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, at this point
6	the Commission's requirements in regards to known and	6	I'd object. My question was just directed at whether he
7	measurable, in-service, offsets, identified offsetting	7	recalled this in the policy statement. This is
8	factors, and fully audited. So we believe that we've	8	beginning to provide a narrative.
9	met all those requirements, and we are asking the	9	JUDGE HOWARD: I I agree with your
10	Commission for inclusion of those assets based on that.	10	concern, Mr. Callaghan. I'm going to for now decline to
11	Q. All right. Does the policy statement require	11	strike testimony from the record, but I would certainly
12	that regulated companies include and consider in their	12	encourage Mr. Parvinen to focus on the specific question
13	proposal the Commission's longstanding practices	13	and allow Ms. Pease to redirect to the extent necessary.
14	regarding property placed in service?	14	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
15	A. Yes.	15	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
16	Q. And those longstanding practices include the	16	Q. Mr. Parvinen, do you recall that the policy
17	prudency standard, the known and measurable standard,	17	statement goes on to say, quote, The Commission will
18	the matching principle including offsetting factors,	18	also also will reject requests that either cannot be
19	correct?	19	audited or are unreasonably burdensome to review?
20	A. Yes.	20 21	A. Yes, I do. And, again, I think that the the Company complied with this. We had originally 15
21	Q. Turning to your rebuttal testimony on page 13,	21	discrete projects, we narrowed that down to ten. The
22	let me know when you're there.	23	information has been provided since we initially filed
23 24	<ul> <li>All right.</li> <li>Q. Page 13 of lines 10 and 11, you state that</li> </ul>	24	our case. That's been fully audited by all the parties,
24	Cascade is only proposing traditional pro forma plant	25	have had that opportunity to review all of that party.
23			
	Page 188		Page 190
1	adjustments, correct?	1	The only information at the time that they submitted
2	A. Correct, in the sense that the policy statement	2	their responsive testimony, the only information not
3	was appeared to direct be more directed at those	3	included or available at that time was actual dollars
4	investments that go into service after the rate	4	and actual in-service dates.
5	effective date. Cascade is not seeking recovery of any	5	Q. Well, we'll get to that soon enough,
6	of those investments. It's using the traditional	6	Mr. Parvinen.
7	approach to include assets only through	7	Does the in Cascade's initial filing, how
8	December 31st, 2020, for those projects that are	8	many line items did Cascade include in its proposed pro
9	actually known and measurable and in service at that	9	forma adjustments?
10	date.	10	A. Based on the testimony per Ms. Gresham's
		11	
11	Q. All right. Thank you.		Exhibit 2, I believe I'm trying to refresh my memory
12	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9	12	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many
12 13	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me.	12 13	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by
12 13 14	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there.	12 13 14	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I
12 13 14 15	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there. Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a	12 13 14 15	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I can explain why if you would like to
12 13 14	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there. Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a proposed adjustment considered in the GRC occurs from	12 13 14	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I
12 13 14 15 16	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there. Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a	12 13 14 15 16	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I can explain why if you would like to <b>Q. We'll we'll get to those eventually.</b>
12 13 14 15 16 17	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there. Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a proposed adjustment considered in the GRC occurs from the end of the test year, the less time Staff and other	12 13 14 15 16 17	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I can explain why if you would like to Q. We'll we'll get to those eventually. But, Mr. Parvinen, on rebuttal, Cascade, as you
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there. Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a proposed adjustment considered in the GRC occurs from the end of the test year, the less time Staff and other parties have to review a company's supporting evidence.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I can explain why if you would like to Q. We'll we'll get to those eventually. But, Mr. Parvinen, on rebuttal, Cascade, as you mentioned, is now proposing to include ten discrete pro
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there. Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a proposed adjustment considered in the GRC occurs from the end of the test year, the less time Staff and other parties have to review a company's supporting evidence. In light of these factors, the company's burden to	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I can explain why if you would like to Q. We'll we'll get to those eventually. But, Mr. Parvinen, on rebuttal, Cascade, as you mentioned, is now proposing to include ten discrete pro forma projects; is that correct?
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there. Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a proposed adjustment considered in the GRC occurs from the end of the test year, the less time Staff and other parties have to review a company's supporting evidence. In light of these factors, the company's burden to demonstrate that has met the requirements guiding	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I can explain why if you would like to Q. We'll we'll get to those eventually. But, Mr. Parvinen, on rebuttal, Cascade, as you mentioned, is now proposing to include ten discrete pro forma projects; is that correct? A. Correct.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there. Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a proposed adjustment considered in the GRC occurs from the end of the test year, the less time Staff and other parties have to review a company's supporting evidence. In light of these factors, the company's burden to demonstrate that has met the requirements guiding adjustments to test year data is greater.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I can explain why if you would like to Q. We'll we'll get to those eventually. But, Mr. Parvinen, on rebuttal, Cascade, as you mentioned, is now proposing to include ten discrete pro forma projects; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. And to your knowledge, Commission Staff in
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9 for me. A. All right. I'm there. Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a proposed adjustment considered in the GRC occurs from the end of the test year, the less time Staff and other parties have to review a company's supporting evidence. In light of these factors, the company's burden to demonstrate that has met the requirements guiding adjustments to test year data is greater. Do you recall this in the policy statement?	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I can explain why if you would like to Q. We'll we'll get to those eventually. But, Mr. Parvinen, on rebuttal, Cascade, as you mentioned, is now proposing to include ten discrete pro forma projects; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. And to your knowledge, Commission Staff in response testimony did accept some of the discrete projects as appropriate for pro forma treatment; is that right?
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Turning back to MPP-12X, could you go to page 9</li> <li>for me.</li> <li>A. All right. I'm there.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 25 states, quote, The further a proposed adjustment considered in the GRC occurs from the end of the test year, the less time Staff and other parties have to review a company's supporting evidence.</li> <li>In light of these factors, the company's burden to demonstrate that has met the requirements guiding adjustments to test year data is greater.</li> <li>Do you recall this in the policy statement?</li> <li>A. I do, and Cascade achieved that effort by</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>from earlier cross, I believe there were 46 lines. Many of those lines were the blanket projects broken out by district. So a lot more information than necessary. I can explain why if you would like to</li> <li>Q. We'll we'll get to those eventually. But, Mr. Parvinen, on rebuttal, Cascade, as you mentioned, is now proposing to include ten discrete pro forma projects; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And to your knowledge, Commission Staff in response testimony did accept some of the discrete projects as appropriate for pro forma treatment; is that</li> </ul>

41 (Pages 187 to 190)

	Page 191		Page 193
1	Q. To your knowledge pardon me. Commission	1	had already included part of the cost.
2	Staff still completely rejects at least seven of the ten	2	JUDGE HOWARD: I think we'll allow the
3	discrete projects that Cascade is proposing on the	3	question. Go ahead.
4	rebuttal, correct?	4	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
5	A. They are, yes.	5	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
6	Q. Okay. And could you please turn to exhibit	6	Q. And just to clarify, Mr. Parvinen, Commission
7	MPP-13X on exhibit page 6 for me and let me know when	7	Staff doesn't accept all costs under lines 5, 6, and 7,
8	you're there.	8	but the costs that they do accept are within lines 5, 6,
9	A. I'm there.	9	and 7, correct?
10	Q. Do you see figure 1?	10	A. I believe that is correct, yes.
11	A. I'm sorry, is this a I may sorry, is it	11	Q. All right. So doing some back of the envelope
12	the wrong no.	12	math, the difference between Cascade's position on
13	Q. This should be the Mr. Garrison's rebuttal	13	discrete pro forma projects and Staff's position is
14	testimony.	14	approximately 32.4 million; does that sound about right?
15	A. Right. Okay. Figure figure 1, yes, shows up	15	A. Yes.
16	on page 4 of the testimony, and I'm not seeing a	16	Q. Okay. Does figure 1 list in-service dates for
17	designation on the top of my anyway, I'm there at	17	these discrete projects?
18	figure 1.	18	A. Yes, it does.
19	Q. Okay. Great.	19	Q. And according to figure 1, three of the discrete
20	And are you familiar with figure 1?	20	projects went into service in December; is that right?
21	A. Yes.	21	A. Yes.
22	Q. All right. And it's a summary of Cascade's	22	Q. And the projects that went into service in
23	discrete and blank what it terms to be blanket	23	December, according to figure 1, are the Wallula Gate
24	project, correct?	24	Project on line 4 and the Bremerton Office Project on
25	A. Correct.	25	line 11 of figure 1; is that right?
	Page 192		Page 194
1	Q. So according to figure 1, based on the numbers	1	MS. PEASE: Counsel, you cut out there, at
2	Cascade provides, the ten discrete projects that Cascade	2	least for me, I don't know
_	is proposing to include total approximately three	3	
3		1 .5	MR, CALLAGHAN: L can restate.
3 4		4	MR. CALLAGHAN: I can restate. BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
4	point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?	4	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
	point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct? A. Yes, that's correct.		BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on
4 5	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found</li> </ul>	4 5	BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the
4 5 6	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate</li> </ul>	4 5 6	BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?
4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7	BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct? A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is
4 5 7 8	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?
4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct? A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1. Q. Oh.
4 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept</li> </ul>	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. CALLAGHAN: Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct? A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1. Q. Oh.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6,</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct. MS. PEASE: Mr I would raise an</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that went into service in December represent approximately</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct. MS. PEASE: Mr I would raise an objection. I'm not sure that Mr. Parvinen would be able</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that went into service in December represent approximately \$25 million in pro forma plants; is that correct?</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct. MS. PEASE: Mr I would raise an objection. I'm not sure that Mr. Parvinen would be able to tell what Staff's proposal was based on the context</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that went into service in December represent approximately \$25 million in pro forma plants; is that correct?</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct. MS. PEASE: Mr I would raise an objection. I'm not sure that Mr. Parvinen would be able to tell what Staff's proposal was based on the context of a Company exhibit.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that went into service in December represent approximately \$25 million in pro forma plants; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. So of the 32.4 million in discrete</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct. MS. PEASE: Mr I would raise an objection. I'm not sure that Mr. Parvinen would be able to tell what Staff's proposal was based on the context of a Company exhibit. MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I'm just</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that went into service in December represent approximately \$25 million in pro forma plants; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. So of the 32.4 million in discrete plant contested by Staff, about \$25 million went into</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct. MS. PEASE: Mr I would raise an objection. I'm not sure that Mr. Parvinen would be able to tell what Staff's proposal was based on the context of a Company exhibit. MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I'm just asking if Mr. Parvinen is aware of Cas or aware of</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that went into service in December represent approximately \$25 million in pro forma plants; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. So of the 32.4 million in discrete plant contested by Staff, about \$25 million went into service in December; is that right?</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct.</li> <li>MS. PEASE: Mr I would raise an objection. I'm not sure that Mr. Parvinen would be able to tell what Staff's proposal was based on the context of a Company exhibit.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I'm just asking if Mr. Parvinen is aware of Cas or aware of Commission Staff's position. If he's not, then he won't be able to answer the question, but it seems like he's aware of what Commission Staff's position is.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that went into service in December represent approximately \$25 million in pro forma plants; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. So of the 32.4 million in discrete plant contested by Staff, about \$25 million went into service in December; is that right?</li> <li>A. That is correct; however, we did provide all the</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct.</li> <li>MS. PEASE: Mr I would raise an objection. I'm not sure that Mr. Parvinen would be able to tell what Staff's proposal was based on the context of a Company exhibit.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I'm just asking if Mr. Parvinen is aware of Cas or aware of Commission Staff's position. If he's not, then he won't be able to answer the question, but it seems like he's</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that went into service in December represent approximately \$25 million in pro forma plants; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. So of the 32.4 million in discrete plant contested by Staff, about \$25 million went into service in December; is that right?</li> <li>A. That is correct; however, we did provide all the documentation and support for those projects from the beginning of our case.</li> <li>Q. All right. So is it fair to say by dollar</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>point or sorry, 39.3 million, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, that's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Commission Staff in response testimony found approximately \$6.9 million worth of plant appropriate for pro forma treatment, correct?</li> <li>A. That sounds right, yes.</li> <li>Q. And that 6.9 million that Staff does accept based on or is based on expenses in figure 1 that are incorporated into the projects listed under lines 5, 6, and 7, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's correct.</li> <li>MS. PEASE: Mr I would raise an objection. I'm not sure that Mr. Parvinen would be able to tell what Staff's proposal was based on the context of a Company exhibit.</li> <li>MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I'm just asking if Mr. Parvinen is aware of Cas or aware of Commission Staff's position. If he's not, then he won't be able to answer the question, but it seems like he's aware of what Commission Staff's position is.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>BY MR. CALLAGHAN:</li> <li>Q. So the projects are the Wallula Gate Project on line 1, the Walla Walla Gate Project on line 4, and the Bremerton Office Project on line 11; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the yeah, the Wallula Gate Project is on line 2, not line 1.</li> <li>Q. Oh.</li> <li>A. But yes, those are the three projects.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, again, doing some back of the envelope math, according to figure 1, those three projects that went into service in December represent approximately \$25 million in pro forma plants; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. So of the 32.4 million in discrete plant contested by Staff, about \$25 million went into service in December; is that right?</li> <li>A. That is correct; however, we did provide all the documentation and support for those projects from the beginning of our case.</li> </ul>

42 (Pages 191 to 194)

Docket No. UG-200568 - Vol. III - 2/24/2021

	Page 195		Page 197
1	forma projects went into service in December?	1 figures.	
2	A. Yes. And I will also point out that those are	2 Do you recall tho	se statements in your rebuttal
3	in service well before the well before the close	3 testimony?	-
4	of of this of this proceeding, which is an	4 A. Yes.	
5	important was an important factor pointed out in the	5 Q. Under the Comr	nission's standards, can prudence
6	most recent PSE rate case.	6 be determined before	a project is placed in service?
7	Q. All right. According to figure 1, the Wallula	7 A. The information	can be is is is
8	Gate Project, \$17 million, went into service on December	8 reviewed. The actual i	in-service date is actual
9	29th; is that right?	9 service date and actual	al cost is a component of prudence,
10	A. Yes.	0 but many of the pruder	nce determination items are much
11	Q. And not everything in the Wallula Gate Project	1 more substantial than	that and those were provided up
12	was in service by the end of the year, correct?	2 front.	
13	A. This portion of that project was in service. I	3 Q. So those well,	, so can prudence be determined
14	believe Mr. Darras talks about a component that that	4 before a project is pla	ced in service?
15	wasn't in service at the end of the year, but this		I'm hesitating is from a number
16	portion was in service and provided benefits to	6 factors. The Commiss	ion has allowed projects to go into
17	customers. The final portion happened to go into	7 service or go into rates	s prior to going into service
18	service yesterday.	8 without making a prude	ence determination. In the policy
19	MS. PEASE: Sorry, I just I appreciate	9 statement, I believe the	e Commission said that prudence
20	that is a cross-exhibit for Mr. Parvinen, but to the	0 is an after-the-fact look	And that I would agree, yes.
21	extent that there's questions that may be better		nt that you're referring to in
22	directed to Mr. Darras as to the actual in-service	2 the policy statement w	was with respect to provisional pro
23	dates, I would just bear that in mind.	3 forma adjustments, co	
24	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sorry, Ms. Pease, you cut		l and maybe I'm going blank on
25	out on the last sentence.	5 what provisional mean	s, but if provisional was the
	Page 196		Page 198
1	MS. PEASE: Oh, what I said is I would just	1 projects that were allo	wing rates to go into effect
2	ask that counsel keep in mind whether some of these	2 after the rate effective	date, then yes, that's what I
3	questions may better be directed to Mr. Darras as you're	3 was referring to.	
4	wading into more of the substance of Mr. Darras'	4 Q. Okay. And Case	cade is proposing only traditional
5	testimony in your cross-examination of Mr. Parvinen.	5 pro forma plant adjus	stments in this case, correct?
6	JUDGE HOWARD: I'll I'll allow	6 A. Correct.	
7	Mr. Callaghan to cross Mr. Parvinen to the extent he is	7 Q. All right. Are yo	
8	familiar with these things. If we need to re-call	8 Commission's ruling	in the 2015 PacifiCorp general rate
9	Mr. Darras, we can, but I I want I want him to	9 <b>case?</b>	
10	have the opportunity to explore that.	0 A. Generally speak	ing, yes.
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.	1 Q. Okay. In that ca	ase, if you recall, did the
12	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:		t PacifiCorp failed to meet its
13	Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, as you've stated in your		the decision to continue installing
14	rebuttal testimony on page 17, the line 14, you state,	4 the SCR system was	-
15	quote, From a substantive perspective, Staff possessed		Counsel, can you provide a
16	all of the information necessary to evaluate the		his may have been designated as
17	prudence of the Company's projects when Staff filed		Ir. Parvinen. I think it might
18	reply testimony.	8 help us all to have the	
19	You also state on page 15 that, quote, All the	9 MR. CALLAGH	
20	materials necessary to review prudence of the Company's	0 BY MR. CALLAGHAN	
21	projects have been provided through Cascade's initial		you can turn to Exhibit MPP-9X
22	filing and through data requests. As explained further	2 at exhibit page 41, pa	
23	below, the only pieces of information missing at the	• •	or a hundred page 41 starts
24	time of the parties' responsive testimony were actual		nless I have the wrong order.
25	in-service dates for discrete projects and final cost	5 Q. Paragraph 116 I	begins with "We find a similar

43 (Pages 195 to 198)

	Page 199		Page 201
1 situat	ion here."	1	[Cross talking.]
	Okay. I'm there.	2	A provided by Mr. Darras. Sorry.
	Okay. So let me know if you need time to read	3	Q. Sorry. That's okay.
	resh your memory, but my question is, in this	4	For those ten projects, did Cascade provide
	the order is MPP-9X, did the Commission find that	5	contemporaneous documentation of the decision to
	Corp failed to meet its burden to prove the	6	continue those projects?
	ion to continue to installing the CSR system was	7	A. I would say by default since they were still
8 prude		8	included in in the ongoing projects, there was no new
9 A.	Yes, that appears to be what it says.	9	information to change those change those projects. I
10 <b>Q.</b>	All right. And does the order explain that the	10	will also say that Mr. Garrison's rebuttal testimony did
11 utility	failed to meet its burden in that case because	11	explain every difference in in-service date and cost
12 it did	not present evidence that the decision to	12	from his initial testimony.
13 contir	nue investing in the SCR system was prudent? And	13	Q. Okay. All right, Mr. Parvinen, I'd like to
14 if you	need a citation to refresh your memory, I can	14	transition into asking you some questions about the
15 provid	de that.	15	matching principle and offsetting factors.
16 A.	I believe that was the case.	16	Could you turn to Exhibit MPP-12X, the used and
17 <b>Q.</b>	Okay.	17	useful policy statement, page 7, footnote 25. Let me
18 A.	I'm not familiar with what the record in that	18	know when you're there.
19 case v	was to come to that determination, but just reading	19	A. All right. I'm there.
20 the or	der, yes, that appears to be the case.	20	Q. All right. This footnote 25 in the policy
21 <b>Q.</b>	All right. So returning to your statements in	21	statement describes offsetting factors, correct?
	rebuttal testimony, how could Staff have had all	22	A. Yes.
	vidence it needed to evaluate the prudence of	23	Q. And it states, quote, Offsetting factors
	ade's projects minus the in-service dates and final	24	include, but are not limited to, removing rate year
25 <b>costs</b>	given that those projects were not yet in service?	25	retirements, dispositions, and nondepreciating plant
	Page 200		Page 202
1 A.	None of the information would have changed. It	1	including revenue growth and operations and maintenance
2 was th	ne same as what was presented in Mr. Darras'	2	expense offsets. Without incorporating these
3 initial	testimony.	3	offsetsetting factors, a proposal will not be
4 <b>Q.</b>	Doesn't Cascade have to provide evidence that it	4	considered to be in the public interest because
5 <b>was c</b>	ontinuously evaluating whether the decision to	5	resulting rates will not be fair, just, reasonable, and
6 contir	nue with these investments was prudent?	6	sufficient as required by RCW 88.28.010, Subsection 1.
7 A.	l would say no, not if there was was no	7	Has Cascade incorporated the offsetting factors
-	cant change in the projects.	8	listed in the policy statement into its proposed pro
	Mr. Parvinen, Cascade delayed two projects	9	forma adjustment?
	ding to rebuttal testimony, it delayed two projects	10	A. Yes, we did. Initially we had had overlooked
	o changes in circumstances, didn't it?	11	the removal and retirement component. We looked at the
	Yes.	12	offsetting factors from more of an operational
	Where does the record contain any exhibits or	13	standpoint and neglected the accounting side of
	nony regarding contemporaneous documentation of	14 15	side an accounting component to these retirements.
	ecision-making process?		That was pointed out to to us by Staff and AWEC in
	Turn to the updated data request provided to the	16 17	their responsive cases, so we did correct that in rebuttal.
	s through 89 and 92 where it shows that for those	18	But we did recognize other offsetting factors
	ular projects they were pushed into 2021, and were reflected as as zeros for our updated	19	for what the potential offsetting factors would be for
	tments as we were going through the case.	20	our plant, and we did bring in the revenue growth
,	So I'm actually referring to the ten discrete	21	associated with those revenue growth projects. So we
	cts that Cascade is is still proposing to	22	have accounted for and recognized those offsetting
	le in the pro forma adjustment on rebuttal.	23	factors.
	Right, those were ongoing ongoing projects of	24	Q. All right. I'm glad you bring that up. So
	no information changed from the testimony	25	could you turn to page 8 of your direct testimony, and
	······································		

44 (Pages 199 to 202)

Page 203 beginning on line 9 and let me know when you're there. A. Yep, I'm there. Q. All right. You're talking about an offsetting factor that the Company considered, and you state that you considered some O & M offsets, but, quote, For a number of projects included in Mr. Darras' testimony,	Page 205 associated with the pro forma capital additions adjustment, correct? A. Yes. Q. Okay. So this offsetting factor doesn't include any depreciation impact from other plants that may be retired, correct?
<ul> <li>A. Yep, I'm there.</li> <li>Q. All right. You're talking about an offsetting</li> <li>factor that the Company considered, and you state that</li> <li>you considered some O &amp; M offsets, but, quote, For a</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>adjustment, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So this offsetting factor doesn't include</li> <li>any depreciation impact from other plants that may be</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Q. All right. You're talking about an offsetting</li> <li>factor that the Company considered, and you state that</li> <li>you considered some O &amp; M offsets, but, quote, For a</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So this offsetting factor doesn't include</li> <li>any depreciation impact from other plants that may be</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>factor that the Company considered, and you state that</li> <li>you considered some O &amp; M offsets, but, quote, For a</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. So this offsetting factor doesn't include</li> <li>any depreciation impact from other plants that may be</li> </ul>
5 you considered some O & M offsets, but, quote, For a	5 any depreciation impact from other plants that may be
7 unquote, the offsetting savings from these projects	7 A. Correct.
8 would occur during a peak weather event, but there was	8 Q. Okay. Isn't including depreciation impact from
9 no peak weather event during the test year; is that	<sup>9</sup> retired plant standard offsetting factor to consider
10 correct?	10 with the proposed pro forma adjustment?
11 A. Correct.	11 A. Can you repeat that question?
12 Q. So in Cascade's initial filing, the only	12 <b>Q. Yeah.</b>
13 offsetting factor included was a projection of	13 Isn't including the depreciation impact from
14 additional customer revenue; is that correct?	14 retired plant a standard offsetting factor to consider
15 A. Correct, yes. We looked at at all these	15 with a proposed pro forma adjustment?
	A. Well, I can't answer that. All I can answer is
	17 for Cascade, we have not included it in our previous
	18 cases in the calculation.
	19 <b>Q. Okay.</b>
	A. So we so we did accept the methodology or the
	idea of realization that it was an offsetting factor
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	that we had overlooked, yes. We had overlooked it and
	agreed that this is a proper a proper offsetting
	24 factor.
25 include the depreciation effect on the replaced and	25 <b>Q. Thank you.</b>
Page 204	Page 206
1 retired plant associated with the pro forma capital	1 And could you turn to your rebuttal testimony at
2 additions adjustment.	2 page 26 beginning on line 1. Let me know when you're
<sup>3</sup> Now, when you say that Cascade has expanded the	3 there.
4 scope of offsetting factors, do you mean that the	4 A. All right. I'm there.
5 depreciation impacts from a retired plant is being	5 Q. So here you mention that Cascade considered
6 presented for the first time on rebuttal?	6 whether pro forma projects would provide offsetting
7 A. Well, it was presented in AWEC's, directly in	7 savings through a reduced O & M expense in addition to
8 AWEC's case. Staff had mentioned it but did not provide	8 increased revenues from customer growth, but Cascade did
9 a calculation. AWEC did provide this idea and included	9 not include that because the Company's test year did not
	10 have a peak weather event and therefore there were no
	11 test year costs to offset by these savings; is that an
and the second second second second second second second	12 accurate summary?
	13 A. That is. That is. And we did do it we did
	14 go back and double-check to make sure that that there
	were no events, even though we did not have a peak
	<ul><li>weather event, were there such a peak that would cause</li><li>these types of costs on any of these projects. So we</li></ul>
	<ul> <li>did go back and verify that there were no such instances</li> </ul>
	19 during the test year.
. ,	20 Q. So here are you saying that because the test
,	year happened to not have a peak weather event, these
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	22 projects won't provide any offsetting savings?
	<ul> <li>A. They will avoid potential costs. Had there been</li> </ul>
	a peak weather event, for example for example, the
	weather that we all just suffered through in in

45 (Pages 203 to 206)

1       February, had we not done these types of projects, we would have potentially incurred a substantial amount of costs but here pole - at Mr. Darras could explain this better than I could - but people out at these spectrates that we doubt explain this better than I could - but people out at these spectrates that we doubt have been avoided this year because we did these the another doubt part of the advance of the could be including paragraphs 28 and 29.       A. Can you give me a reference point on that?         2       A. So five and what ower and what ower any well could have been avoided this year because we did these projects.       A. If right. And are you familiar with the 2009         3       So these savings are not included - these contails alwings are not included as an offsetting factor in Cascade's proposed for form adjustments, correct?       A. If m sorry, I was looking at an attachment. Can you give me the ord number or the page number again, page - 1         4       A. Well, the varing associated with these in the test year.       A. If m sorry, I was looking at an attachment. Can you give me the ord number or the page number again, page - 1         5       A. Well, the varing associated with these in that we identified - we is your costs, but these was not actual costs in that the synet.       A. If ma sorry, I was looking at an attachment. Can you give me to order number or the page Not. 14.         6       A. If souded costs is one would have avoided costs as you gut h, they're not included as an offsetting factor sors, but the sevings, or avoided costs as you gut h, they're not included as an offsetting factor seases the corrently unknown?       A. Are sea.         7       Cascade will ge		Page 207		Page 209
2         would have polentially incurred a substantial amount of constant to and Mr. Carras could explain this better than I could - but people out at these particular points making sure that the pressure bypass values and whatnot were maintained to keep the - to keep the gas supply.         0. Yes. 'S o'pur direct testimenty on page 11, footnotes 10 through 13, - A Yes.           3         0. So these particular points making sure that the pressure bypass values and whatnot were maintained to keep the - to would have been avoided this year because we did these projects.         0. Chay. Could you turn to Exhibit MPP-8X for me on exhibit page 14, and that would be including paragraphs 28 and 29.           4         A. Weal, they are in that we identified - we identified the potential offset. but there was not coat associated with these in the testy ear.         0. Chay. Could you turn to Exhibit MPP-8X for me on exhibit page 14, and that would be including page           7         A. Weal, they are in that we identified - we identified the potential offset. but there was not coat associated with these in the testy ear.         0. Chay. So is it full there was not a coat associated with these was not a coat associated with the savings associated with the coars. So is it full to savings associated with the coars. So is it full to savings associated with the coars. So is it full to savings that sociated coars. so we would have avoided infecting factor because the amount of axings that social associated with is un tot savings. Int a woulde coars as you put it, they're not included as an offsetting factor because the amount of axings that social associated with is un tot savings. Int a social associated with is not test year. And because we did thook and neffecting factor is to stake something that occurred during the test year that you will	1	February, had we not done these types of projects, we	1	A. Can you give me a reference point on that?
<ul> <li>costs to have people - and Mr. Darras could explain this better than I could - but people out at these particular points making sure that the pressure bypass values and whatnot were maintained to keep the - to keep the gas supply.</li> <li>So we - it's - the potential offset is costs</li> <li>So we - it's - the potential offset is costs</li> <li>C. All right. And are you familiar with the 2009 PBE GRC order?</li> <li>A. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>C. Okay, Could you turn to the Shibit MPP-8X for me on exhibit page 14, and that would be including paragraphs 28 and 29.</li> <li>A. Brostry, I was looking at an attachment. Can you give ma the order number or the page number again, page</li> <li>C. So these savings are not included these capital savings are not included we identified the potential offset. but there was not a cost associated with these in the test year.</li> <li>C. All there will be savings, associated with these this paint, correct?</li> <li>C. All there will be savings, associated with these costs weren't there to - to remove from our test year.</li> <li>C. Okay. So is it fait to say that the savings, or avoided costs as you put it, they're not included as an offsetting factor bacause the amount of saving shat</li> <li>Cascade will get from them is currently unknown?</li> <li>A. Well, the leas of an offsetting factor is to take semething that coursed. Just it standard</li> <li>Commission practice to assess the certainty with which the costs and offsetting factor as a with which costs and offsetting factors an known when it balances the competing pressure to change test year that balances the competing pressure to change test year the costs and offsetting factors as the cost will not write was no actual cost associated with it no ur test year.</li> <li>G. All right. S. Ot he evidence that Cascade has projected additions thmastews, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Cascade will get from them is currently w</li></ul>				
4       this better than 1 could - but people out at these       A       Yes.         9       particular points making sure that the pressure bypass       So. All right. And are you familiar with the 2009         7       A. Weil, the gas anphy.       So. All right. And are you familiar with the 2009         9       PSE GRC order?       A. Generally speaking, yos.         9       C. So these samply.       C. Okay. Could you turn to Exhibit MPP-8X for me or exhibit page 14, and that wold be including projects.         9       projects.       C. So these samply are not included - these capital savings are not included as an offsetting factor in casa sociated with those in the test year.       A. I'ms orry, I was looking at an attachment. Can you give me the order number or the page number again, page -         10       capital savings are not included - these varians associated with these in the test year.       A. Weil, they are in that weidentified - we         11       cost associated with these will be savings associated with these in the test year.       A. O'kay. I'm there.         12       O. Okay. So is if fait to say that the savings, or avoided costs as you put it, they're not included as an offsetting factor is to - to remove from our test year.       A. Yes.         12       C. Cascade will get from them is currently withownew it balances the compering pressure to change test year.       C. And paragraph 28 describes the fast aspect of the offsetting factor is to - the revertements, these costs will no urerest are worked in but or test year.	3		3	
6       values and whatord were maintained to keep the - to       PSE GRC order?         7       Keep the gas supply.       0       O. Okay. Could you turn to Exhibit MP-8X for me         9       or exhibit have been avoided this yas because we did these       0       O. Okay. Could you turn to Exhibit MP-8X for me         9       or exhibit page 14, and that would be including       paragraphs 28 and 29.         11       0. So these savings are not included - these       0       O. Okay. Could you turn to Exhibit MP-8X for me         12       0. So these savings are not included - these       0       O. Okay. Could you turn to Exhibit MP-8X for me         13       0. So these savings are not included - these       0       O. Okay. Could you turn to Exhibit MP-8X for me         14       inclustering are not included - these       0       O. So these savings are not included as an offsetting factor readys page no. 12.         16       identified the potential offset, but there was not a       0       O. Yes. So it's exhibit page No. 12.         16       1. The more argaraphs discuss the two aspects of the consideration of offsetting factors and you they field was an offsetting factor analysis as evidence that         17       0. Okay. So is it fair to say that the savings, or       2       A. Yes.         18       0. Okay out it, they're not included as an offsetting factor analysis as evidence that       2      <	4		4	-
r       A. Generally speaking, yes.         So we - it's - the potential offset is costs         in the eident incur but very well could have. So those         would have been avoided this year because we did these         capital savings are not included - these         identified the potential offset, but there was not a         identified the potential offset, but there was not a         incurring other costs, but those in the test year.         cot associated with those in the test year.         cot associated with those in the test year.         cot or enrove from or ortest year.         cot or enrove from or ortest year.         cot or or enrove from ortest year.         cot or enrove from ortest year.         capital factor because the amount of savings that         Page 208         Cascade will get from them is currently unknown?         A. Weil, the idea of an offsetting factor is to         take semething factor cases the certainty with which         take semething factor save are toremove, so we         identi	5	particular points making sure that the pressure bypass	5	Q. All right. And are you familiar with the 2009
8       So we - it's - the potential offset is costs       6       O. Kay. Could you'turn to Exhibit MPP-8X for me on exhibit MPP-8X for me for subject and the order, it and the order, it and the me again, page -         1       Cascade will opset inform form the is typer inform our field with the exit year.       A. Mage -       A. Ada pag.       A. Ada pag.       A. Clay, J. Market Intheoreme and part of the order's page No. 12.         2       A. Max forme on the set year.       C. Market MPP-8X for me on included as an offsetting factor server were inthere in the record can l - in the set year.       A. Ada pag.       A. Yes.         2       A. Well, the idea of an offsetting factor is to moffsetting factor serverement, these costs	6	valves and whatnot were maintained to keep the to	6	PSE GRC order?
<ul> <li>that we didn't incur but very well could have. So those would have been avoided this year because we did those in projects.</li> <li>a. So these savings are not included as an offsetting factor in Cascade's proposed pro forma adjustments, correct?</li> <li>A. Well, they are in that we identified - we lidentified the potential offset, but there was not a cost associated with those in the test year.</li> <li>C. Su three will be savings associated with these in the test year.</li> <li>A. Well, they are not included as an offsetting factor is the order state consideration of offsetting factors is a would have avoided increase in expense, i.e. pro forma projects, directly increase in expense, i.e. pro forma projects, directly with which costs and offsetting factors are known when it balances the compting pressure to change test year is a cost and offsetting factors are known when it balances the compting pressure to change test year is a cost and offsetting factors are known when it balances the compting pressure to change test year is a cost and offsetting factors are known when it balances the compting pressure to change test year is a difficult of the tore that the offsetting factors, correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the idea of an offsetting factor is to a costs in diffsetting factors are known when it balances the compting pressure to change test year idue?</li> <li>A. Sorry, can you repeat that question again for me?</li> <li>A. Yes, and that is what Cascade is is is doing in compsion?</li> <li>A. Yes, and that is what Cascade is - is doing in our presention.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that is what Cascade is - is doing in our presention.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that is what Cascade is - is doing in our presention.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that is what Cascade is - is doing in our presention.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that is what Cascade is - is doing in our presention.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that is what Cascade is - is doing in our presention.</li> <li>A. Yes, and</li></ul>	7	keep the gas supply.	7	A. Generally speaking, yes.
10       would have been avoided this year because we did these       10       projects.         11       0. So these savings are not included these       11       A. I'm sorry, I was looking at an attachment. Can you give muthe arder number of the page number again, page -         12       0. So these savings are not included these       11       A. I'm sorry, I was looking at an attachment. Can you give muthe arder number of the page number again, page -         13       incascade's proposed pro forma adjustments, correct?       0. Yes. So it's exhibit page No. 14, but going just with the order, it's the order's page No. 12.         14       cost associated with these in the test year.       10       A. Thank you. All right. Then paragraph Siccurs the was apped to forma adjustments, test year.         15       incursing other costs, but these costs werenit there       10       C. 28 and 29.         16       A. It's avoided costs, so we would have avoided incursing factor because the amount of savings that       10       C. Respected the first aspect of the consideration of whether a proposed increase consideration of whether a proposed increase consideration of whether a proposed increase in expense, i.e. pro forma projects, directly         12       Cascade will get from them is currently unknown?       3.       4. Yes.         13       bacase we did those investments, these costs will not be incurred during the test year. And a because we did those investments, these costs will not be incured during the rate yare either.       10	8	So we it's the potential offset is costs	8	Q. Okay. Could you turn to Exhibit MPP-8X for me
11       Projects.       11       A. Tim sorry, I was looking at an attachment. Can you give me the order number or the page number again, page -         12       A. Well, they are in that we identified - we identified the order, it's the order's page No. 14, but going just with the order, it's the order's page No. 12.         14       A. Well, they are in that we identified - we identified the order, it's the order's page No. 12.         17       Cascade's proposed pro form adjustments, correct?         18       A. Well, they are in the test year.         19       A. It's avoided costs, so we would have avoided incorrects so they on utest year.         18       It's avoided costs, so we would have avoided incorrect year.         29       A. Okay. So is it fair to say that the savings, or avoided costs as you put it, they're not included as an offsetting factor because the amount of savings that to say that the saving so reader of the proforma projects, directly incorrect year.         20       A. Well, the idea of an offsetting factor is to atake something that cocurred during the test year.         21       Cascade will get from them is currently unknown?         3       A. Well, the idea of an offsetting factor is to acta so is solated with it in our test year.         3       Cascade will get from the test year.         4       A. Well, the idea of an offsetting factor is to acta so the corresting with which the offset would be, but there was no actual cost associated with it in our test year.         5	9	that we didn't incur but very well could have. So those	9	
12       Q. So these savings are not included – these       12       you give me the order number or the page number again, page –         13       in Cascade's proposed proforma adjustments, correct?       13       page –         14       in Cascade's proposed proforma adjustments, correct?       14       Page –         15       A. Well, they are in that we identified - we       15       page –         16       identified the potential offset, but there was not a       16       A. Thank you, All right. Then paragraph No         16       these – this plant, correct?       A. The avoided costs, so we would have avoided       17       Q. 28 and 28.         17       A. Us, voided costs, so we would have avoided       18       A. Okay. Im there.       18         18       A. Okay. So is it fair to say that the savings, or       20       Consideration of offsetting factors, don't the?         19       Page 208       22       Q. And paragraph 28 describes the first aspect of         10       the offsetting factor is to       18       A. Yes.         11       Page 208       Page 210         12       Page 210       11       provides any offsetting benefits; is that righ?         13       take something that occurred during the test year. And       11       Indentis carce asasociated with         14 <th>10</th> <th>would have been avoided this year because we did these</th> <th>10</th> <th></th>	10	would have been avoided this year because we did these	10	
13       capital savings are not included as an offsetting factor in Cascade's proposed pro forma adjustments, correct?       14       Q. Yes. So it's exhibit page No. 14, but going just with the order, it's the order's page No. 12.         14       Cost associated with those in the test year.       16       A. Thank you. All right. Then paragraph No         15       A. Well, they are in that we identified we identified the potential offset, but there was not a sociated with those in the test year.       16       A. Thank you. All right. Then paragraph No         16       M. The savided costs, so we would have avoided incurring other costs, but those costs weren't there to to remove from our test year.       17       Q. Zes and 23.         17       O. Kay. So is if fair to say that the savings, or avoided costs as you put it, they're not included as an offsetting factor is to avoided the an offsetting factor is to avoided costs as you put it, they're not included as an offsetting factor is to an offsetting factor is to an offsetting factor is to avoided will get from them is currently unknown?       2       A. Ves.       Page 210         11       Cascade will get from them is currently unknown?       3       G. Where in the record can 1 - in this case can 1 find that analysis for each of the pro forma projects, directly increase in expense, i.e. pro forma projects that data cost associated with it in our test year. And a cost as in that test year it standard       10       D. Wall, the idea of an offsetting factor is to an offsetting factor is to an offsetting depreciation inpact.       11       In this case can 1 find that analysis or ea	11		11	
14       in Cascade's proposed pro form adjustments, correct?       14       Q. Yes. So if's exhibit page No. 14, but going just with the order; if's the order's page No. 12, just with the order, if's the order's page No. 12, just with the order, if's the order's page No. 12, just with the order, if's the order's page No. 12, int with the order, if's the order's page No. 12, int with the order, if's the order's page No. 12, int with the order, if's the order's page No. 12, int with the order, if's the order's page No. 12, int with the order, if's the order's page No. 12, int with the order, if's the order's page No. 12, int with the order order's page No. 12, int with the order order order integence order	12	-	12	
15       A. Well, they are in that we identified we       15       just with the order, it's the order's page No. 12.         16       identified the potential offset, but there was not a       16       A. Thank you. All right. Then paragraph No         17       cost associated with those in the test year.       16       A. Thank you. All right. Then paragraph No         18       Q. But there will be savings associated with       16       A. Cleay. I'm there.         19       these paragraph discuss the two aspects of the consideration of offsetting factors, don't they?         21       to remove from our test year.       20       A. And paragraph 28 describes the first aspect of the offsetting factor analysis as evidence that demonstrates consideration of whether a proposed increase in expense, i.e. pro forma projects, directly         19       Page 208       Page 210         10       Cascade will get from them is currently unknown?       A. Yes.         2       A. Well, the idea of an offsetting benefit.       3         4       you will no longer incur. That's an offsetting benefit.       3         5       the offsetting factor is to and offsetting factor is to and offsetting factors are known when it balances the competing pressure to change test year.       4         6       A. Will, the idea of an offsetting factor sets will not be record can 1 - in this cascade is proposing?       5         11       Casc				
16       identified the potential offset, but there was not a cost associated with those in the test year.       16       A. Thank you. All right. Then paragraph No         17       Q. But there will be savings associated with these incurring other costs, but these costs weren't there       17       Q. Chay. I'm there.         18       Q. Diday. So is it fair to say that the savings, or avoided costs as you put it, they're not included as an offsetting factor because the amount of savings that       16       A. Thank you. All right. Then paragraph 8 discuss the two aspects of the consideration of offsetting factors, don't they?         21       A. Otay. Zo is it fair to say that the savings, or avoided costs as you put it, they're not included as an offsetting factor because the amount of savings that       16       A. Yes.         19       Cascade will get from them is currently unknown?       A. Weli, the idea of an offsetting factor is to take something that cocurs during the test year to remove, so we identified what the offset would be, but there was no actual cost associated with it in our test year. And because we did those investments, these costs will not be incurred during the rate year either.       11       Page 210         12       A. Weli, the idea of an offsetting factor sacciated with whith is andfard       12       A. Yes.         13       because we did those investments, these costs will not be incurred during the rate year either.       12       A. Yes.         14       you will no longer incur. That's an offsetting the test year that year.       16       17<				
17       c. 28 and 29.         18       0. But there will be savings associated with         19       0. Statt, correct?         20       A. It's avoided costs, so we would have avoided         21       incurring other costs, but those costs weren't there         22       to - to remove from our test year.         23       0. Okay. So is it fair to say that the savings, or         24       avoided costs as you put it, they're not included as an ovided costs as you put it, they're not included as an ovided cost as you put it, they're not included as an ovided cost as you put it, they're not included as an ovided cost as you put it, they're not include as an ovided cost as an out of savings that         25       offsetting factor because the amount of savings that         26       Page 208         27       A. Well, the idea of an offsetting factor is to         3       take something that occurred during the test year that         4       you will no longer the rewould be, but there was no         7       A. Well, the offsetting factor is to         3       take something that occurred during the test year. And         4       because we did those investments, these costs will not be incurred using the rate year either.         9       a. All right. In general, isn't it standard         11       balances the compating pressure to change test year         12				
18       Q. But there will be savings associated with       18       A. Okay. I'm there.         19       A. It's avoided costs, so we would have avoided       0. These paragraphs discuss the two aspects of the         21       incurring other costs, but those costs weren't there       20       0. Okay. So is fair to say that the savings, or         23       Q. Okay. So is fair to say that the savings, or       avoided costs as you put it, they're not included as an         25       offsetting factor because the amount of savings that       22         Page 208         Page 200         Page 200         Page 200         Page 200				

46 (Pages 207 to 210)

	Page 211		Page 213
1	additional information included in his initial	1	would fall under the unreasonably burdensome category,
2	testimony.	2	and I think I think you got cut off in your
3	Q. Do you so you don't recall whether his	3	explanation there. And so I just wanted to ask if you
4	initial testimony has discusses consideration of	4	had any any further explanation on that piece that
5	offsetting factors?	5	you would like to offer.
6	A. Yes, I know it's a factor when you're looking at	6	A. Sure. Well, from Cascade's point of point of
7	the projects, the associated cost savings associated	7	view, we provided all the justification for the projects
8	with projects as a consideration, so his descriptions to	8	initially up front in Mr. Darras's testimony, so the
9	the extent there were, I believe the material offset was	9	majority of the information was there. When we updated
10	those particular projects that during peak weather	10	in rebuttal and through data requests, the parties have
11	created a savings. I'm looking for possibilities. If	11	had that opportunity.
12	there was additional testimony, it would have been	12	For example, when Staff put on its responsive
13	Mr. Darras's initial testimony.	13	case and it accepted three of the projects, remaining
14	Q. Okay. If there is if there isn't any	14	seven the remaining seven projects were known to
15	additional testimony in Mr. Darras's direct testimony,	15	Staff in our rebuttal case. And since then, Staff has
16	then your direct and rebuttal testimony would be where	16	had then a month and a half since our rebuttal case to
17	the evidence exists or where Cascade presented its	17	get any information into the record if it was in
18	consideration of offsetting factors for the pro forma	18	disagreement with any of the information it provided.
19	plant adjustments, correct?	19	So we do we do feel that the parties have had
20	A. Yes.	20	ample opportunity as required by the policy statement.
21	Q. Okay.	21	Q. Thank you.
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: Nothing further, Your Honor.	22	And I believe when Mr. Callaghan was asking you
23	JUDGE HOWARD: Cascade may proceed with any	23 24	questions about how many how many line items were
24 25	redirect. MS. PEASE: Thank you, Your Honor. Just one	24	included in our case as presented in Ms. Gresham's testimony, you had started to offer an explanation about
25	MO. TEADE. Thank you, Four Hohor. Sust one	23	testimony, you had started to oner an explanation about
	Page 212		Page 214
1	second to allow me to gather my notes.	1	how that how that information is presented and why
2		2	there's so much information there, and I think again
3	EXAMINATION	3	that you were cut off in your explanation. If you could
4	BY MS. PEASE:	4	just expand on that.
5	Q. Mr. Parvinen, turning to the earlier part of	5	A. Yes. Cascade started off, we were trying to be
6	your examination, Mr. Callaghan had asked you questions	6	open you know, open and honest and present our case
7	about whether Cascade had presented the restated	7	in totality. So Ms. Gresham's initial exhibit was
8	restated figures for the test year without pro forma	8	basically a a budget presentation, what is the
9 10	adjustments. Do you recall that that line of	9	Company's total capital budget. So it included our
10	questioning? A. Yes.	10 11	it included our total our total capital budget and we wanted parties to be able to see every project that we
11			
11 12	0 And would you agree in general that it would be	1	
12	Q. And would you agree in general that it would be appropriate to review the restated test year results	12	were proposing or every project that had been approved
12 13	appropriate to review the restated test year results	12 13	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget.
12 13 14	appropriate to review the restated test year results without the pro forma adjustments included?	12 13 14	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the
12 13 14 15	appropriate to review the restated test year results without the pro forma adjustments included? A. No, no, as as stated in in in my	12 13 14 15	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by
12 13 14	<ul><li>appropriate to review the restated test year results</li><li>without the pro forma adjustments included?</li><li>A. No, no, as as stated in in in my</li><li>rebuttal testimony, that's looking at half the picture,</li></ul>	12 13 14	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by service service territory. I'm going blank on our
12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>appropriate to review the restated test year results</li> <li>without the pro forma adjustments included?</li> <li>A. No, no, as as stated in in in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, that's looking at half the picture,</li> <li>when in ratemaking it's a combination of the restating</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by service service territory. I'm going blank on our on the area. So every one of our geographical areas got
12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>appropriate to review the restated test year results</li> <li>without the pro forma adjustments included?</li> <li>A. No, no, as as stated in in in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, that's looking at half the picture,</li> <li>when in ratemaking it's a combination of the restating</li> <li>and pro formas to determining to determining whether</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by service service territory. I'm going blank on our on the area. So every one of our geographical areas got in a specific money project. So for the blanket
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>appropriate to review the restated test year results</li> <li>without the pro forma adjustments included?</li> <li>A. No, no, as as stated in in in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, that's looking at half the picture,</li> <li>when in ratemaking it's a combination of the restating</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by service service territory. I'm going blank on our on the area. So every one of our geographical areas got
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>appropriate to review the restated test year results</li> <li>without the pro forma adjustments included?</li> <li>A. No, no, as as stated in in in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, that's looking at half the picture,</li> <li>when in ratemaking it's a combination of the restating</li> <li>and pro formas to determining to determining whether</li> <li>the company is earning prior to to rates rates</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by service service territory. I'm going blank on our on the area. So every one of our geographical areas got in a specific money project. So for the blanket services, we had a blanket services for each of our
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>appropriate to review the restated test year results</li> <li>without the pro forma adjustments included?</li> <li>A. No, no, as as stated in in in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, that's looking at half the picture,</li> <li>when in ratemaking it's a combination of the restating</li> <li>and pro formas to determining to determining whether</li> <li>the company is earning prior to to rates rates</li> <li>from the the current case.</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by service service territory. I'm going blank on our on the area. So every one of our geographical areas got in a specific money project. So for the blanket services, we had a blanket services for each of our district offices.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>appropriate to review the restated test year results without the pro forma adjustments included?</li> <li>A. No, no, as as stated in in in my rebuttal testimony, that's looking at half the picture, when in ratemaking it's a combination of the restating and pro formas to determining to determining whether the company is earning prior to to rates rates from the the current case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And, Mr. Parvinen, Mr. Callaghan had</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by service service territory. I'm going blank on our on the area. So every one of our geographical areas got in a specific money project. So for the blanket services, we had a blanket services for each of our district offices. So it looked like there was a lot more
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>appropriate to review the restated test year results</li> <li>without the pro forma adjustments included?</li> <li>A. No, no, as as stated in in in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, that's looking at half the picture,</li> <li>when in ratemaking it's a combination of the restating</li> <li>and pro formas to determining to determining whether</li> <li>the company is earning prior to to rates rates</li> <li>from the the current case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And, Mr. Parvinen, Mr. Callaghan had</li> <li>asked you in in referring to the policy statements</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget. Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by service service territory. I'm going blank on our on the area. So every one of our geographical areas got in a specific money project. So for the blanket services, we had a blanket services for each of our district offices. So it looked like there was a lot more information, but that was more so that we could track
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>appropriate to review the restated test year results without the pro forma adjustments included?</li> <li>A. No, no, as as stated in in in my rebuttal testimony, that's looking at half the picture, when in ratemaking it's a combination of the restating and pro formas to determining to determining whether the company is earning prior to to rates rates from the the current case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And, Mr. Parvinen, Mr. Callaghan had asked you in in referring to the policy statements and questions about the amount of time that parties</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>were proposing or every project that had been approved in our capital budget.</li> <li>Now, for the blanket projects, this was the first year that we broke the blanket projects by by service service territory. I'm going blank on our on the area. So every one of our geographical areas got in a specific money project. So for the blanket services, we had a blanket services for each of our district offices.</li> <li>So it looked like there was a lot more information, but that was more so that we could track those costs, and then going forward they'd potentially</li> </ul>

47 (Pages 211 to 214)

	Page 215		Page 217
1		1	
1 2	Wallula Gate Project and the Walla Walla Gate Project,		filing our initial case, it appeared that capital was
3	the Bremerton Project as representing a significant amount of the Company's total investment. Do you recall	3	getting very restrictive, so we were looking at what could we do to control our our capital costs. Can we
4	that line of questions?	4	delay projects? And and and, you know, the
5	A. Yes.	5	Company had made a decision to do what we could do.
6	Q. And and asking about the timing for those	6	So it was a matter of evaluating each and every
7	projects coming in being towards the end of our end	7	project from a status standpoint, the impact on on
8	of our period, December 2020, have and concern about	8	ratepayers, and the impact on service. So there's a lot
9	whether parties would have adequate time to review	9	of fine lines, information that has to be taken into
10	review that investment. Do you recall that line of	10	account to make that determination. And it was a long
11	questioning?	11	pro and it was a long process.
12	A. Yes.	12	So it wasn't a distinct look at the projects and
13	Q. But for for those projects, Cascade was	13	go, you know, this this is a matter of this one's in
14	providing I mean, would you agree that Cascade was	14	and this one's out. It wasn't that. There was a lot
15	providing updates all along the way?	15	more to take into account in that in those decisions.
16	A. Yes, yes, anytime when we provide our updates,	16	Q. And then you were also asked questions about
17	if there were changes in estimated in-service dates or	17	where in in the case there is support for the
18	changes in estimate costs, we were providing those. As	18	consideration of offsetting adjustments. Do you recall
19	they were going into service, we were providing that	19	those questions?
20	type of information. And we provided, you know,	20	A. Yes.
21	identified which of those projects then were delayed	21	Q. And did you describe in your testimony the end
22	into 2021. So yes, there was no surprises there	22	of period customer count adjustment that Cascade
23	should have been no surprises in those projects. We	23	considered?
24	initially proposed 15 discrete projects. We ultimately	24	A. Yes, we identified it as as a major
25	ended up at ten.	25	offsetting factor. So we went went with what we felt
	Page 216		Page 218
1		1	
2	Q. And Staff had asked a few questions or my apologies, Mr. Callaghan had asked a few questions about	1 2	was above and beyond and included all new customers as an as an offset. Not trying to specifically identify
3	providing contemporaneous documentation of the Company's	3	those customers, just specifically associated with the
4	decisionmaking throughout the process and suggesting	4	blanket projects. But we were being conservative, so we
5	that Cascade should have been providing updates on a	5	took into account all new customers.
6	moment-to-moment basis about whether these projects were	6	We did identify up front that that initial
7	still prudent. Do you recall that that line of	7	customer count was a projection that would also then be
8	questioning?	8	trued up at the end of of the calendar year to
9	A. Yes.	9	coincide with the actual plant that was going into
10	Q. And in general for the the capital project,	10	service at the same time.
11	is that something that after Cascade decides to to	11	Q. And, Mr. Parvinen, do you recall whether there
12	start one of its projects, does it keep after it	12	were any other Cascade witnesses that addressed the end
13	started, does it keep evaluating and reevaluating that	13	of period customer count?
14	decision?	14	A. Mr. Myhrum did as well.
15	A. Well, that would be a question more specific	15	MS. PEASE: Thank you. No further
16	to to Mr. Darras.	16	questions.
17	Q. Okay. I guess one one point of confusion	17	JUDGE HOWARD: AWEC has also indicated cross
18	that I think there may be is with respect to the	18	for this witness. Mr. Stokes, you may proceed.
19	Company's reevaluation of projects with respect to COVID	19	MR. STOKES: Thank you.
20	and continuing to proceed with these projects sort of in	20	
21	the normal course of business. And I guess I I had	21	EXAMINATION
22	wondered if that was something that you could comment	22	BY MR. STOKES:
23		23	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen.
24 25	A. Well, I know as part of that process, it was a	24	A. Good afternoon.
25	kind of a long, tedious process. At the time we were	25	Q. Can you hear me okay?
		1	

48 (Pages 215 to 218)

	Page 219		Page 221
1 A. Yes, I can.		1 box	settlement, so no specific adjustments were
-	ve a few questions for you about	1	luded.
	osal to use end of period rate base, and	1	. Well, that's not what I'm asking. So so
	to page 5 of your rebuttal testimony,		ich were included in your original filing in the last
-	know when you get there.	1	se and also included in this case? There's four of
6 A. All right. I'r			m. Would you agree subject to check that that
•	I I'm specifically looking at lines 2		ludes the Wallula Gate Station, the Bellingham high
8 through 5.		1	essure line, the Arlington Gate Station, and the
-	stimony that Cascade assumed that		erdeen high pressure line?
-	ncontested because that was Cascade's		. Yes.
11 proposal in the (	Company's last general rate case, in	1	. Okay. And as we heard this morning, the
12 <b>190210?</b>		1	erdeen Project has now been removed from Cascade's
	scade's view, we we viewed that		ng in this case because it's not yet in service,
- ,	ve did assume it would be uncontested		rect?
	riteria that that we had explored in		. Correct.
	existed here too.		. Okay. In your initial filing in the last rate
	sides Cascade, did any any party		se, Cascade included pro forma a pro forma plant
-	ebuttal testimony in that case besides		dition for the Wallula Gate Station Project with an
	e, well, black box settlement?		pected operation date of December 31st, 2019, correct?
20 A. No.			. Correct.
	all if the EOP was addressed was		. Okay. And that that project was not actually
-	black box settlement or was it only		ced in in service in 2019, right?
addressed in Ca	-		
	addressed in Cascade's filing.		. So when was that that project placed in
-	because no rate base adjustments were	1	vice
	•		
	Page 220		Page 222
1 agreed to in the	black box settlement, isn't it a	1 A	A. We did, on figure 1 for Mr. Darras's
2 misrepresentation	on to say that the issue was uncontested	2 0	Q. December 31st I believe it was
3 because a settle	ment by its nature is a compromised	3 <b>De</b>	cember 31st, 2020, correct?
4 decision?		4	MS. PEASE: If you could provide a page
5 A. It is, and I v	would I would agree with I	5 ref	erence, Counsel, that would be helpful.
6 would agree with	that. It was Cascade's viewpoint that	6 A	A. Was this the Wallula Gate?
7 it was unconteste	ed.	7 BY	MR. STOKES:
8 Q. Okay.		8 (	Q. Yes, correct.
9 A. In reality, y	es, a settlement is a settlement,	9 A	A. Yeah, December 29th, 2020.
10 it's particularly a	black box.	10 0	Q. 29th, okay. Thank you.
11 Q. Okay. I'm	going to now switch gears and ask you	11	So why wasn't the Wallula Gate Station
12 a few questions	about pro forma capital additions and	12 <b>Pr</b>	oject
13 specifically the p	pro forma capital additions that	13	THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Stokes, this is the
14 Cascade include	ed in its filing in UG-190210, which were	14 co	urt reporter. I can't hear
15 also included in	this filing, okay?	15	JUDGE HOWARD: You're breaking up,
16 A. Okay.		16 Mr	. Stokes.
17 Q. So in in g	your last rate case, did any party	17	MR. STOKES: Sorry about that. Not sure
18 besides Cascade	e file testimony on pro forma capital	18 wh	at happened there.
19 additions beside	es testimony in support of the black box	19 BY	MR. STOKES:
20 settlement?		20 0	2. So why wasn't the Wallula Gate Station Project
21 A. No.		21 pla	aced into service in 2019?
22 Q. Okay. Whi	ich pro forma capital additions were	22 A	A. Mr. Darras in his rebuttal testimony provides
23 included in the la	ast rate case and also included in this	23 inf	ormation on why that wasn't in or in his direct
24 case?		24 tes	timony.
25 A. Well, again	, the last rate case was the black	25 🤇	Q. Okay.

	Page 223		Page 225
1	A. And I'm not recalling the specifics on why.	1	Cascade?
2	Q. Okay. When did Cascade know that the Wallula	2	MS. PEASE: Just just a few questions.
3	Gate Station Project would not be in service in 2019?	3	
4	A. I don't recall that either. I do know that in	4	EXAMINATION
5	our 2019 rate case, similar to this case, we proposed	5	BY MS. PEASE:
6	those projects that were intended to be in service by	6	Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, Mr. Stokes had asked you about
7	the end of 2019. But that case was resolved long before	7	EOP rate base and whether it would be a
8	we got to the end of 2019.	8	misrepresentation to say that it was uncontested in
9	Q. Was the timing of the in-service date of the	9	in the last case. Do you recall that line of
10	Wallula Gate Station Project or any of the other three	10	questioning?
11	projects that are also in the filing addressed in either	11	A. Yes.
12	the settlement agreement or the hearing in UG-190210?	12	Q. And I I just wanted to ask a clarifying
13	A. No.	13	question there.
14	Q. So in the last rate case, did the parties	14	I I think that wasn't wasn't quite what
15	establish a rate base amount?	15	you were saying. I think what I guess, could you
16	A. No.	16	could you explain what your perspective was in in
17	Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 14 of your rebuttal	17	your initial testimony as to what what parties had
18	testimony in MPP-2T.	18	agreed to in the in the last case and whether
19	A. All right. I'm there.	19	whether it was contested?
20	Q. Okay. And you quote the portion of the	20	A. Well, based on the direction the case was going,
21	settlement agreement from from the last rate case,	21	the settlement discussions, the data requests, that
22	and do you do you agree that the settlement stated	22	was it appeared to Cascade that that was not an issue
23	that no plant additions were deemed to be included or	23	of contention.
24	excluded from the agreed upon revenue requirement?	24	Q. Okay. Thank you.
25	A. Yes.	25	A. If I didn't answer the question, I apologize.
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Page 224		Page 226
1	Q. Okay. So in your opinion, how can plant not be	1	Q. That's okay.
2	considered included or excluded from revenue	2	MS. PEASE: I have nothing further.
3	requirement?	3	JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from
4	A. I believe that that language was put in there to	4	the bench for Mr. Parvinen?
5	identify that no plant was treated from a prudence	5	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, and I will
6	standpoint to be accepted and included.	6	start.
7	Q. And if you look at the following sentence, that	7	
8	the parties other than Cascade retain the right to	8	EXAMINATION
9	challenge in future proceedings the recovery of	9	BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
10	investments not yet explicitly included in rates, isn't	10	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen.
10		11	A. Good afternoon.
11	that in a sense reserving the right of parties other		
	that in a sense reserving the right of parties other than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in	12	Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was
11			
11 12	than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in	12	Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was
11 12 13	than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases?	12 13	Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning?
11 12 13 14	than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases? A. Yes.	12 13 14	Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning? A. Yes.
11 12 13 14 15	than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases? A. Yes. Q. Is there anything in the record in UG-190210	12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you heard the questions about the load</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in the record in UG-190210 that indicates that certain projects would not be in service and would be included in a later rate case?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you heard the questions about the load study that she suggested that we talk to you about?</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in the record in UG-190210 that indicates that certain projects would not be in service and would be included in a later rate case?</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you heard the questions about the load study that she suggested that we talk to you about?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in the record in UG-190210 that indicates that certain projects would not be in service and would be included in a later rate case?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you heard the questions about the load study that she suggested that we talk to you about?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So at this time, does the Company have a</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in the record in UG-190210 that indicates that certain projects would not be in service and would be included in a later rate case?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. When does Cascade intend on filing its</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you heard the questions about the load study that she suggested that we talk to you about?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So at this time, does the Company have a written plan with timelines for how it is planning to</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in the record in UG-190210 that indicates that certain projects would not be in service and would be included in a later rate case?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. When does Cascade intend on filing its next rate case?</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you heard the questions about the load study that she suggested that we talk to you about?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So at this time, does the Company have a written plan with timelines for how it is planning to complete its load study other than what is in</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in the record in UG-190210 that indicates that certain projects would not be in service and would be included in a later rate case?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. When does Cascade intend on filing its next rate case?</li> <li>A. This question was asked to Ms. Kivisto earlier</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you heard the questions about the load study that she suggested that we talk to you about?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So at this time, does the Company have a written plan with timelines for how it is planning to complete its load study other than what is in Ms. Kivisto's testimony?</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in the record in UG-190210 that indicates that certain projects would not be in service and would be included in a later rate case?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. When does Cascade intend on filing its next rate case?</li> <li>A. This question was asked to Ms. Kivisto earlier this morning, and we honestly don't know. A lot depends</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning? <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. Okay. So you heard the questions about the load study that she suggested that we talk to you about? <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So at this time, does the Company have a written plan with timelines for how it is planning to complete its load study other than what is in Ms. Kivisto's testimony? <ul> <li>A. Specific specifically no due to the the</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>than Cascade to challenge the prudence of projects in future cases?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is there anything in the record in UG-190210 that indicates that certain projects would not be in service and would be included in a later rate case?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. When does Cascade intend on filing its next rate case?</li> <li>A. This question was asked to Ms. Kivisto earlier this morning, and we honestly don't know. A lot depends on the outcome of this rate case and</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Were you on this session when Ms. Kivisto was testifying this morning? <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. Okay. So you heard the questions about the load study that she suggested that we talk to you about? <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So at this time, does the Company have a written plan with timelines for how it is planning to complete its load study other than what is in Ms. Kivisto's testimony? <ul> <li>A. Specific specifically no due to the the kind of the unknown still. We have a general we have</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>

50 (Pages 223 to 226)

	Page 227		Page 229
1	but we do not have specific dates, timelines when things	1	
2	would be implemented. We do have a budget for 2021 and	2	EXAMINATION
3	'22, and part of that project requires at this point,	3	BY CHAIR DANNER:
4	you know, the next step in the process for the fixed	4	Q. Mr. Parvinen, the agreement to do a load study
5	network is to go talk to the electric utilities, for	5	was four years ago, 2017. Are there meeting notes or
6	example, in our service territory to get agreements to	6	contemporary notes that show that you've initiated
7	be able to put our equipment on there. So those	7	something that you could share with us to show that you
8	become those discussions then become	8	have been making progress towards at least beginning a
9	Q. Okay. But	9	load study?
10	A it could make it un a little	10	A. Yes, and and Ms. Kivisto pointed out that she
11	uncontrollable, unknown.	11	could in her initial testimony provided an update on
12	Q. So so, Mr. Parvinen, for a project of this	12	where we were in the study, the timeline on how this
13	magnitude, which is what is described in Ms. Kivisto's	13	started, because it initially started back in our 2015
14	testimony, wouldn't it make sense to have an actual plan	14	rate case. So we agreed to do a load study in the 2015
15	with steps of what you're going to do or is this a plan	15	rate case. Then by the 2017 rate case, we went down an
16	that is in somebody's head?	16	avenue that we thought was appropriate and we worked
17	A. No, we do have I mean, I'm not sure how well	17	you know, we worked with Staff. We found out that was
18	written out the plan is. So we do have so we do have	18	not what parties were thinking.
19	a plan. We're and I'm not sure the status of	19	So we reconfigured at that point in 2017 rate
20	where where we will be having a project manager	20	case. We did point out that it would take that our
21	for this project. Whether that person has been defined	21	preferred path was to install a fixed network. That
22	yet or not not, I'm not aware I'm not sure.	22	wasn't in the immediate immediate future, but at the
23	But then for you know, then from there, we do	23	same time, we would be replacing our FERCs associated
24	have our capital budget. We have to look at where we	24	with our meters that could potentially get get data
25	can do the most good. So we do have a we do have a	25	that way. But it was known at that time that this was
	Page 228		Page 230
1	plan, it just may not be formally written out and	1	not going to be an immediate project. It would take us
2	because of like I said, some of the unknown timeline	2	several years to do and then we'd have to reevaluate the
3	parameters.	3	data.
4	Q. So I guess what I would like to ask is a bench	4	So but we we did put in place in 2017 and for
5	request is for the Company's plan. And if there is no	5	ratemaking purposes how we would handle that in the
6	one consolidated plan, I would like to see the budget	6	meantime. So we don't believe that we're behind
7 8	documents, the proposal for a project manager, any discussions that might be occurring at the board level	7	behind the schedule other than, you know, the requirement from the from the WAC WAC rule change
9	for pursuing this plan. Do you understand what I'm	9	that requires a load study do a cost of service study.
10	asking?	10	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Commissioner
11	A. Yes, I believe so. And there's kind of two	11	Rendahl, I'm sorry for the interruption.
12	components too. So this is the network to be able to	12	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, it's not an
13	collect the data for the load study. At the same time,	13	interruption, and are there other questions you would
14	we are also will be having to analyze the data that	14	like to ask because there are a few others I could ask,
15	we have collected, which will be relevant to put on a	15	a different different topic, but I defer to you if
16	load study.	16	you have something
17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So, Judge	17	CHAIR DANNER: No, go right go right
18	Howard, we can formalize this into a bench request to	18	ahead. I think that we'll do a bench request regarding
19	submit to the Company after the hearing.	19	this.
20	JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.	20	
21	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I have	21	EXAMINATION
22	questions, but if my colleagues have some questions, I	22	BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
23	will defer to them.	23	Q. So, Mr. Parvinen, referring to pro forma plant,
24	CHAIR DANNER: Just a second. I just want	24	and there's been a lot of discussion about that in your
25	to follow up on this.	25	testimony and others, in your rebuttal testimony, and I
		1	

51 (Pages 227 to 230)

Docket No. UG-200568 - Vol. III - 2/24/2021

Page 231		Page 233
	1	Commission orders, and I was going to bring that up.
		And in previous Commission orders, we have directed
		Cascade to put the EDIT balances in I believe it's FERC
		Account 254, the other regulatory liabilities, and so
-		is are those balances going into those accounts?
		A. Yes.
	7	Q. Okay. So then if that is the case, then why
	1	were you not able to respond to a data request from AWEC
		related to how producing EDIT balances and I will
	10	refer you to Mr. Mullins' cross-answering testimony
5 5 i	11	where he had expressed some concerns that Cascade was
Q. And for the	12	unable to produce EDIT balances because they were not
A. And for the adjustment would be based on that	13	separated from ADIT balances.
-	14	A. Sorry, I guess I'm a little confused. I thought
Q. So both the pro forma plant adjustment and the	15	we had responded to those to those questions, so I
removal and retirement adjustment would both be end of	16	don't have a clear answer for you.
period?	17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Commissioner
A. Yes.	18	Balasbas, can I follow up?
Q. Okay.	19	COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Please.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Again, I'll defer to	20	
my colleagues if there are other questions.	21	EXAMINATION
COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I do have a couple	22	BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
of questions for Mr. Parvinen.	23	Q. So I guess the question is, are you separately
////	24	accounting for the protected and the unprotected or
////	25	A. Yes.
Page 232		Page 234
_	1	
-		Q is the protected and unprotected in one account?
		A. No, they are in separate accounts.
		Q. Okay.
		A. If I could clarify, I think what got confusing
		was the refund of those since we aren't tracking those
-		kind of separately and passing those back to customers,
	8	it was the corresponding reduction in revenue that was
	9	the confusing aspect.
-	10	I think we did did get that did get that
	11	clarified, and we did put on my rebuttal testimony
account, which is direct offset the rate base. So going	12	kind of explained, goes back to the history of deferrals
back to pre pre pre-tax reform, the deferred tax	13	where you have when you create the deferral, you have
is recorded at the 35 percent rate. So now you	14	a net income impact, but when you do the amortization,
basically have two accounts; one at the 21 percent and	15	it works out there is no net income impact. I may have
then the excess at 15 percent.	16	just gotten totally off topic with what you were talking
So it's still a hundred percent offset to the	17	about, sorry.
rate base. That 15 percent is then tracked separately	18	Q. No problem.
per the per the order in our last rate case, rate	19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have one other
case before, sorry, the 2017 rate case. We we	20	question unless, Mr. Commissioner Balasbas, you would
tracked that account separately and true it up annually.	21	like to go forward.
The	22	BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. Okay. So just to okay. I I think you may	23	Q. So in looking at your rebuttal testimony,
have maybe already answered this, but going to ask this question directly anyway. And you referred to previous	24	Mr. Parvinen, you you commit at page 37 of your rebuttal testimony to excluding all supplemental tariff
	<ul> <li>A. And for the adjustment would be based on that end of period amount, yes.</li> <li><b>9.</b> So both the proforma plant adjustment and the removal and retirement adjustment would both be end of period?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li><b>9.</b> Okay.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Again, I'll defer to my colleagues if there are other questions.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I do have a couple of questions for Mr. Parvinen.</li> <li>////</li> <li>////</li> <li>////</li> <li>Page 232</li> <li>E X A MINATION</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER BALASBAS:</li> <li><b>9.</b> Good afternoon, Mr. Parvinen.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li><b>9.</b> Switching subjects now. I'd like to ask you some questions about excess deferred income tax.</li> <li>And my first question is, how is Cascade accounting for protected and unprotected EDIT in its regulated books of account?</li> <li>A. So the protected EDITs is shows in a 1 believe it's a 256 regulatory regulatory liability account, which is direct offset the rate base. So going back to pre pre pre-tax reform, the deferred tax is recorded at the 35 percent rate. So now you basically have two accounts; one at the 21 percent and then the excess at 15 percent.</li> <li>So it's still a hundred percent offset to the rate base. That 15 percent is then tracked separately per the per the order in our last rate case, rate case before, sorry, the 2017 rate case. We we tracked that account separately and true it up annually.</li> </ul>	24 and going onto page 25, where you explain the offsetting removal and retirement adjustment; are you seeing that?       3         A. Yes.       4         A. Yes.       5         Q. Okay. Does - does Cascade's proposed proforma plant adjustment and the associated removal and retirement adjustment use end of period or average of monthly averages; do you know?       9         A. I guess that would be reflecting end of period for the investment, yes.       11         Q. And for the -       12         A. And for the adjustment would be based on that end of period amount, yes.       11         Q. So both the proforma plant adjustment and the removal and retirement adjustment would both be end of period?       17         A. Yes.       18         Q. Okay.       20         COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Again, I'll defer to my colleagues if there are other questions.       21         COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I do have a couple of questions for Mr. Parvinen.       23         ////////////////////////////////////

52 (Pages 231 to 234)

	Page 235		Page 237
1	schedules from future general rate cases. So do you	1	A. At the Washington Utilities and Transportation
2	plan to develop an adjustment in future rate cases to	2	Commission as a regulatory analyst.
3	remove all supplemental tariff schedules, revenues, and	3	Q. And as part of your work there, did you prepare
4	costs in a transparent manner?	4	testimony and exhibits for this case?
5	A. Yes, yes, we do. Theoretically, it will work	5	A. I did.
6	out to zero net income impact, but we will do that	6	Q. And are those Exhibits DJP-1T through DJP-8T?
7	presentation and and show supporting work papers for	7	A. That's correct.
8	it.	8	Q. All right. And do you have any amendments or
9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I have no	9	corrections to those testimony or exhibits today?
10	further questions.	10	A. No, I do not.
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any further	11	Q. All right. Thank you.
12	questions from the bench for this witness?	12	MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Panco is
13	CHAIR DANNER: No.	13	available for cross-examination.
14	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hearing none, we are	14	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
15	now turning to Staff's witnesses. No party has	15	Cascade has indicated cross for this
16	designated Chris McGuire or Kristen Hillstead	16	witness, and you may proceed.
17	cross-examination. Are there any questions from the	17	MS. PEASE: Thank you. And for the record,
18	bench for McGuire or Hillstead at this time?	18	this is Jocelyn Pease for Cascade.
19	Hearing none, the next witness would be	19	
20	David Panco for Staff. Mr. Panco, are you on the line?	20	EXAMINATION
21	MR. PANCO: Yes, I am.	21	BY MS. PEASE:
22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, could	22	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Panco.
23	we take a ten-minute break now?	23	A. Hello.
24	JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Let's take a	24	Q. Can you see me and hear me okay?
25	ten-minute break and return at 3:05 if that works. All	25	A. I can.
	Page 236		Page 238
1	right. We are off the record.	1	Q. Okay, great.
2	(A break was taken from	2	A. And if at any time you can't hear or see me,
3	2:56 p.m. to 3:05 p.m.)	3	please speak up.
4	JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record	4	Q. Certainly.
5	after a short break. The next witness is David Panco	5	A. Or gesture.
6	for Staff. Mr. Panco, please turn on your video and I	6	Q. Would you please refer to your response
7	will and raise your right hand and I will swear you	7	testimony Exhibit DJP-1T at page 2, and let me know when
8	in.	8	you're there.
9	MR. PANCO: It's on and showing in front of	9	A. My goodness, I started at page 3, so my copy
10	me. Can you hear me and see me?	10	starts at page 3. Do you want to just run the question?
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Sometimes it takes a	11	It must be very introductory.
12	moment to pop up, but I can hear and see you now.	12	Q. Sure.
13	(David Panco sworn.)	13	In this section of your testimony, you state
14	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	14	that you either submitted or drafted testimony regarding
15	Mr. Callaghan, would you please introduce	15	pro forma capital projects for Cascade's three most
16	the witness?	16	recent rate cases is; is that correct?
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.	17	A. That's correct.
18		18	Q. And in each of those cases, did you review the
19		19	Company's testimony and exhibits regarding the pro forma
20	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:	20	capital projects?
21	Q. Mr. Panco, would you please state your full name	21	A. Yes, I did.
22	and spell your last name for the record?	22 23	Q. Based on this experience, would you say that you
23 24	A. David Panco, P, as in papa, a-n-c-o.	23	are familiar with Cascade's presentation of information about its pro forma capital projects?
24 25	Q. Thank you. And where are you employed?	24	A. I would think that I'm fairly familiar with it,
20	And where are you employed ?	20	

53 (Pages 235 to 238)

	Page 239	Page 241
1	Ves.	1 <b>Q. Yes.</b>
2	Q. Okay. Could you please refer to your response	2 On on line 5, the same page, page 11, you
3	testimony at page 11.	<ul> <li>3 state that the the Exhibit PCD-1, Mr. Darras's</li> </ul>
4	A. I'm at that page.	<ul> <li>4 initial testimony, also describes Company's blanket</li> </ul>
5	Q. And specifically lines 1 through 8. In this	5 funding projects; is that correct?
6	section of your testimony, you refer to Mr. Darras's	6 A. That's what it says.
7	testimony; is that correct?	7 Q. And did you review the Company's testimony in
8	A. That's correct, and also to MCP-6.	8 its initial filing regarding the blanket funding
9	Q. Okay. And, Mr. Panco, you reviewed Mr. Darras's	9 projects?
10	initial testimony in this case; is that correct?	10 A. I did at that time, yes.
11	A. That's correct.	11 Q. And based on your prior experience reviewing
12	Q. And you state here that the Company provided	12         Cascade's pro forma plant projects, would you say that
13	detail regarding the pro forma capital projects; do you	13 you're generally familiar with the projects that the
14	see that?	14 Company refers to as blanket funding projects?
15	A. It was narrative detail about the projects, yes.	15 A. The presentation this time was more complicated,
16	There were some holes in some of the financial data that	16 especially as the revised versions and the responses to
17	was provided, though.	17 the data requests started rolling in.
18	Q. Okay. And in that narrative detail, would you	18 <b>Q. I I think you didn't quite answer my</b>
19	agree that the Company provided detail regarding the	19 question. Would you say
20	discrete pro forma capital projects including the	20 A. Will you ask it again and I'll try to?
21	project need and analysis of alternatives?	21 <b>Q. Certainly, certainly.</b>
22	A. They did, but I would qualify that with that	22 Based on your prior experience reviewing the
23	information having been provided prior to having	23 Cascade pro forma plant adjustments in in the earlier
24	provided the financial and cost information that I	cases, would you say that you are generally familiar
25	typically would have reviewed before even considering	with the projects that the Company refers to as blanket
		······ ···· ··· ······················
	Page 240	Page 242
1	any of the other data.	1 funding projects? Is that
2	Q. And was there any cost information in that	2 A. The
3	initial filing?	3 Q a familiar term for you?
4	A. I'd have to go back, I have it here, and review	4 A. I would have to go back to those records and
5	it. Quite frankly	5 check to see if those were terms that were used. Those
6	Q. Based on your recollection, would you agree that	6 cases were considered several years ago. I don't tend
7	there were budget figures provided?	7 to hold things in my head.
8	A. There were comparisons of the options. I don't	8 Q. Okay. From your from your review of the
9	know that there were specific budget figures provided.	9 Company's three most recent cases, would you agree that
10	I believe they were provided in in PCD-2, that was	10 in the initial testimony provided by Mr. Darras that
11	then replaced with revised PCD-2 in response to Staff's	11 there was more narrative detail in support for the pro
12	DR No. 89.	12 forma projects?
13	Q. Okay. And in in looking at PCD-2, would you	13 A. It was definitely a larger volume of narrative
14	agree that there were estimated cost figures there?	14 in support of the projects, and there was also a more
15	A. There were. There were also figures stated as	15 detailed description of the capitaling capital
16	actual cost figures, there was some confusion on my	16 budgeting process the Company uses; however, I was not
17	part, because some of those actual cost figures were	17 really looking for capital budgets. I was looking for
18	atata difan dataa in tha futuna that wana alaa atata diaa	18 costs of actual projects completed. So I was finding
	stated for dates in the future that were also stated as	
19	actual in-services dates which is what led to that data	19 that to be somewhat distracting.
19 20	actual in-services dates which is what led to that data request.	<ol> <li>that to be somewhat distracting.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Panco, could you please refer to the</li> </ol>
19 20 21	actual in-services dates which is what led to that data request. Q. Okay. Please refer to your still on your	<ol> <li>that to be somewhat distracting.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Panco, could you please refer to the</li> <li>cross-exhibit designated as DJP-9X?</li> </ol>
19 20 21 22	actual in-services dates which is what led to that data request. Q. Okay. Please refer to your still on your testimony page 11, still lines 1 through 8. You state	<ol> <li>that to be somewhat distracting.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Panco, could you please refer to the</li> <li>cross-exhibit designated as DJP-9X?</li> <li>A. That would be the testimony from 170929,</li> </ol>
19 20 21 22 23	actual in-services dates which is what led to that data request. Q. Okay. Please refer to your still on your testimony page 11, still lines 1 through 8. You state here that the Company described its blanket funding	<ol> <li>that to be somewhat distracting.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Panco, could you please refer to the</li> <li>cross-exhibit designated as DJP-9X?</li> <li>A. That would be the testimony from 170929,</li> <li>correct?</li> </ol>
19 20 21 22	actual in-services dates which is what led to that data request. Q. Okay. Please refer to your still on your testimony page 11, still lines 1 through 8. You state	<ol> <li>that to be somewhat distracting.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Panco, could you please refer to the</li> <li>cross-exhibit designated as DJP-9X?</li> <li>A. That would be the testimony from 170929,</li> </ol>

Docket No. UG-200568 - Vol. III - 2/24/2021

	Page 243		Page 245
1		1 4 4	
1	A. It appears to be, yes.		correct, yes.
2	Q. Do you recall why you revised this testimony?		And at lines 9 through 10, you state that you
3	A. I don't at the moment.		king to heart the Commission's admonition to avoid
4	Q. Okay. If you refer to page 9.		e cutoffs with regard to pro forma plant
5	A. That would be page 9 of the exhibit. Do you		ments; is that right?
6	have the page number in the testimony? Because I have		That is correct.
7	the original testimony here in front of me.		And I think this is similar to what you're
8	Q. Yes, it's page 9 of the exhibit and page 7 of		about the noncontiguous service territory. At
9	the revised testimony. I guess the questions you had		s 12 through 15, you're also distinguishing
10	A. Thank you. That's with table 1 on it, I have		en electric utility investment and natural gas LDC
11	that.		ment; do you see that testimony?
12	Q. Correct, correct.	12 A.	
13	And there's some red line red line there; do		And you specifically state, (as read) Natural
14	you see that?	-	cal distribution companies such as Cascade invest
15	A. I'm sorry, I only have the the the Docket		ny small individual projects such as main or
16	170929. I I don't have a printer access to a	-	tor replacements. This distinguishes them from
17	printer and I'm working from my home, so I was using the		c utilities where major high-dollar projects such
18	information that I had with me. But if you point out	-	nerating plants dominate the investment dollars; do
19	that red line to me, I would be glad to mark it on my	-	ee that testimony?
20	copy.		That is what that says at lines 14 and 15.
21	Q. I it probably isn't the most important to		And in describing and for for the record,
22	make here most important point to make here, so I		the exhibit that's for me lines 12 through 15.
23	can I can just move on. I think, though, I'll		gain, it sounds like we have different
24	I'll be mindful that it appears we have different		ent copies.
25	copies, and I will try to coordinate as far as specific	25 <b>I</b> r	n describing the small projects as main or
	Page 244		Page 246
1	references to make sure we're we're looking at the	1 regula	ted replacements, would you agree that these would
2	same documents.	-	same type of projects that the Company might
3	A. Yeah, apologies. I don't get into the office		o as blanket projects?
4	that frequently, and as I said, I'm not able to use my		They may be. I would also qualify that with
5	home printer with my work computer.		that when this testimony was written, I had been
6	Q. Okay. So my next reference is to page 6 of the		Commission half the time that I have been now,
7	exhibit, lines 8 through 19 and I'll try to	7 and so	it could be that perspective has shifted through
8	A. Were all these pro forma plant additions in		ny perspective and Staff's perspective and my
9	service by the of the 2019, is that where we're	9 perspe	ective on behalf of Staff.
10	starting?		Well, that's I think getting at my next
11	Q. 4 it would look like page 4 I think of the	11 questi	on.
12	exhibit, and it's the Q and A starting with, (as read)	12 <b>V</b>	/ould you agree that the distinction you
13	How did Staff define the thresholds for major plant	13 highlig	phted between LDC investments and electric
	additions in this case.	14 invest	ments is still an accurate and relevant
14			
14 15	A. I found that.	15 observ	ation that would apply equally today in this
			<i>v</i> ation that would apply equally today in this eding?
15	A. I found that.	16 proce	
15 16	<ul><li>A. I found that.</li><li>Q. Okay. In this section, your testimony explains</li></ul>	16 <b>procee</b> 17 A. I	eding?
15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I found that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In this section, your testimony explains how Staff defined the Commission's major resource</li> </ul>	16 <b>procee</b> 17 A. I	eding? believe that you're not building wind farms or
15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I found that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In this section, your testimony explains how Staff defined the Commission's major resource threshold in this case; is that right?</li> </ul>	16         process           17         A.         I           18         nuclea         I           19         yes.         I	eding? believe that you're not building wind farms or
15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I found that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In this section, your testimony explains how Staff defined the Commission's major resource threshold in this case; is that right?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>	16         process           17         A.         I           18         nucleas         I           19         yes.         I           20         Q.         I	eding? believe that you're not building wind farms or r generating plants, so if that's what you mean,
15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I found that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In this section, your testimony explains how Staff defined the Commission's major resource threshold in this case; is that right?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. And specifically, you are articulating Staff's</li> </ul>	16         process           17         A.         I           18         nucleas         I           19         yes.         I           20         Q.         I           21         read) \$         I	eding? believe that you're not building wind farms or r generating plants, so if that's what you mean, n the next sentence here, you explain, (as
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I found that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In this section, your testimony explains how Staff defined the Commission's major resource threshold in this case; is that right?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. And specifically, you are articulating Staff's rationale for departing from the use of a percentage of</li> </ul>	16         process           17         A.         I           18         nucleas         I           19         yes.         I           20         Q.         I           21         read) \$         I           22         define         I	eding? believe that you're not building wind farms or r generating plants, so if that's what you mean, n the next sentence here, you explain, (as Staff offers a broader notion of major, which
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I found that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In this section, your testimony explains how Staff defined the Commission's major resource threshold in this case; is that right?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. And specifically, you are articulating Staff's rationale for departing from the use of a percentage of rate base and setting a setting a threshold for a</li> </ul>	16         process           17         A.         I           18         nucleas         I           19         yes.         Q.         I           20         Q.         I         I           21         read) \$         I         I           22         define         I         I           23         in the         I         I	eding? believe that you're not building wind farms or r generating plants, so if that's what you mean, n the next sentence here, you explain, (as Staff offers a broader notion of major, which s that term by a percentage of projects included
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I found that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In this section, your testimony explains how Staff defined the Commission's major resource threshold in this case; is that right?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. And specifically, you are articulating Staff's rationale for departing from the use of a percentage of rate base and setting a setting a threshold for a major resource; is that right?</li> </ul>	16         process           17         A.         I           18         nucleas         I           19         yes.         I           20         Q.         I           21         read) s         I           22         define         I           23         in the         I           24         A.         I	believe that you're not building wind farms or r generating plants, so if that's what you mean, In the next sentence here, you explain, (as Staff offers a broader notion of major, which s that term by a percentage of projects included test year; do you see that testimony?

55 (Pages 243 to 246)

	Page 247		Page 249
1	into this, and if I were trying to do time allocation	1	A. Yes, it would.
2	for analysis, I would be looking at the smaller number	2	Q. And would you agree, then, that these would be
3	of major projects involved. That's where that is being	3	the same items that the Company would call blanket
4	derived from.	4	funding projects?
5	Q. Okay. And I think if we move ahead to page 9 in	5	A. The blanket funding concept was a new concept to
6	the cross-exhibit or page I think's page 7 of your	6	me, and it was introduced as them being programmatic
7	exhibit, Mr. Panco, there's a discussion where you are	7	investments. And after discussion with other Staff, the
8	applying that broader notion of major.	8	position that Staff came to is that those projects were
9	A. That's correct.	9	not appropriate for consideration and pro forma in the
10	Q. Do you do you see that testimony?	10	current present case.
11	A. That's starting with the question, (as read) How	11	Q. Okay. Thank you.
12	did Staff determine which projects meet the major	12	Please refer to your response testimony at page
13	threshold?	13	3.
14	Q. That's right.	14	A. I'll be there in just a moment. I have that
15	So it opined the broader notion of major, you	15	page. I'm there.
16	state here that the top 20 percent of the projects will	16	Q. And you testified here that Cascade has placed
17	make up 80 percent of the total cost. Staff considered	17	only 6.9 million of plant in-service before
18	this method as applicable to the types of projects in	18	October 27th, 2020; is that correct?
19	which an LDC must engage; do you see that testimony?	19	A. That's is that's correct. That's what
20	A. This sentence actually starts, (as read) Nearly	20	Staff was able to verify from the data responses, which
21	always and a widespread selection of projects or costs	21	were coming through with a very confused set of uses of
22	the top 20 percent of the projects and goes on from	22	various terminologies, such as references to in-service
23	there.	23	dates, whether they were actual or estimated, and total
24	Q. Yes, yes. I was quoting an excerpt, yes.	24	cost numbers and whether those were realized or
25	A. I wanted to be clear how it started.	25	estimated, and they did not always appear to be
	Page 248		Page 250
1	Q. Certainly.	1	implicitly stated.
2	So you were proposing an approach that would	2	Q. And, Mr. Panco, it sounds like there might have
3	account for 80 percent of the Company's total pro forma	3	been some confusion in the discovery, and I think we've
4	costs; isn't that right?	4	heard some earlier testimony about that today.
5	A. We were using that as a baseline estimate as we	5	To the extent that that you had any questions
6	started to look at their projects. Having been handed a	6	or conditions about how the information was presented,
7	very large set of line item funding projects, that's	7	had you reached out to Cascade to seek to clarify that?
8	what we were trying to do, work it down to a size that	8	A. I had sent out subsequent data requests both to
9	was manageable to consider.	9 10	make it clear that they were intended to be continuous.
10	Q. And if you refer to table 1 on page 9, this is	11	And Cascade appeared to continue to offer updates
11 12	the list of projects that you had proposed should be allowed for cost recovery; is that right?	12	against their capital budget through their responses to Staff DR 92 I was looking primarily at the undates to
13	A. In that case, yes, it was.	13	Staff DR 92. I was looking primarily at the updates to PCB-2 that were coming in in response to Staff DP 89 as
13	<b>Q.</b> And table 1, could you please take a look at	14	PCB-2 that were coming in in response to Staff DR 89 as a more dependable source of information, because that
14	items one, seven, eight, and nine.	15	was allegedly at least providing project completion
16	Are these the main replacement or regulator	16	dates and not simply end of period book numbers of
17	station replacement projects that you had described	17	expenses dated to the same individual funding project
18	earlier in reference to the many small individual	18	line items.
19	projects typical of LDC investments?	19	Q. So, Mr. Panco, did you consider the responses to
20	A. I'm not certain at this point in time. It's	20	DR 92 in coming up with your recommendation?
21	been a long time since I've written this testimony.	21	A. I considered the responses to DR 89. I cannot
22	Q. Okay. Thank you.	22	confirm from the responses to DR 92 that the individual
	Would you agree that your recommendation here	23	funding project as listed were in service providing
23		1	01
23 24		24	Washington customers at known and measurable costs.
	likely included those types of projects; the regulator station and main replacement projects?	24 25	Washington customers at known and measurable costs. Q. And it sounds like there may have been some

56 (Pages 247 to 250)

	Page 251		Page 253
1	confusion over some of the labeling as to whether there	1	know, more information later.
2	were estimated or actual in-service dates. And I think	2	In DJP-5 at the bottom of the response, the last
3	Mr. Darras had sought to clarify some of that in his	3	paragraph says well, those two paragraphs pretty much
4	testimony earlier today, and then I think I also heard	4	sum it up. You know, it's like please see attached
5	you say that you might assume if there's an estimate	5	Exhibit PCD-2, UTC-89, UTC-92 and Exhibit PCD-2 updated
6	provided, that if it's for a date in the future, that it	6	PDF showing actual, quote, updated in-service states.
7	would be an estimate. But if it's for a date in the	7	I mean, that that was the kind of language I
8	past, it may very well be the actual date; is that	8	was getting to response to the DRs. And then it says,
9	right?	9	you know, more information will follow as it's
10	A. In in general, I agree with what you're	10	available.
11	saying.	11	Q. And so then did you decide that you wouldn't
12	Q. Okay. Circling back to your recommendation in	12	review the data included in DR 92 that was provided to
13	the case, just so we're we're we're all clear, the	13	you?
14	specific project that you included in in your figure	14	A. I reviewed it as it came in.
15	of \$6.9 million include the Moses Lake 4 inch PE	15	Q. Could we take a look at your Exhibit DJP-5?
16	Project, the Bellingham 8 inch HP, and two out of three	16	A. And that would be the Company's revised
17	funding projects associated with the Arlington Gate; is	17	supplemental response to Request 92, yes?
18	that correct?	18	Q. That's correct. Do you have it there?
19	A. That's correct.	19	A. I have it in front of me.
20	Q. And to be clear	20	Q. Okay. And I think we heard testimony earlier
21	A. Those were the actual costs as revised in	21	today that although this request on page 1 appears to be
22	Mr. Darras's responses to DR 89.	22	dated August 27th, that it was actually provided to
23	Q. And to be clear, your recommendation in this	23	Staff on October 27th. Did you did you hear that
24	case excludes all of the other discrete pro forma	24	testimony earlier today?
25	capital projects; is that correct?	25	A. Yes, I did, and I ascertained that from review
	Page 252		Page 254
1	A. I find it not possible to confirm that they're	1	of the attached files with that and when they were last
2	in place and in service at known and measurable prices,	2	modified, and that's the date that's listed in my
3	or costs rather, from the data that has been presented	3	response testimony as having truncated the analysis of
4	to me in the response to the data requests that we've	4	the investments to be included, the October 27 date.
5	had outstanding.	5	Q. Okay. So I think that was my next question.
6	Q. And your recommendation also excludes all of the		
		6	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that
7	Company's proposed blanket funding projects; is that	7	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct?
8	right?	7 8	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have
8 9	right? A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the	7 8 9	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys
8 9 10	<b>right?</b> A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not	7 8 9 10	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission.
8 9 10 11	<b>right?</b> A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that	7 8 9 10 11	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you
8 9 10 11 12	<b>right?</b> A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of	7 8 9 10 11 12	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the
8 9 10 11 12 13	<b>right?</b> A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	right? A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors. Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is impossible for me to read.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And you say with your review and evaluation for</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is impossible for me to read. Q. I also have
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And you say with your review and evaluation for the projects included in your recommendation, that you</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is impossible for me to read. Q. I also have A. I need a magnifying glass.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And you say with your review and evaluation for the projects included in your recommendation, that you are relying on only DR 89; is that correct?</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is impossible for me to read. Q. I also have A. I need a magnifying glass. Q a tiny copy and I think I
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And you say with your review and evaluation for the projects included in your recommendation, that you are relying on only DR 89; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I have to point out that the responses to those</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is impossible for me to read. Q. I also have A. I need a magnifying glass. Q a tiny copy and I think I A. I can
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And you say with your review and evaluation for the projects included in your recommendation, that you are relying on only DR 89; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I have to point out that the responses to those two DRs were cross-referencing each other and how many</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is impossible for me to read. Q. I also have A. I need a magnifying glass. Q a tiny copy and I think I A. I can Q I can try to do screen sharing, but I think
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And you say with your review and evaluation for the projects included in your recommendation, that you are relying on only DR 89; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I have to point out that the responses to those two DRs were cross-referencing each other and how many times the the lines like NCP-6 is the best</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is impossible for me to read. Q. I also have A. I need a magnifying glass. Q a tiny copy and I think I A. I can Q I can try to do screen sharing, but I think it might still look tiny
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And you say with your review and evaluation for the projects included in your recommendation, that you are relying on only DR 89; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I have to point out that the responses to those two DRs were cross-referencing each other and how many times the the lines like NCP-6 is the best information the Company has at this time, it I I</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is impossible for me to read. Q. I also have A. I need a magnifying glass. Q a tiny copy and I think I A. I can Q I can try to do screen sharing, but I think it might still look tiny A. That's fine.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. I stated earlier that Staff had come to the conclusion that the blanket projects were not appropriate for pro forma treatment, and I believe that was discussed quite a bit earlier today too in terms of the lack of provision of full offsetting factors.</li> <li>Q. And circling back to the responses to UTC DRs 89 and 92, you included those as exhibits to your testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And you say with your review and evaluation for the projects included in your recommendation, that you are relying on only DR 89; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I have to point out that the responses to those two DRs were cross-referencing each other and how many times the the lines like NCP-6 is the best</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So October 27th is your cutoff date; is that correct? A. October 27th was when I was requested to have testimony to be reviewed and turned over to attorneys for submission. Q. Okay. And referring to column G, would you agree that the information presented here includes the Company's proposed pro forma adjustment for pro forma plant balances as of September 30th, 2020? A. I would have to take your word for that. The copy of that that I have in front of me is is impossible for me to read. Q. I also have A. I need a magnifying glass. Q a tiny copy and I think I A. I can Q I can try to do screen sharing, but I think it might still look tiny

57 (Pages 251 to 254)

	Page 255		Page 257
1	So maybe we could run through a couple questions	1	MR. PANCO: I'm waiting for it to show up.
2	that are subject to check, and if you discover that	2	MR. CALLAGHAN: I just sent it, so any
3	that there's any difference, you can let us know. Or if	3	second now. Thank you.
4	you have an electronic version you can work with, we	4	MR. PANCO: Okay. I'm opening that file
5	can we can do that to.	5	now. I'm trying to get it large enough on this laptop
6	A. I have an electronic version I can work with it,	6	screen.
7	but I can't work with it simultaneously with being on	7	A. I have column I estimated in-service date, your
8	this conference call.	8	line numbers again were?
9	Q. Okay. So let's start this out subject to check.	9	BY MS. PEASE:
10	Referring to lines 18 and 12 for the Othello Gate	10	Q. The line numbers were 18 and 22 for the Othello
11	Project, would you agree that the in-service dates	11	Gate Project. And the question, would you agree that
12	provided in column I are September 18th, 2020, and	12	the in-service dates provided in column I are
13	August 28th, 2020, respectively?	13	September 18th, 2020, and August 28th, 2020,
14	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Panco, I believe you're	14	respectively?
15	cutting out.	15	A. This is not the Othello Gateway Project, line
16	MR. PANCO: Oh, I'm sorry, I was turning	16	18. This is above that, yes?
17	away from microphone trying to squint and read this.	17	Q. I'm sorry, what was exactly your comment,
18	I I can't read this copy that I have in front of me.	18	Mr. Panco, asking about the Othello
19	I I would gladly check the names of the projects	19	A. Can you give me the line numbers, please?
20	and but I can't confirm	20	Q. Yes, 18 and 22.
21	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Panco, if you have are	21	A. 18 reads 9/18/2020, 22 reads 8/28/20 on the copy
22	you on the Teams app on your on your computer here?	22	that I'm looking at on the screen
23	MR. PANCO: I'm on the Teams app on my	23	Q. Okay. That's that's what I was seeking to
24	laptop.	24	confirm.
25	JUDGE HOWARD: Are you	25	Okay. And referring to line 121 for the Othello
	Page 256		Page 258
1	MR. PANCO: So I only have the small screen	1	Gate Project, would you agree that the in-service date
2	available to me.	2	provided in column I is September 18th, 2020?
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Are you able to click to	3	A. Line 121?
4	Internet Explorer or however you have this document	4	Q. Mm-hmm.
5	saved electronically? Because the app will remain open	5	A. Is 9/18/2020.
6	and we will still be able to hear and see you and then	6	Q. And referring to line 16, which is funding
7	you will be to view the electronic version.	7	project 317322 for the Othello for the Arlington
8	MR. PANCO: That might take me a moment to	8	Gate, would you agree that the in-service date provided
9	find my way there. I apologize.	9	in column I is September 3rd, 2020?
10	JUDGE HOWARD: If you're able to to look	10	A. Yes, I would.
11	at that using like ALT tab or clicking on the menu bar	11	Q. But your recommendation in this case for pro
12	at the bottom.	12	forma plant through October 27th, 2020, did not include
13	MR. PANCO: I'm working my way through the	13	these projects; is that correct?
14	cross-exhibits for this this case and cases.	14	A. My recommendation was based on the responses to
15	A. Can I get the name of that exhibit again,	15	DR 89. As I said earlier, these these were
16	please?	16	considered to be end of period spending updates. That's
17	BY MS. PEASE:	17	how they were considered by me anyway.
18	Q. It's your exhibit, DJP-5.	18	Q. Okay. And still on this exhibit, let's refer
19	A. I'm sorry, that pulled up my testimony from	19	I'm I'm glad you got a copy that you can work with
20	170929. I'm going to a different place to try to come	20	because I have a couple additional questions.
21	up with this.	21	A. It's pretty marginal.
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: Mr. Panco, I can email you a	22	Q. Well, I appreciate I appreciate your bearing
23	copy if that would be helpful.	23	with us.
24 25	MR. PANCO: That would be great. MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. I will do that now.	24 25	If you refer to the note in pink at the top of page 2 of Exhibit DJP-5, would you agree that the
20	WIT. CALLAGHAN. OKAY. I WIII UU INAL HOW.	20	page 2 of Exhibit Dor-o, would you agree that the

58 (Pages 255 to 258)

	Page 259		Page 261
1	information presented here includes balances through	1	Staff's position.
2	September 30th, 2020?	2	Would you agree that one theoretically could
3	A. Sorry, I just lost the image on my screen. I'm	3	perform that review?
4	getting it back, though. And I'm having to resize it	4	A. I would agree that one theoretically could
5	again. Could you repeat the question, please?	5 p	perform the review.
6	Q. Certainly.	6	Q. Okay. And in this in this note at the top of
7	If you refer to the note in pink at the top of	7 t	he page, it specifies that the projects with the note
8	page 2 of this exhibit, would you agree that the	8 (	code 27 or 28 are the blanket projects; do you see that
9	information presented here includes balances through	9 r	note?
10	September 30th, 2020? I think you were referring to	10	A. I don't see it. I don't have that part of the
11	them as maybe the end of period or end of the month	-	bage up, but I recall having read that to you.
12	balances.	12	Q. Okay. And if you could look at line 34, DAF
13	A. The note in pink on my page 2 says, (as read)	13 <b>r</b>	neters, and the blanket code reference.
14	Projects with note code 27 or 28 in column twenty or	14	A. Page 28.
15	column H are blanket projects to keep accruing and	15	Q. And the total balance there as of
16	closed to plant service each. Plant is reflecting the		September 30th, 2020, is almost \$6 million; is that
17	current Cascade is reflecting the current balance in		ight? In column
18	the, and then it's cut off on my screen, and the funding	18	A. I'm showing I'm showing the I'm showing
19	project as of 9/30, 2020. In addition, these projects		hat in column G, but I'm not seeing the header to
20	are in place to be more than Cascade originally filed		column G unless I shrink the page and scroll down. So
21	for by yearend. Is that what you're referring to?		'm I'm not sure what date that would be the case.
22	Q. Yes. And I'm sorry, where did you say it was	22	Q. Okay. And if we look at the note code 27, which
23	cut off for you?		s I think starts on line 73 and continues through 108,
24 25	A. I I read the rest of it. I got the cutoff	24 <b>(</b> 25	to you see that note code 27 for those projects?
25	Q. You got it, you got it, okay.	25	A. Could you repeat those numbers, please?
	Page 260		Page 262
1	So as we discussed earlier, the projects in the	1	Q. Yeah. I hadn't planned to walk you through each
2	blanket funding category tend to be smaller projects; is		ndividual project
3	that right?	3	A. This is very tedious I'll have you know. I'm
4	A. Yes.		rying to do this on a very small screen. So I if
5	Q. And these smaller projects are completed		ou'll bear with me, I'll try to find the locations
6	throughout the year and accrue to the associating	-	ou're after.
7	associated funding project; is that right?	7	Q. Sure. Looking at lines 73 through 108, and in
8	A. I believe that's the intent.	8 <b>c</b>	column G there, if you scan those balances, would you
9	Q. And so if the balances for the blanket funding	9 <b>a</b>	gree that some of those balances are over a million
10	projects close every month, would you agree that it	10 <b>c</b>	Iollars?
11	would be possible to perform a midyear review of the	11	A. Starting at line 73?
12	investment for blanket projects year to date?	12	Q. Yes, between lines 73 and 108.
13	A. Sorry, I I I'm not understanding why a	13	A. I'm seeing values pretty much in the hundreds of
14	person would do that.	14 t	housands of dollars.
15	Q. The distinction being with blanket projects in	15	Q. Okay.
16	comparison with a bigger discrete project, that there's	16	A. So
17	smaller projects that are continually being accrued to	17	[Cross talking.]
18	this, to associated funding project, and distinct from	18	A 6,000.
19	the pro forma projects where you would need to complete	19	Q. Line 91, for example?
20	all of the investments to to have the the total	20	A. ls 1,035,068.99.
21	cost.	21	Q. And line 95, for example?
22	A. Staff in this case had already chosen to reject	22	A. I believe that you're finding examples on this
23	all of the blanket projects. I would not have had any		age of numbers that that do meet those criteria that
24 25	reason to do that midyear review.		ou stated.
25	Q. Okay. I appreciate your you clarifying	25	Q. Okay. Would you agree that some of the funding

59 (Pages 259 to 262)

	Page 263		Page 265
1	project balances in this exhibit are even greater than	1	that those are the numbers that were presented in PCD-4
2	the blanket funding project amounts that you had	2	and that's what they total to.
3	proposed for your recommendation in the Company's 2017	3	Q. Okay. And so the the question here, it seeks
4	case?	4	to confirm that the final costs for those projects as
5	A. In the 2017 case, I was working with a different	5	reflected in the Company's rebuttal filing is 7 million,
б	manager using different criteria for assessing projects.	6	eight hundred sorry, \$7,865,808; do you see that
7	And at that point in time, the recommendations that were	7	here?
8	made in 2017 were made. At this point in time, I'm	8	A. Yes, I do.
9	working with a Staff team, and I'm trying to follow that	9	Q. And in your response, you state that you did not
10	Staff team's advice and the decision was made not to	10	have sufficient time to examine and verify the costs
11	accept these projects.	11	that we now claim that are associated with funding
12	Q. Okay. One one final question on the blanket	12	project 317322; is that correct?
13	projects and then we can move on.	13	A. That's correct.
14	Did you ask any questions in discovery about the	14	Q. So you state that you cannot confirm that
15	blanket projects?	15	amount; is that correct?
16	A. Only in reference to having included them in the	16	A. I can confirm that it was stated in Mr. Darras's
17	continuous update request to MCP-6.	17	rebuttal testimony, but that was the first time I ever
18	Q. Thank you.	18	saw it.
19	A. Are we done with this exhibit now?	19	Q. And as you state in your in this response,
20 21	Q. Yes, we can be done with this exhibit now.	20 21	the Company's rebuttal testimony was filed on January 8th, 2021; is that correct?
21	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Thank you for your flexibility in working with</li> </ul>	22	A. That's correct.
22	what I recognize is a challenging situation while	23	Q. Would you agree that discovery was available in
24	we're we're also doing the cross-examination.	24	this case through January 29th, 2021?
25	A. Yeah, no, I apologize. I was I do not feel	25	A. I would. I would also point out, though, that I
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	Page 264		Page 266
1	as though I had adequate access to the data that you	1	was being asked questions that typically I would have
2	were asking me to review. So I hope that we got to the	2	been presented with in the opening presentation of the
3	points you were trying to make.	3	and asked to begin doing the investigation new that
		-	case and asked to begin doing the investigation now that
4	Q. Okay. Could you please refer to your	4	typically would have been done when a case was
4 5	Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?	4 5	typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside
5 6	Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X? A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.	4 5 6	typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken
5 6 7	Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X? A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here. Q. Sure.	4 5 6 7	typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.
5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8	typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up. Q. And following following this line of
5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> </ul>	4 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> <li>projects you had included in your \$6.9 million figure in</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project 317322; is that true?</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> <li>projects you had included in your \$6.9 million figure in your recommendation are the Moses Lake 4 inch TE</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project 317322; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific projects you had included in your \$6.9 million figure in your recommendation are the Moses Lake 4 inch TE Project, the Bellingham 8 inch HP, and two out of the</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project 317322; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> <li>projects you had included in your \$6.9 million figure in your recommendation are the Moses Lake 4 inch TE</li> <li>Project, the Bellingham 8 inch HP, and two out of the three funding projects associated with the Arlington</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project 317322; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking additional information about any other pro forma</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> <li>projects you had included in your \$6.9 million figure in your recommendation are the Moses Lake 4 inch TE</li> <li>Project, the Bellingham 8 inch HP, and two out of the three funding projects associated with the Arlington Gate; is that correct?</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project 317322; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking additional information about any other pro forma capital projects after the Company filed its rebuttal</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> <li>projects you had included in your \$6.9 million figure in your recommendation are the Moses Lake 4 inch TE</li> <li>Project, the Bellingham 8 inch HP, and two out of the three funding projects associated with the Arlington Gate; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. And what I found was that when</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project 317322; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking additional information about any other pro forma capital projects after the Company filed its rebuttal testimony; is that correct?</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> <li>projects you had included in your \$6.9 million figure in your recommendation are the Moses Lake 4 inch TE</li> <li>Project, the Bellingham 8 inch HP, and two out of the three funding projects associated with the Arlington Gate; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. And what I found was that when PCD-4 was submitted, it reconfigured the allocation of</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project 317322; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking additional information about any other pro forma capital projects after the Company filed its rebuttal testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's also correct.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> <li>projects you had included in your \$6.9 million figure in your recommendation are the Moses Lake 4 inch TE</li> <li>Project, the Bellingham 8 inch HP, and two out of the three funding projects associated with the Arlington Gate; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. And what I found was that when PCD-4 was submitted, it reconfigured the allocation of the funding projects to to the what are called project names. Again, this was one of these nomenclature issues that was very difficult to follow</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project 317322; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking additional information about any other pro forma capital projects after the Company filed its rebuttal testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's also correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. PEASE: Thank you. No further questions here.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Cross-Exhibit DJP-10X?</li> <li>A. I'm just recollecting my paperwork here.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>A. I have that in front of me.</li> <li>Q. On this exhibit is Staff's response to Data</li> <li>Request No. 14 from Cascade; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you prepare this response?</li> <li>A. I was involved in the preparation of it.</li> <li>Q. And as we discussed earlier, the specific</li> <li>projects you had included in your \$6.9 million figure in your recommendation are the Moses Lake 4 inch TE</li> <li>Project, the Bellingham 8 inch HP, and two out of the three funding projects associated with the Arlington Gate; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. And what I found was that when PCD-4 was submitted, it reconfigured the allocation of the funding projects to to the what are called project names. Again, this was one of these</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>typically would have been done when a case was originally presented. So I would have had to set aside other tasks with which I'm involved and and taken that up.</li> <li>Q. And following following this line of questions through, so there was about three weeks during which discovery still was available to Staff following the rebuttal filing; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking any additional information about funding project 317322; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. And Staff did not serve any data requests seeking additional information about any other pro forma capital projects after the Company filed its rebuttal testimony; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's also correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. PEASE: Thank you. No further questions</li> </ul>

60 (Pages 263 to 266)

	Page 267	Page 269
1	Staff?	1 that the pro forma plant that you recommend to be
2	MR. CALLAGHAN: I do. Thank you, Your	2 included meets all the Commission's standards, right?
3	Honor.	3 A. That's correct.
4		4 Q. And would you have been able to do that after
5	EXAMINATION	5 rebuttal testimony with three weeks for data requests
б	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:	6 and, you know, no ability to follow up?
7	Q. First, Mr. Panco, in a general rate case, who	7 A. I don't think I get to make an opening
8	bears the burden to prove that a pro forma adjustment is	8 statement, so I would have only been able to present it
9	appropriate, is it Staff or the Commission or sorry,	9 had I had it prepared and happened to have been asked it
10	Staff or the Company?	10 in cross-examination. Other than that, I don't have a
11	A. I believe it's the Company that bears that	11 voice.
12	burden.	12 Q. And so you wouldn't have been confident in your
13	Q. All right. But you discussed on	ability to to recommend those plant additions be
14	cross-examination that you did send several data	14 included in customer rates, correct?
15	requests regarding the pro forma plant issues, correct?	15 A. No, I would not have been.
16	A. That's correct.	16 Q. And Ms. Pease asked you on cross about the
17	Q. And the first data request was Staff DR 89; is	17 materiality threshold; is that right?
18	that right?	18 A. Yes.
19	A. I believe that was the first of them, yes.	19 <b>Q.</b> Now, in your response testimony, was that the
20	Q. And then you had a follow-up that was Staff DR	20 primary reason that you gave for not being able to
21	92, correct?	21 include most of Cascade's proposed pro forma plant
22	A. DR 92 was differently directed to the MCP-6	22 additions?
23	testimony as opposed to 89, which was directed to the	A. I don't believe I mentioned that in my response
24	PCD-2.	24 testimony at all. My primary concern was whether the
25	Q. Okay. And you also issued another data request,	25 plant was being used and whether offsetting factors had
	Page 268	Page 270
1	DR 124, correct?	1 been appropriately considered in determining the the
2	A. That's correct. That's because there were not	2 costs incurred.
3	any updates coming in and I wanted to make it clear that	3 Q. All right. And so in this case, did the
4	those requests were intended to be continuous.	4 Commission Staff receive DR responses that, you know,
5	Q. All right.	5 essentially in December indicated that there had been
6	A. And there were also some other DRs related to	6 errors in the information that Cascade has provided with
7	to pro forma plant that were issued as well.	7 respect to in-service dates?
8	Q. And were each of those data requests, they were	8 A. In December did we receive that?
9	requesting actual in-service dates and actual final	9 <b>Q. Correct.</b>
10	costs, correct?	10 A. Through the month of December, we received
11	A. They were, and it was even trying to use	11 responses that were confusing both in terms of the date
12	particular language extracted from the from the rule	12 in which they were prepared and what the dates were that
13	and statute to make it clear that that was what it was	13 were represented.
14	that I was requesting.	14 Q. All right. And so, Mr. Panco, after following
15	Q. All right. Thank you.	15 up with the Company several times with different data
16	So you did make attempts when you were concerned	16 requests that requested ongoing updated information,
17	that that Cascade was providing the incorrect	17 past the point where Staff had already filed response
18	information; is that right?	18 testimony, it was still unclear based on the information
19	A. I don't know if I would say it was incorrect	19 they provided what the actual in-service dates were,
20	information, but it wasn't the information which I was	20 what final costs were; is that right?
21	seeking, which was the these projects were being used	A. To me it was it was uncertain and it was unclear, yes.
22		22 unclear, yes.
~ ~ ~	and useful to Washington customers and what the known	
23	prices were or costs were.	23 <b>Q. Okay.</b>
23 24 25		

61 (Pages 267 to 270)

	Page 271		Page 273
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from	1	MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Ms. Huang is
2	the bench for Mr. Panco?	2	available for cross-examination.
3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Not from me. Thank	3	JUDGE HOWARD: Cascade may proceed with its
4	you.	4	cross-examination. Is Ms. Baird handling this witness?
5	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Panco, thank	5	MS. BAIRD: I am, Your Honor.
6	you for your testimony today. You are excused.	6	JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.
7	No party has designated the next witness,	7	MS. BAIRD: Thank you. And so for the
8	Amy White, for cross-examination. Are there any	8	record, Shoshana Baird on behalf of Cascade.
9	questions from the bench for Ms. White at this time?	9	
10	CHAIR DANNER: No.	10	EXAMINATION
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Hearing none, the next	11	BY MS. BAIRD:
12	witness will be Joanna Huang for Staff.	12	Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Huang.
13	Ms. Huang, please turn on your video and I	13	A. Good afternoon.
14	will swear you in.	14	Q. So I know we are nearing the end of the day, I
15	MS. HUANG: Good afternoon.	15	promise not to take up too much of your or the
16	JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon. Please feel	16	Commissioners' time.
17	free to correct me if I'm saying your name wrong. Am I	17	So to get right into it, could I ask you to turn
18	right in saying that?	18	to your response testimony at page 8, please. And if
19	MS. HUANG: I can't I don't remember.	19	you could let me know when you're there.
20	What did you say?	20	A. Yes, I'm there.
21	JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, am I saying your name	21	Q. And specifically, I'm looking at lines 14 to 19,
22	correctly?	22 23	and here you note that Cascade's case includes a 3
23 24	MS. HUANG: Can you say it again? JUDGE HOWARD: Huang?	23	percent increase in wages in 2019, as well as 3 to 4 percent wage increases in 2020 and 2021, right?
25	MS. HUANG: Very good. That's very correct.	25	A. That's correct.
23			A. mars concer.
	Page 272		Page 274
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I just wanted to	1	Q. And I believe on line 18 you refer to these wage
2	be mindful of that. Please raise your right hand and I	2	increases as aggressive; is that right?
3	will swear you in.	3	A. That's correct.
4	(Joanna Huang sworn.)	4	Q. Okay. When you say "aggressive," do you mean
5	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	5	aggressive as compared to other utilities; is that
б	Mr. Callaghan, would you please introduce	6	right?
7	the witness.	7	A. Aggressive as more than the standard average.
8	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.	8	Q. And by "standard average," are you referring to
9		9	what other utilities pay for salaries?
10	EXAMINATION	10	A. Yes.
11	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:	11	Q. Okay. So I'm going to ask you next to turn to
12	Q. Ms. Huang, can you please state your full name	12	your Cross-Exhibit JH-6X, please.
13	and spell your last name for the record?	13	A. I what what is that? I don't have that.
14	A. Joanna Huang, last name H-u-a-n-g.	14	Q. Oh, it should be it's the first of the two
15	Q. And where are you employed?	15 16	cross-exhibits that were designated for you. A. Oh.
	A. Utility and Transportation Commission as a	17	A. On. Q. It should be 6X. I realize there was some
16 17	regulatory analyst		
17	regulatory analyst.		
17 18	Q. Thank you.	18	last-minute numbering changes, so it is the first one.
17 18 19	Q. Thank you. And in the course of your work, did you prepare	18 19	<b>last-minute numbering changes, so it is the first one.</b> A. Okay. So is that Avista's Docket UE-170485?
17 18 19 20	Q. Thank you. And in the course of your work, did you prepare Exhibits JH-1T through JH-5 for this case?	18 19 20	<ul><li>last-minute numbering changes, so it is the first one.</li><li>A. Okay. So is that Avista's Docket UE-170485?</li><li>Q. Yes, and that's your testimony in Avista's 2017</li></ul>
17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And in the course of your work, did you prepare</li> <li>Exhibits JH-1T through JH-5 for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>last-minute numbering changes, so it is the first one.</li> <li>A. Okay. So is that Avista's Docket UE-170485?</li> <li>Q. Yes, and that's your testimony in Avista's 2017 rate case.</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And in the course of your work, did you prepare</li> <li>Exhibits JH-1T through JH-5 for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to your</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>last-minute numbering changes, so it is the first one.</li> <li>A. Okay. So is that Avista's Docket UE-170485?</li> <li>Q. Yes, and that's your testimony in Avista's 2017 rate case.</li> <li>A. Yes, thank you.</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And in the course of your work, did you prepare</li> <li>Exhibits JH-1T through JH-5 for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to your prefiled testimony or exhibits today?</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>last-minute numbering changes, so it is the first one.</li> <li>A. Okay. So is that Avista's Docket UE-170485?</li> <li>Q. Yes, and that's your testimony in Avista's 2017 rate case.</li> <li>A. Yes, thank you.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you could turn to page 16 of that</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And in the course of your work, did you prepare</li> <li>Exhibits JH-1T through JH-5 for this case?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to your</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>last-minute numbering changes, so it is the first one.</li> <li>A. Okay. So is that Avista's Docket UE-170485?</li> <li>Q. Yes, and that's your testimony in Avista's 2017 rate case.</li> <li>A. Yes, thank you.</li> </ul>

Docket No. UG-200568 - Vol. III - 2/24/2021

	Page 275		Page 277
1	A. So page 16 start with, (as read) How has the	1	A. Okay.
2	Commission treated pro forma incentive pay in the past;	2	Q. Okay. Thank you.
3	is that the page?	3	A. You're welcome.
4	Q. Two pages before that, so page 16 of the	4	Q. And so here, I believe, you had not opposed,
5	exhibit, which is	5	then, the 3 percent wage increases for Avista in 2017,
6	A. Oh, I see.	6	correct?
7	Q in upper right-hand corner.	7	A. That's correct.
8	A. Okay.	8	Q. Okay. I'm going to ask us to go ahead and turn
9	Q. Yeah.	9	back to your testimony now and go back to page 8,
10	A. Okay. I'm there.	10	please.
11	Q. Great.	11	A. I'm there.
12	And so I'm specifically focusing on lines 3 to	12	Q. So thank you.
13	6, and here you testified that Avista applied a pro-rata	13	You are talking about Cascade's 3 percent wage
14	share of the 2016 wage increase, and then it goes on to	14	increases, did you consider the wage increases in the
15	say, in addition Avista also added a 3 percent wage	15	Avista case to be aggressive as you say here?
16	increase for each of 2018 sorry, 2017 and 2018 for a	16	A. Avista which which rate cases?
17	total of 6 percent; is that right?	17	Q. Oh, I'm so sorry. The one we were just speaking
18	A. This page 16, the first question is about	18	of, so in the the 2017 Avista rate case where we were
19	incentive, right?	19	commenting that you had agreed, I believe, that you did
20	Q. Yes. So please explain how Avista calculated	20	not propose an adjustment. Did you did you find
21	its proposed pro forma incentive adjustment, it is	21	those rate increases, salary increases to be aggressive?
22	referring to also the wage increases, I believe; is that	22	A. Okay. You have to consider Avista general rate
23	incorrect?	23	case did propose 3 percent increase, but in this general
24	A. You are incorrect.	24	rate case, you propose 4 percent increase. So I have
25	Q. Could I ask you to turn, then, to your next	25	done PSE adjustment, Cascade adjustment, and Avista
	Page 276		Page 278
1	cross-exhibit, it's JH-7X.	1	adjustment, I rarely see 4 percent adjustment for
2	A. That would be the 2019?	2	non-union employee.
3	Q. Yes, and	3	Q. Okay. Thank you.
4	A. Okay.	4	So here when you are talking about one of the
5	Q specifically on page 12 of the exhibit, so	5	kind of main reasons, I believe, on lines 11 and 12, you
6	the numbering in the upper right-hand corner.	6	point to the economic circumstances that customers are
7	A. Okay. I'm there.	7	facing as one of the reasons why you believe that the
8	Q. And specifically on lines 14 to 19, here you are	8	salary increases aren't aren't reasonable; do I have
9	referring back to the 2017 rate case.	9	that right?
10	A. Yes.	10	A. That's correct.
11	Q. And you say, (as read) Avista included two pro	11	Q. Okay.
12	forma adjustments reflecting 3 percent wage increases	12	A. If you if you refer
13	for both union and nonunion employees; one 3 percent	13	Q. Sorry, go on.
14	increase for the period of 2017 to 2018 and another 3	14	A. If you refer it back to James Kaiser's
15	percent increase for the 2018 to 2019.	15	exhibit [inaudible.]
16	And then you go on to say, (as read) These wage	16	Q. I'm sorry, could you repeat that? I couldn't
17	increases were uncontested and so were included in the	17	quite hear what you said.
18	Commission's final revenue determination; is that right?	18	A. If you refer to Kaiser James Kaiser Exhibit
19	A. That's correct.	19	3C, his exhibit support this situation.
20	Q. Is it still your testimony that the Avista 2017	20	Q. Okay. I'm not going to be able to I'm not
21	case did not include two pro forma wage increases?	21	I'm going stop you there because that's a confidential
22	A. If you look at 2017 GRC, the cover page, and	22	exhibit, so I don't want to get into the details of this
23	there's no place I mention labor adjustment for	23	exhibit on this cross-examination.
24 25	executive or non-executive. So there Q. That's correct.	24 25	A. Okay. O So for now I'm just going to proceed with
40	w. mats conect.	45	Q. So for now, I'm just going to proceed with
L			

63 (Pages 275 to 278)

	Page 279		Page 281
1	with your testimony.	1	Q. Okay.
2	So here and elsewhere in your testimony, I'm not	2	MS. BAIRD: I have no further questions.
3	seeing that you comment on the broader salary markets or	3	Thank you.
4	what Cascade's competitors are paying for salaries, do	4	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
5	you?	5	Any redirect from Staff?
6	A. Can you say that again, please?	6	MS. HUANG: Can I say something over here?
7	Q. Of course, and I will try and speak more	7	JUDGE HOWARD: Is it about logistic is it
8	clearly.	8	about your connection or anything like that or
9	In your testimony, you don't comment on broader	9	because if it's about the substance of the case, we need
10	salary markets or what Cascade's competitors are paying	10	to have someone posing a question to you.
11	for salaries, do you?	11	MS. HUANG: It's about JEK testimony on
12	A. No, I don't.	12	page
13	Q. Would you agree that the market rate for	13	JUDGE HOWARD: I I prefer that we let
14	salaries is not something that the Company can generally	14	Mr. Callaghan pose the questions to you on redirect.
15	control?	15	MS. HUANG: Okay.
16	A. Yes, I would agree.	16	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	Q. Do you agree that customers benefit from Cascade	17	······· , , · · · · · · · ·
18	having knowledgeable, skilled, and reliable workers?	18	ΕΧΑΜΙΝΑΤΙΟΝ
19	A.   do.	19	BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
20	Q. And would you agree that fair and competitive	20	Q. Ms. Huang, could you turn to JEK-1CT on page 6,
21	salaries are necessary to attract and retain those types	21	and I will also will avoid any confidential
22	of workers?	22	information. Are you on lines 4 through 5, are you
23	A. I do, but not I believe that Cascade need to	23	there?
24	pay average industry level, but not	24	A. Iam.
25	Q. Okay.	25	Q. Okay. And lines 4 through 5 on page 6 indicate
	-		
	Page 280		Page 282
1	A above.	1	that the Pearl Meyer report was prepared in 2018; is
2	Q. I I hear you and I appreciate that.	2	that correct?
3	Can you go ahead and turn to actually Jim	1 2	
		3	A. Yes.
4	Kaiser's testimony I believe you were referencing,	4	Q. Okay. And that that would that impact
4 5	Kaiser's testimony I believe you were referencing, JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential		Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is
		4	Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?
5	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay.	4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6.	4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And specifically page 6.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And specifically page 6.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And specifically page 6.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's</li> </ul>	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And specifically page 6.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally</li> </ul>	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And specifically page 6.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And specifically page 6.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels.</li> <li>So is it my understanding from your comments</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6. A. Yes. Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels. So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6. A. Yes. Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels. So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement? A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6. A. Yes. Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels. So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement? A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's analysis, but for wages increase, 4 percent is above	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not known and measurable.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6. A. Yes. Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels. So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement? A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's analysis, but for wages increase, 4 percent is above industry level.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not known and measurable.</li> <li>Q. And there what you're discussing is the nonunion</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6. A. Yes. Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels. So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement? A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's analysis, but for wages increase, 4 percent is above industry level. Q. Thank you.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not known and measurable.</li> <li>Q. And there what you're discussing is the nonunion wage increases for 2021, correct?</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And specifically page 6.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels.</li> <li>So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement?</li> <li>A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's analysis, but for wages increase, 4 percent is above industry level.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And if I could ask you to turn to the just</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not known and measurable.</li> <li>Q. And there what you're discussing is the nonunion wage increases for 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6. A. Yes. Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels. So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement? A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's analysis, but for wages increase, 4 percent is above industry level. Q. Thank you. And if I could ask you to turn to the just the next page, page 7, of his testimony, and lines 13 to	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not known and measurable.</li> <li>Q. And there what you're discussing is the nonunion wage increases for 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. All right. And when you say that it's not known</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6. A. Yes. Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels. So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement? A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's analysis, but for wages increase, 4 percent is above industry level. Q. Thank you. And if I could ask you to turn to the just the next page, page 7, of his testimony, and lines 13 to 14, do you see it says, (as read) Cascade also	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not known and measurable.</li> <li>Q. All right. And when you say that it's not known and measurable, page 15 on line 5</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6. A. Yes. Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels. So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement? A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's analysis, but for wages increase, 4 percent is above industry level. Q. Thank you. And if I could ask you to turn to the just the next page, page 7, of his testimony, and lines 13 to 14, do you see it says, (as read) Cascade also proposes to adjust its costs for 2021 nonunion wage	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not known and measurable.</li> <li>Q. And there what you're discussing is the nonunion wage increases for 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. All right. And when you say that it's not known and measurable, page 15 on line 5 MS. BAIRD: Your Honor, I'm going to object.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And specifically page 6.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels.</li> <li>So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement?</li> <li>A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's analysis, but for wages increase, 4 percent is above industry level.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>And if I could ask you to turn to the just the next page, page 7, of his testimony, and lines 13 to 14, do you see it says, (as read) Cascade also proposes to adjust its costs for 2021 nonunion wage increases to 3 percent; do you see that?</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not known and measurable.</li> <li>Q. And there what you're discussing is the nonunion wage increases for 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. All right. And when you say that it's not known and measurable, page 15 on line 5 MS. BAIRD: Your Honor, I'm going to object.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JEK-1CT. I will keep us away from any confidential pages. A. Okay. Q. And specifically page 6. A. Yes. Q. So at the very top, lines 1 and 2, Mr. Kaiser testified that Pearl Meyer noted that that Cascade's compensation targets remain conservative and generally lag behind median market levels. So is it my understanding from your comments here today that you dispute this statement? A. I I don't dispute the Pearl Meyer's analysis, but for wages increase, 4 percent is above industry level. Q. Thank you. And if I could ask you to turn to the just the next page, page 7, of his testimony, and lines 13 to 14, do you see it says, (as read) Cascade also proposes to adjust its costs for 2021 nonunion wage	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. And that that would that impact your evaluation of whether that that analysis is is up to date given current events?</li> <li>A. Yes, well, because if they prepare in 2018, they probably use the year before that or ten, five years before that. But we are in a different situation for 2019, '20, and '21.</li> <li>Q. All right. And was there anything else you were going to mention about this exhibit?</li> <li>A. Yes. I would like to refer back to JEK-1CT page 15, line 5 to line 6. Even though Cascade revised their 2021 wages increase, but under line 6, that number is still predicted to increase. So it's not firm, it's not known and measurable.</li> <li>Q. And there what you're discussing is the nonunion wage increases for 2021, correct?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. All right. And when you say that it's not known and measurable, page 15 on line 5 MS. BAIRD: Your Honor, I'm going to object.</li> </ul>

64 (Pages 279 to 282)

Docket No. UG-200568 - Vol. III - 2/24/2021

	Page 283		Page 285
1	MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I I	1	considered the exact page number, so I'm open to
2	believe that Ms. Baird discussed the 2021 nonunion wage	2	whatever the Commissioners would like, however lengthy
3	increases on her cross-examination.	3	they would like to have the post-hearing briefs.
4	JUDGE HOWARD: I am concerned it is outside	4	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.
5	the scope of the cross, Mr. Callaghan. I'm not	5	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Or however or
6	recalling any questions about the union contracts being	6	however brief the briefs might be.
7	known and measurable. Are you able to persuade me	7	MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken with Public
8	otherwise?	8	Counsel. I will just throw out that perhaps the opening
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: I'll just leave it at that,	9	briefs could be I believe under the rule it's 60
10	Your Honor. Thank you, no further questions.	10	pages as the maximum, and I don't see any reason why to
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Are there any	11	shorten it. I am not saying that our briefs need to be
12	questions from the bench for Ms. Huang?	12	60 pages. I think we'll all endeavor to not make them
13	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No questions, thank	13	that long. But, you know, for the for the reply
14	you.	14	briefs actually, let me pause. I'm actually not sure
15	JUDGE HOWARD: Hearing none, thank you for	15	if we have reply briefs in this case, but if we do, that
16	your testimony today. You are excused.	16	could certainly be shorter, maybe 25 or 30 pages.
17	MS. HUANG: Thank you.	17	JUDGE HOWARD: Does Cascade have a position
18	JUDGE HOWARD: No party has designated the	18	on this?
19	next witness, Aimee Higby, for cross-examination. Are	19	MS. PEASE: We have not formulated a
20	there any questions from the bench for Ms. Higby?	20	position on the page number, but would agree that 60
21	We are now turning to Public Counsel's	21	pages probably should be adequate.
22	witnesses, and of course we already heard testimony from	22	JUDGE HOWARD: Do the intervenors have a
23	Dr. Woolridge this morning. No party has designated	23	position?
24	Mark Garrett for cross-examination. Are there any	24	MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project is
25	questions from the bench for Mark Garrett?	25	comfortable with the limits in the Commission's rules.
	Page 284		Page 286
1	Moving to the intervenors, no party has	1	MR. STOKES: AWEC's fine with that as well,
1 2	designated either Shawn Collins from The Energy Project		Your Honor.
3	or Bradley Mullins from AWEC for cross-examination. Are	3	JUDGE HOWARD: Well, in this case with the
4	there any questions from the bench for either of these	4	procedural schedule, we only have the single
5	witnesses?	5	post-hearing briefs and now post-hearing reply briefs.
6	Hearing none, we have just a couple of	6	If the Commissioners are are fine with it, perhaps we
7	housekeeping items before we adjourn today.	7	could just default to the regulatory standard for more
8	Ms. Gafken, I wanted to discuss with you how	8	than 60 pages. Hopefully the parties can certainly be
9	long Public Counsel might need to compile any comments	9	more brief than that.
10	received regarding this proceeding.	10	Do any of the Commissioners have thoughts on
11	MS. GAFKEN: Yes, thank you for raising	11	the topic?
12	that. You know, I typically ask for a week after the	12	CHAIR DANNER: I'm good with 60 pages. I
13	hearing, so I think we could have that in by next	13	promise I'll read all 60 of them.
14	next Wednesday.	14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And as I said,
15	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. We will designate	15	brevity is always wonderful so
	that as a bench exhibit and number it BE-5, and it will	16	JUDGE HOWARD: In that case, we will stick
16	that as a bench exhibit and number it BE-5, and it will be filed in the docket by next Wednesday.	16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: In that case, we will stick with the the maximum page limit of 60 pages.
	be filed in the docket by next Wednesday.	16 17 18	with the the maximum page limit of 60 pages.
16 17	be filed in the docket by next Wednesday. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you.	17	with the the maximum page limit of 60 pages. Are there any questions from the parties or
16 17 18 19	be filed in the docket by next Wednesday. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Finally for the post-hearing	17 18	with the the maximum page limit of 60 pages. Are there any questions from the parties or anything else that we should address before we adjourn?
16 17 18	be filed in the docket by next Wednesday. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Finally for the post-hearing briefs, our schedule provides for one round of	17 18 19	with the the maximum page limit of 60 pages. Are there any questions from the parties or anything else that we should address before we adjourn? MR. CALLAGHAN: Nothing from Staff, Your
16 17 18 19 20	be filed in the docket by next Wednesday. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Finally for the post-hearing briefs, our schedule provides for one round of post-hearing briefs due on March 22nd. Do the parties	17 18 19 20	with the the maximum page limit of 60 pages. Are there any questions from the parties or anything else that we should address before we adjourn? MR. CALLAGHAN: Nothing from Staff, Your Honor.
16 17 18 19 20 21	be filed in the docket by next Wednesday. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Finally for the post-hearing briefs, our schedule provides for one round of	17 18 19 20 21	with the the maximum page limit of 60 pages. Are there any questions from the parties or anything else that we should address before we adjourn? MR. CALLAGHAN: Nothing from Staff, Your Honor. MS. GAFKEN: Nothing from Public Counsel.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	be filed in the docket by next Wednesday. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Finally for the post-hearing briefs, our schedule provides for one round of post-hearing briefs due on March 22nd. Do the parties have positions on the number of pages that they would like?	17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>with the the maximum page limit of 60 pages. Are there any questions from the parties or</li> <li>anything else that we should address before we adjourn? MR. CALLAGHAN: Nothing from Staff, Your</li> <li>Honor.</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: Nothing from Public Counsel. MS. PEASE: Nothing from Cascade.</li> </ul>
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	be filed in the docket by next Wednesday. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Finally for the post-hearing briefs, our schedule provides for one round of post-hearing briefs due on March 22nd. Do the parties have positions on the number of pages that they would	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	with the the maximum page limit of 60 pages. Are there any questions from the parties or anything else that we should address before we adjourn? MR. CALLAGHAN: Nothing from Staff, Your Honor. MS. GAFKEN: Nothing from Public Counsel.

65 (Pages 283 to 286)

Docket No. UG-200568 - Vo	ol. III - 2/24/2021
---------------------------	---------------------

	Doco 287	
	Page 287	
1	the occasional technical hiccups and working through it.	
2	We are adjourned.	
3	(Adjourned at 4:21 p.m.)	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	Page 288	
1		
1 2	CERTIFICATE	
2	CERTIFICATE	
2 3	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON	
2 3 4	CERTIFICATE	
2 3 4 5	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON	
2 3 4 5 6	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand	
2 3 4 5 6 7	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of the best of my knowledge, skill of all the state of the best of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of the best of my knowledge, skill of all the state of the best of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of the best of my knowledge, skill of all the state of the best of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of the best of my knowledge, skill of all the state of the best of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of the best of my knowledge, skill of all the state of the best of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, 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 of all the state of the best of my knowledge, skill of all the state of the best of	

66 (Pages 287 to 288)

				8
A	118:7 232:15	211:1,12,15	34:21 35:3,7,13	affairs 179:5
<b>a-n-c-o</b> 236:23	233:5 234:3	258:20 266:14,18	35:20 37:6 38:4	affect 69:7
<b>a-r-r-a-s</b> 136:5	<b>accrue</b> 260:6	additions 33:9	138:22 139:16	affiliate 128:24
	accrued 260:17	34:16 35:4 42:18	155:7 184:19,20	affirmative 168:10
<b>a.m</b> 27:16 44:2,8	accruing 259:15	204:2,20 205:1	184:21 185:4,4,12	169:3
122:2,2	accurate 63:11	210:15 220:12,13	185:13,16,17	after-the-fact
Aberdeen 141:20	143:15 151:16	220:19,22 223:23	186:16,20 188:1	197:20
142:15 143:24	152:18 153:16	244:8,14 269:13	188:21 190:9	afternoon 88:1,2
144:8 149:12	154:12 155:5	269:22	197:23 198:5	92:18 94:8,10
150:8 156:9,12	173:12 174:11	address 45:20 46:4	200:20 207:14	113:9 124:13,14
157:9 221:9,12	181:19 206:12	46:11 48:1 59:23	211:19 212:9,14	128:13,14 162:3
ability 129:22	214:24 246:14	69:21 95:1 166:8	217:18 219:25	178:22,23 180:14
131:21 148:12	288:9	168:10 286:19	221:1 241:23	218:23,24 226:10
269:6,13 288:9	achieved 172:17	addressed 59:13	245:5 276:12	226:11 232:3,4
<b>able</b> 98:4 128:1	188:23	218:12 219:21,22	administrative	237:22 271:15,16
131:25 148:2,3	acknowledge	219:23,24 223:11	27:13 28:2 44:10	273:12,13
192:16,22 203:18	125:13 131:12	,		<b>agencies</b> 64:13 65:5
214:11 227:7	123.13 131.12	<b>adequate</b> 125:17 127:8 215:9 264:1	<b>admission</b> 31:17 32:2 33:2 34:2	65:8
228:12 233:8	acknowledgement	285:21	35:2 36:2 37:2	agencies' 58:25
244:4 249:20	132:16		38:2 39:2 40:2	0
256:3,6,10 269:4		adequately 96:6 ADIT 233:13		<b>aggressive</b> 274:2,4
269:8,20 278:20	act 59:4,7 134:13		41:2 42:2 43:2	274:5,7 277:15,21
283:7	action 66:4,24	adjourn 284:7	45:21	<b>ago</b> 84:1 104:20
accept 73:1 104:16	168:10 169:3	286:19	admit 46:7 101:11	114:12 229:5
138:25 139:14	actions 186:25	<b>adjourned</b> 287:2,3	<b>admitted</b> 46:14	242:6
190:22 192:10	actual 145:19,24	adjust 95:16,19	47:18 51:14	<b>agree</b> 61:2 72:23,24
193:7,8 205:20	146:24 156:8,14	109:7 113:20	101:13	73:3 79:13 84:5
263:11	156:20 157:14	280:23	admonition 245:3	97:7 105:8,19
accepted 213:13	183:5,6,16,17	adjusted 39:15	advance 81:5	106:16 111:12
224:6	190:3,4 195:22	67:25 109:6	advice 263:10	113:2 169:22
access 243:16	196:24 197:8,8,9	adjustment 37:9,11	advise 94:5	181:21 182:5
264:1	208:7 218:9	37:13,16,16 39:21	Advisors 48:9	189:9 197:20
accessed 59:16	227:14 240:16,17	39:22 40:10,11,12	<b>AEB</b> 48:16	212:12 215:14
accommodate	240:19 242:18	86:19 138:2,10	<b>AEB-1</b> 48:15,17	220:5,6 221:6
244:24	249:23 251:2,8,21	139:12 142:16	<b>AEB-1T</b> 32:7	223:22 239:19
<b>account</b> 120:10	253:6 268:9,9	144:9,12 150:12	<b>AEB-2</b> 32:8	240:6,14 242:9
184:15 204:12	270:19	154:14 184:17,24	<b>AEB-3</b> 32:9	246:1,12 248:23
217:10,15 218:5	actuals 148:20	188:16 200:23	<b>AEB-4</b> 65:10,14	249:2 251:10
232:9,12,21 233:4	add 98:19 154:8	202:9 204:2 205:2	AEB-4T 32:10 53:1	254:12 255:11
234:2 248:3	155:1	205:10,15 217:22	53:9,17	257:11 258:1,8,25
accounted 84:22	added 77:18	231:3,7,8,13,15	<b>AEB-5</b> 32:11	259:8 260:10
202:22	130:10 275:15	231:16 235:2	<b>AEB-6</b> 32:12 48:17	261:2,4 262:9,25
accounting 33:21	addition 59:6 77:21	254:13 267:8	<b>AEB-7X</b> 32:13 54:5	265:23 279:13,16
79:14 147:9	206:7 221:18	275:21 276:23	54:13 55:3 56:17	279:17,20 285:20
184:16 202:13,14	259:19 275:15	277:20,25,25	59:19 60:10 64:3	agreed 46:22
232:8 233:24	additional 169:1	278:1,1	65:12 66:11	126:22 135:8
accounts 77:20	203:14 210:12	adjustments 34:15	<b>AEB-8X</b> 32:14	204:10,11 205:23
	I		I	I

Dogo	200
Page	290

				<u> </u>
220:1 223:24	124:19 172:13	192:22 205:16,16	204:12 247:18	<b>argue</b> 129:19
225:18 229:14	194:25 207:2,25	225:25 233:16	applied 83:2	argument 128:24
277:19	212:23 215:3	241:18	183:10 275:13	130:21 131:14
agreement 34:3	223:15 231:14	answered 147:5	apply 246:15	arguments 131:6
125:9 163:18	265:15	166:17 232:24	applying 247:8	Arizona 84:17
181:10,14,18	amounts 132:1	answering 94:25	appreciate 87:6,10	Arlington 221:8
223:12,21 229:4	263:2	133:2	96:2 113:8 128:5	251:17 258:7
agreements 227:6	ample 213:20	answers 49:10	134:9 195:19	264:18
ahead 112:12	Amy 271:8	130:14 136:20	258:22,22 260:25	arrived 99:14
122:12 138:5	analyses 78:10	161:20 180:3	280:2	arriving 99:9
166:19 179:16	119:18	anticipate 147:22	approach 169:13	article 54:20 55:19
193:3 230:18	analysis 39:10	159:5	175:11,12 176:16	56:1,4,7,10,14
247:5 277:8 280:3	50:10 57:8 63:13	anticipated 103:4	188:7 248:2	61:24
Aimee 283:19	68:19,20,22 88:7	166:15	approaches 91:19	articulating 244:20
AIW-1T 39:19	88:21 89:1,24	anticipating 74:20	91:20 119:8	ascertained 253:25
AIW-2 39:20	91:14 114:20	118:1	175:25	<b>aside</b> 63:4 266:5
<b>AIW-3</b> 39:22	115:15 117:24	anybody 92:23	appropriate 80:8	asked 49:1 66:7,10
all-inclusive 167:4	119:1,2 209:23	anytime 215:16	106:2 173:5	67:14 84:9 85:11
all-party 125:16	210:4 239:21	anyway 191:17	190:23 192:7	87:1 113:18
<b>all-time</b> 56:9 61:4	247:2 254:3	232:25 258:17	212:13 229:16	115:10 116:20
allegedly 250:15	280:17 282:5	<b>apart</b> 180:1	249:9 252:11	117:13 119:1
Alliance 45:13	analyst 237:2	apologies 186:11	267:9	121:1 141:16
allocated 166:4	272:17	216:2 244:3	appropriately	147:4 157:17
168:22	analysts 65:8	apologize 54:22	270:1	168:5,7,20 169:20
allocation 129:16	119:19	87:3,7 135:11	Approvals 36:18	174:24 175:4
247:1 264:21	analytical 117:16	139:21 225:25	<b>approve</b> 165:9	212:6,22 214:25
<b>allow</b> 66:17 70:5	analyze 228:14	256:9 263:25	181:23	216:1,2 217:16
164:15 189:13	analyzed 63:7	<b>app</b> 255:22,23	approved 165:11	224:21 225:6
193:2 196:6 212:1	ANH-1T 36:20	256:5	182:5 185:11	266:1,3 269:9,16
allowed 151:8	<b>ANH-2</b> 36:21	apparent 84:22	214:12	asking 58:15 66:13
197:16 248:12	<b>ANH-3</b> 36:22	<b>appear</b> 84:25	approving 182:1	66:15,25 71:6
allowing 198:1	<b>ANH-4</b> 36:23	249:25	approximately	96:24 99:19
<b>ALT</b> 256:11	<b>ANH-5</b> 36:24	appearance 44:23	44:8 72:16 73:6	110:10 137:19
alternative 171:21	<b>ANH-6</b> 37:3	45:10	79:4 81:4 85:7	155:25 164:11
172:24 173:4,15	Ann 29:15 30:2	appearances 42:13	121:23 171:1,14	174:4 187:9
189:4	130:3	44:16	173:22 192:3,7	192:20 201:14
alternatives 239:21	<b>annual</b> 108:13	appeared 188:3	193:14 194:15	212:24 213:22
amenable 159:23	120:16 168:23	217:1 225:22	April 109:11	215:6 221:3
amendments 186:3	169:12 170:6	250:10	115:19 163:10	228:10 257:18
186:17 237:8	Annualize 37:11	appearing 45:2,7	183:18	264:2
<b>America</b> 36:13	annually 232:21	45:18 160:19	<b>Archer</b> 178:2,4	<b>asks</b> 173:19
<b>amid</b> 56:9	<b>answer</b> 86:11 89:4	appears 48:23	area 154:7 155:1	<b>aspect</b> 209:22
amortization 39:21	113:6 127:17	85:16 98:21 199:9	214:17	234:9
234:14	128:1 130:11,17	199:20 243:1,24	areas 214:17	aspects 209:19
<b>amount</b> 115:1,2	132:24 141:23	253:21	244:25	assess 208:11,19
119:8 121:3	151:20 169:19	applicable 186:22	<b>arena</b> 164:22	assessing 263:6
		l	l	I

<b>asset</b> 41:21 69:2,3	156:6 253:22	141:5 192:20,20	259:17 261:15	111:14 113:1
assets 154:9 155:3	255:13 257:13	192:23 227:22	<b>balances</b> 208:13,20	114:16 115:20
187:10 188:7	<b>authorized</b> 35:9,17	AWEC 29:2 32:20	233:3,5,9,12,13	117:21 121:3
Assistant 45:2,7	35:22 53:13,21	41:7 42:18 45:10	254:14 259:1,9,12	182:25 187:2
associated 55:24	56:8,21,24 57:3	202:15 204:9	260:9 262:8,9	216:6
202:21 204:1,19	57:10 59:20 60:11	218:17 233:8	263:1	<b>BE-1</b> 31:18
204:21 205:1	61:3 62:14 63:10	284:3	balancing 134:13	<b>BE-5</b> 284:16
207:17,18 208:7	64:13,18,20,22	AWEC's 42:21,22	Balasbas 30:16	<b>bear</b> 76:16 88:3
211:7,7 218:3	65:21,23 67:19	204:7,8 286:1	31:8 128:7,12	93:14 195:23
229:23 231:7	86:17,21 95:13,18	·	134:21 231:22	262:5
251:17 260:7,18	105:13 114:14	<u> </u>	232:2 233:18,19	bearing 258:22
264:18 265:11	118:15,23	<b>B</b> 55:17	234:20	<b>bears</b> 267:8,11
associates 50:7	available 49:12	back 59:18 72:9	<b>bar</b> 256:11	<b>began</b> 70:21
55:15	50:18 52:15 55:11	74:9 76:17 78:4	barely 49:23	beginning 61:10
associating 260:6	124:8 136:23	83:21 88:4 89:21	Bargaining 163:18	139:22 141:12
<b>assume</b> 112:19	137:22 161:22	90:23 104:24	<b>base</b> 107:21 131:2	146:9 152:22
219:14 251:5	180:7 190:3	105:5,9,20 106:10	219:3,25 223:15	167:5,11,13
assumed 219:9	237:13 253:10	107:4,25 110:10	225:7 232:12,18	168:16 189:8
assuming 144:14	256:2 265:23	111:10,25 114:5	244:22	194:23 203:1,23
assumption 145:23	266:10 273:2	120:7 122:3	<b>based</b> 62:18 77:6	206:2 229:8
attached 55:19	<b>avenue</b> 27:22 28:14	138:17 140:20	104:12 116:11	begins 166:22
56:7 93:7 253:4	28:20 29:4 229:16	143:11 146:8	127:4 131:14	198:25
254:1	average 38:24 63:1	148:18 149:10	150:23 151:25	<b>begun</b> 175:7
attachment 32:13	91:25 92:1,4 95:8	156:3 160:7	153:7 171:15	<b>behalf</b> 45:2,7,12,18
32:15 36:15,16,16	95:21 102:21	172:12 175:20,23	172:16 182:7	160:19 246:9
36:17 40:17,19,22	109:2,3 115:24	188:12 193:11	187:10 190:10	273:8
41:7,9 143:22	170:17 171:4,7,14	194:13 204:23	192:1,11,11,17	<b>believe</b> 47:1 57:5
209:11	171:22 172:6	206:14,18 229:13	225:20 231:13	62:24 69:20 80:2
Attachments 41:4	173:1,9,14,22,23	232:13 234:7,12	238:22 240:6	85:12 89:15
41:6	204:21 231:8	236:4 240:4 242:4	241:11,22 258:14	100:10 108:2
attempts 268:16	274:7,8 279:24	246:24 251:12 252:14 259:4	270:18	114:12 122:11
attention 71:15	averages 62:24		baseline 248:5	130:23 138:6
74:12 77:9 101:18	76:8,9 231:9	276:9 277:9,9 278:14 282:13	bases 111:11	140:13 141:9
105:1 111:24	Avista 33:22 83:17	background 38:19	120:13	142:17 143:8,10
attentions 53:3	275:13,15,20	42:3 50:1	<b>basically</b> 48:16	144:1 147:7 157:8
<b>attorney</b> 28:7,20	276:11,20 277:5	<b>Bainbridge</b> 29:11	65:18 67:10,18	157:22 158:2
29:10 45:2,7 52:24 87:25 162:4	277:15,16,18,22	Baird 28:12 30:22	84:21 85:19,21 107:8 113:6 214:8	159:10 164:13
	277:25 Avista's 274:19,20	31:15 44:22	232:15	167:22 175:4 176:7,7 182:18
attorneys 254:9 attract 279:21	avoid 206:23 245:3	160:18,19,23	<b>basis</b> 39:3 55:19,21	,
<b>audio</b> 94:6	281:21	161:2,22 164:7,13	60:22 72:16 73:3	187:4,5,8 190:11 190:12 192:14,25
<b>Audit</b> 37:9	<b>avoided</b> 207:10,20	174:18,23 177:11	74:23 75:8 80:3	190.12 192.14,23
audited 187:8	207:20,24	273:4,5,7,8,11	80:17 83:22,25	195.10 195.14
189:19,24 212:25	<b>aware</b> 49:7 86:9	281:2 282:23	84:14,20 85:15,16	197.19 198.10
August 61:14	88:20,25 89:7	283:2	85:17 86:18	213:22 222:2
142:12 143:13	127:18,20 133:7	<b>balance</b> 208:21	100:21 104:17	213.22 222.2 224:4 228:11
172.12 173.13	127.10,20 133.7		100.21 104.17	227.7 220.11
	1	I	1	

				1 490 202
230:6 232:11	108:3,4,14,15,18	158:11,17,21,24	222:15	119:6
233:3 240:10	109:1,6,7,21,23	190:13 191:23	Bremerton 193:24	Bulkley's 72:20
246:17 252:11	110:11 111:1,5,7	214:14,15,18,19	194:7 215:2	74:18 110:5
255:14 260:8	111:8,8,12,14,16	218:4 240:23	brevity 286:15	119:15 128:21
262:22 264:25	111:21 115:17	241:4,8,14,25	Brian 178:2	<b>bump</b> 85:1 103:1,3
267:11,19 269:23	116:21,25 117:1	246:3 249:3,5	brief 47:24 57:17	<b>bumped</b> 115:18,24
274:1 275:22	<b>better</b> 93:3,5,17	252:7,10 259:15	123:8 132:19	<b>bunch</b> 113:6
277:4,19 278:5,7	96:14 172:6 185:7	260:2,9,12,15,23	143:18 285:6	<b>burden</b> 188:19
279:23 280:4	195:21 196:3	261:8,13 263:2,12	286:9	198:13 199:6,11
282:24 283:2	207:4	263:15	<b>briefly</b> 131:4	267:8,12
285:9	<b>beyond</b> 66:7 168:4	<b>blows</b> 110:7	<b>briefs</b> 284:20,21	burdensome
Bellingham 146:12	176:5,18 218:1	BLR-1T 35:23	285:3,6,9,11,14	189:19 213:1
148:19 221:7	BGM-10X 42:22	BLR-2 35:24	285:15 286:5,5	business 42:3 101:3
251:16 264:17	BGM-11X 42:24	BLR-3 36:3	bring 202:20,24	109:1 216:21
<b>bench</b> 31:18 121:13	BGM-12X 42:25	BLR-436:4	233:1	bypass 207:5
122:9 123:8	BGM-13X 43:3	BLR-5 36:5	broader 246:21	
134:24 135:5	BGM-1T 42:12	BLR-6 36:6	247:8,15 279:3,9	<u> </u>
159:16 177:14	BGM-242:13	board 165:8 228:8	<b>broke</b> 139:21	<b>C</b> 28:1 29:1 33:5,9
178:3 226:4 228:4	BGM-342:15	<b>bold</b> 176:9	214:15	34:7 39:13,17
228:18 230:18	BGM-442:16	<b>bolded</b> 169:10	broken 190:13	44:4 288:1,1
235:12,18 271:2,9	BGM-542:17	175:5 176:13	brought 130:13	Cable 29:4 45:12
283:12,20,25	BGM-642:18	<b>bond</b> 39:5 61:11,20	<b>budget</b> 36:13	calculate 79:16
284:4,16	BGM-7T 42:19	63:13 68:18 69:4	127:19 149:13,17	90:2 118:4 173:22
benchmarking	BGM-842:20	<b>bonds</b> 69:6	153:5 163:3	173:23 185:10
176:3	BGM-9X 42:21	<b>book</b> 79:14 186:12	165:25 166:2,7,11	calculated 173:14
<b>benefit</b> 128:25	<b>big</b> 108:20 111:2	250:16	166:11,14 167:1,3	275:20
131:17,19 132:3,5	117:12 119:13,14	<b>booked</b> 146:15,16	167:4,10,12,19,20	calculating 90:7
172:12 208:4	<b>bigger</b> 260:16	146:18	168:2,25 169:7,11	calculation 33:20
279:17	<b>Bill</b> 36:23	<b>books</b> 149:6 232:9	169:16 170:6	34:13,14,20,25
<b>benefits</b> 129:16,18	<b>billion</b> 117:22	<b>bottom</b> 59:22 65:25	175:7,15,17,20	37:7,15 171:7
129:25 130:23	<b>bit</b> 78:3 92:21 93:8	75:17 79:20 97:18	176:12,14,17	172:11 174:7
195:16 210:1,11	93:20 96:5 113:13	98:25 101:17	214:8,9,10,13,24	185:14 204:9
benefitting 129:21	116:20 120:5	108:7,16 112:14	227:2,24 228:6	205:18
<b>best</b> 126:8 146:5	129:9 146:21	253:2 256:12	240:7,9 250:11	<b>calculations</b> 42:15
147:16 148:12	172:4 177:20	<b>bounce</b> 114:16	budgeting 242:16	42:20 75:23 76:1
252:23 288:9	180:24 185:7	<b>box</b> 28:7 29:11 67:6	<b>budgets</b> 126:18	78:8
<b>beta</b> 106:16,20,21	252:12	219:19,22 220:1	149:22 166:10	<b>calendar</b> 167:6
106:25 107:11	black 219:19,22	220:10,19 221:1	242:17	218:8
108:1 109:2,3,9	220:1,10,19,25	Bradley 42:13 43:3	<b>Buell</b> 27:21	<b>call</b> 46:21 47:2 85:1
109:18,25 110:3	<b>blank</b> 197:24	284:3	<b>building</b> 246:17	147:1,9 166:10 249:3 255:8
110:20,23 111:20	214:16	break 121:22 122:1	Bulkley 29:15 30:2	<b>Callaghan</b> 28:6
115:10,11,14,16	blank- 191:23	122:4 159:22	46:20 47:3,14	30:6,20 31:4,10
115:23,24 116:3	blanket 151:5	160:2,5 166:16	48:6 52:23 63:24	31:14 44:25 45:1
116:18 117:8	152:24,25 153:6	181:3 235:23,25	67:14 78:11 86:7	46:24 49:15,17,20
<b>betas</b> 53:7 106:4,11	153:14,19 154:5	236:2,5	86:23 114:1 115:2	40:24 49:13,17,20 50:17 87:15 92:9
106:14 107:17	154:13,24 155:6	breaking 180:24	116:8 117:12	50.17 07.15 92.9
	I	I	I	I

				5
137:3,5,10,12,15	205:1 207:13	157:18 159:21	193:12 194:25	189:24 194:23
139:9,10 143:19	214:9,10,13	160:8,17,19 161:8	196:21 199:24	195:6 198:5,9,11
143:21 151:14	216:10 217:1,3	162:10,14,19	203:12 207:14	199:5,11,16,19,20
152:1,9,14 154:19	220:12,13,18,22	163:1,4,8 164:2,5	213:6 219:3,10,13	200:20 204:8,13
155:15,24 157:17	227:24 238:15,20	165:13 172:13	219:23,24 220:6	204:15 210:3
180:8,10,13,24	238:24 239:13,20	174:12,17 178:1,7	221:12 231:6	212:20 213:13,15
181:1,4 184:2,3	242:15,17 250:11	178:15,18 179:5	238:15,23 241:12	213:16,24 214:6
189:5,10,14,15	251:25 266:19	182:14 183:22	269:21 273:22	217:1,17 219:11
192:19 193:4,5	capitaling 242:15	184:10,14 185:13	277:13 279:4,10	219:16,18 220:17
194:3,4 195:24	<b>CAPM</b> 39:6 41:21	187:25 188:5,23	280:11	220:23,24,25
196:7,11,12	68:19,20,23 91:11	190:8,17 191:3	<b>case</b> 44:15 46:25	221:5,5,13,17
198:19,20 211:22	91:15 105:19	192:2,2 198:4	50:10 51:9,13	223:5,5,7,14,21
212:6,21 213:22	110:7 116:4,10	200:4,9,22 201:4	57:13 65:22 67:17	224:17,20,23
214:25 216:2	117:7	202:7 203:24	68:14,16 69:15	225:9,18,20
236:15,17,20	<b>capture</b> 183:23	204:3,14 205:17	71:10 73:16,18	229:14,15,15,20
237:12 256:22,25	184:11	206:5,8 208:1,22	74:1,8,10,22,23	232:19,20,20
257:2 267:2,6	captured 132:25	210:5,10 211:17	75:1,7,10,18 76:7	233:7 237:4
270:24 272:6,8,11	capturing 62:24	211:23 212:7	76:18,23 77:1,5	239:10 244:14,18
273:1 281:14,16	care 46:2 66:8	214:5 215:13,14	77:10,16 78:2,4,5	248:13 249:10
281:19 283:1,5,9	<b>Cas-</b> 192:20	216:5,11 217:22	78:7,12 80:22,23	251:13,24 256:14
284:24,25 286:20	<b>Cascade</b> 27:7 28:10	218:12 219:9,17	81:2,5,17 82:10	258:11 260:22
called 132:21	34:3,4 37:3 38:15	220:14,18 221:17	82:15 83:6,10,22	261:21 263:4,5
264:22	38:16,20,22,23	223:2 224:8,12,19	83:23,25 84:1,8	264:25 265:24
camera 47:8 160:9	40:14,15,17,18,20	225:1,22 232:7	84:16,18 85:6,7,7	266:3,4 267:7
capable 212:25	40:21,23 41:3,5,8	233:3,11 237:15	85:12,13,22,23	270:3 272:20
capacity 48:11	41:10,22 42:5,7,9	237:18 241:23	86:2,3,6,7,14,16	273:22 274:21
123:22 136:9	42:21,22 44:17,20	244:25 245:14	86:20 88:7,9,17	276:9,21 277:15
161:10 179:6	54:14 55:5 59:15	249:16 250:7,10	94:11 95:8 96:25	277:18,23,24
CapEx 134:10	63:19 68:3 69:15	259:17,20 264:10	100:6,9,14,17,20	281:9 285:15
capital 32:17,19	73:16,19 75:1,17	268:17 270:6	100:25 101:1,2,6	286:3,16
38:20,23 40:13	83:18 85:2,12	273:3,8 277:25	101:16,24 103:5	case-by-case 187:2
41:13,15,18,21,23	106:3 107:16	279:17,23 280:22	104:22 110:12,21	cases 77:19,23
42:18 46:20 47:1	118:24 122:8	282:14 285:17	110:23 111:6,11	125:20 129:19
47:7 51:9 53:4	123:20 128:15,22	286:23	116:23 117:2,2,15	131:7 187:1
58:22 59:2,16	129:3,12,24	Cascade's 31:22	117:15,17,17,18	202:16 205:18
80:8 95:14,20	130:19 131:6,17	32:4,5,13,14,20	118:5,5,8 119:2,3	224:13 235:1,2
100:8 107:12	131:22 132:13	32:22 33:5 36:14	119:4,4,23,23,25	238:16,18 241:24
114:24 115:1,3,3	133:5 135:9,19,21	37:12 41:7 44:14	120:1 121:2,4,4	242:6,9 256:14
115:5,7,7,8,15	136:8 138:9	47:12 51:9 94:19	125:16 128:15	277:16
120:2,10 121:13	140:25 141:4,17	97:2 99:21 101:25	132:15 133:9,12	<b>cash</b> 41:19,20
126:1,18 127:19	142:14 143:23	131:24 137:25	133:14,25,25	120:18 131:12,18
128:22 130:2	144:11,15,17	151:7 165:2	134:3,6,20 138:4	131:20 132:4
131:9,18,23 132:1	148:19,25 149:11	170:14,25 171:4	146:25 149:6,9	170:16
132:9 133:15,20	150:10,12,19,25	181:8,15 182:12	157:25 181:11,14	category 64:23
134:8,9 149:13,16	151:5 154:13	183:5,5,16,16	182:6,14 183:2,10	203:19 213:1
149:22 204:1	155:6,18 157:17	190:7 191:22	183:11 185:14	260:2
			l	l

<b>challenge</b> 224:9,12 <b>challenging</b> 263:23 <b>change</b> 62:4 80:18	<b>circling</b> 251:12 252:14 <b>circumstances</b> 79:5	261:13,22,24 coincide 218:9 colleagues 128:4	<b>comments</b> 280:14 284:9 <b>Commission</b> 27:2,4	159:23 285:2 286:6,10 Commissioners'
Chairman 45:17	<b>Chris</b> 235:16	code 259:14 261:8	277:19	44:12,19,25 45:17
286:12	<b>chosen</b> 260:22	Coast 92:19	commenting	Commissioners
235:13 271:10	<b>chose</b> 146:5 147:21	<b>co-counsel</b> 44:21	279:3,9	286:14
229:3 230:10,17	<b>choice</b> 69:2	<b>CNGC</b> 32:12	216:22 257:17	283:13 285:5
177:19 228:24	255:9,19	<b>CNG</b> 32:15	comment 134:9	235:9,22 271:3
152:12 177:16,18	221:6 242:5 255:2	259:16	250:13,20 268:3	234:19,20,22
122:12,13 152:7	139:2,15 144:19	closed 148:16	246:25 249:21	233:17,17,19,22
71:1,5 121:15	135:4 138:25	195:3 260:10	160:11 215:7	231:22 232:2
<b>Chair</b> 31:7 44:18	<b>check</b> 72:24 104:16	close 104:10 149:6	<b>coming</b> 146:6	230:12,22 231:20
Chad 29:3 45:11	<b>cheap</b> 115:7	clicking 256:11	285:25	228:17,21 230:10
155:3	charts 56:20 59:21	<b>click</b> 256:3	comfortable	178:5 226:5,9
133:17,21 154:10	105:2	163:24	comfort 133:19	135:6 159:17,24
<b>cetera</b> 127:25	68:6 80:21 91:8	clerical-type	166:12	133:1 134:21
certify 288:8	66:5,13,14,25	<b>Clerical</b> 36:10	140:19 153:10	124:12 128:3,7,12
Certified 288:6	61:6 62:18 63:4	279:8	<b>comes</b> 131:18,20	122:11,15,22
208:11,19	60:9,10,20,25	clearly 160:12	252:9 256:20	97:17,23 121:17
133:15 134:6	<b>chart</b> 56:21,24 57:7	cleared 148:12	133:5 199:19	51:21 54:17 94:21
certainty 127:3	149:1	268:3,13	111:25 112:24	30:15,16 31:6,8
286:8	charges 146:15,16	251:13,20,23	<b>come</b> 85:11,17	Commissioner
259:6 285:16	163:11	247:25 250:9	212:17	285:25
241:21,21 248:1	characterize	186:25 233:16	83:11,13,17	269:2 276:18
235:24 238:4	79:7	<b>clear</b> 147:21 148:9	combination 83:8	244:17 245:3
189:11 228:20	characteristics	163:15,21	262:8	198:8 208:18
175:11 182:20	274:18	classification	261:17,19,20	187:6,13 197:5
147:24 151:17,21	200:11 215:17,18	260:25	258:2,9 259:14,15	185:21 186:21,25
134:10,13,18	179:13 186:24	clarifying 225:12	255:12 257:7,12	151:8 152:3
129:25 133:23	161:16 167:7	250:7 251:3	157:3,11 254:11	Commission's
127:17 128:9	136:15 147:22	146:5 193:6 234:5	144:2,3 145:9,12	272:16 275:2
69:19 85:4 94:1	124:3 125:10	<b>clarify</b> 139:5,7	138:15,21 139:11	268:25 270:4
certainly 59:3 69:1	48:19 49:5 51:16	234:11	<b>column</b> 51:25 52:8	246:6 267:9
224:16 248:20	<b>changes</b> 47:20	clarified 145:24	colloquy 47:19	233:1,2 237:2
67:1 69:5 155:25	125:23 200:1,25	140:15	Collins 284:2	210:20 226:25
<b>certain</b> 62:23 66:22	120:4 125:13,18	clarification 83:20	127:11,12	199:5 208:11
<b>CEO</b> 123:20	61:19 109:10	265:11	collectors 126:9	197:16,19 198:12
centralized 129:20	changed 53:5 61:9	<b>claim</b> 183:21 184:9	Collective 163:18	192:6,21,23 193:6
80:4 91:23	230:8	<b>City</b> 125:15	127:4	190:21 191:1
<b>CE</b> 75:13,23 78:8	201:9,9 208:13,21	<b>citing</b> 145:4	collecting 126:9	187:10 189:17
<b>CCR</b> 27:20 288:11	126:11 200:8	<b>cited</b> 49:2	228:15	182:2 186:14
causing 93:8 168:1	120:2,3 125:7	208:25	collected 126:25	171:22 181:19,23
<b>cause</b> 206:16 <b>caused</b> 79:3,17	85:9 86:24 111:1 114:10 115:23	199:14 cite 144:22 145:9	125:8 126:4 228:13	124:8 125:24 131:8 142:20,20

[				1 age 295
commitment	196:20 206:9	completing 158:15	250:22 252:1	228:6
133:24	212:24 214:9	completing 158.15	255:20 257:24	<b>constitutes</b> 282:24
<b>committee</b> 165:11	215:3 216:3,19	complicated	265:4,14,16	construction 154:9
<b>Common</b> 38:24	219:11 228:5	241:15	confirming 58:12	155:2
companies 38:24	238:19 241:4,7	<b>complied</b> 189:21	<b>conflict</b> 128:17	construed 184:22
39:3,4,6,7 53:14	242:9 248:3 252:7	component 195:14	confused 233:14	Consumers 45:13
53:22 57:22 58:14	253:16 254:13	197:9 202:11,14	249:21	Cont 29:1 31:1
58:22 59:6,23	263:3 265:5,20	<b>components</b> 228:12	confusing 49:4	32:1 33:1 34:1
65:20 82:23,23	<b>comparable</b> 75:13	compression	60:7 234:5,9	35:1 36:1 37:1
83:1,3,12,13,15	75:16 85:22 86:3	168:10 169:4	270:11	38:1 39:1 40:1
99:25 103:1 106:4	91:18	compromised	<b>confusion</b> 216:17	41:1 42:1 43:1
108:22,24 115:4	comparative 177:3	220:3	240:16 250:3	contain 150:18
118:15,16,20,21	<b>compare</b> 118:19	<b>computed</b> 109:5	251:1	200:13
129:13,23 187:12	119:1 173:5 177:2	computer 244:5	connection 93:13	contained 150:25
245:14	compared 82:16,20	255:22	281:8	contemporaneous
company 77:20,21	120:18 274:5	<b>computes</b> 107:22	conservative	150:18 151:1
78:16 79:7 83:18	compares 62:14	111:8,21	172:22 175:25	200:14 201:5
83:19 125:3,10	comparing 114:21	<b>Con</b> 67:8	176:16 218:4	216:3
126:12 127:23	117:14	Concentric 48:9	280:12	contemporary
128:18,19,23	comparison 36:4,5	concept 63:7	<b>consider</b> 74:7 84:6	229:6
129:1,4,5,6 130:5	38:3 65:23 260:16	164:11 249:5,5	121:6 132:11	contention 225:23
130:20,20,23	comparisons	<b>concern</b> 59:7,11	164:5 187:12	contested 194:19
131:16,16,17,20	129:13 240:8	189:10 215:8	205:9,14 248:9	225:19
149:19 150:13	compensation 36:8	269:24	250:19 277:14,22	context 129:9
153:4 157:23	40:9 128:25 166:9	concerned 268:16	consideration 65:4	130:12 192:17
158:6,24 165:8	170:16,25 171:4	283:4	74:6 209:20,24	continually 131:6
172:2 176:11,12	171:23 172:14,18	<b>concerns</b> 46:23	210:21,25 211:4,8	158:3 260:17
176:14 181:10	172:21,22 175:23	58:25 59:5,8	211:18 217:18	continue 122:4
182:16 189:21	175:25,25 176:5	169:3 233:11	249:9	127:6 134:17
192:18 203:4	280:12	conclude 149:24	considerations	148:3 150:20
212:19 217:5	competing 208:13	conclusion 80:6	189:4,4	168:25 181:2
226:18 228:19	208:21	252:10	considered 64:13	198:13 199:7,13
239:12,19 240:23	competitive 129:11	concuct 116:15	78:8 150:13 151:9	200:6 201:6
241:14,25 242:16	172:19 279:20	conditions 53:4	153:8 157:18,18	250:10
246:2 249:3	competitors 279:4	120:3,10 182:2	185:5 188:16	continued 111:6
252:24 266:19	279:10	250:6	202:4 203:4,5	150:22
267:10,11 270:15	<b>compile</b> 284:9	conduct 116:15	206:5 217:23	continues 261:23
279:14	<b>Complainant</b> 27:5	conducted 88:6	224:2 242:6	continuing 162:9
company's 32:23	complete 125:5	conference 255:8	247:17 250:21	216:20
33:3,11,13,14	127:5 131:13	confident 269:12	258:16,17 270:1	continuous 250:9
37:17,18,20 38:3	140:22 148:2	confidential 31:22	285:1	263:17 268:4
38:5,6,8,9,11	175:9 226:20	31:24 32:4,4,5,6	considering 133:22	continuously
54:14 55:5 68:8	260:19	36:7,8,9,12 41:3,3	157:23 158:20	149:25 200:5
77:18 138:1 153:2	completed 242:18	41:5,6 278:21	210:25 239:25	<b>contract</b> 177:6
153:15 184:17	260:5	280:5 281:21	consistent 147:18	contractors 127:11
188:18,19 196:17	completely 191:2	<b>confirm</b> 169:20	consolidated 64:19	148:7
			l	

				1 490 200
contracts 177:5	94:12,13 97:4	241:5 242:23,24	240:16,17 247:17	174:24 176:20
283:6	99:17 100:9,12,15	242:25 243:12,12	248:12 249:24	231:22 255:1
<b>control</b> 153:2,15	100:16,18,21,22	244:19 245:1,6	260:21	258:20 284:6
217:3 279:15	101:21 102:8	247:9 249:18,19	<b>costly</b> 126:6	<b>course</b> 61:19
Conversion 34:14	103:6,19 104:13	251:18,19,25	<b>costs</b> 100:23 114:24	108:21 112:8
37:8	104:14,22 106:18	252:16,17,20	115:3,8 126:1	131:11 134:2
coordinate 243:25	106:23,24 107:1,2	253:18 254:7	133:16 146:13	153:3 163:7
coordinated 101:16	109:14 110:15,16	258:13 264:11,19	151:8 153:1,3	164:16 170:2
Coordination	110:21,25 118:24	264:20 265:12,13	173:11 174:12	216:21 264:25
37:13 40:11	124:2,18 136:14	265:15,21,22	175:17 185:10	272:19 279:7
<b>copies</b> 180:19	137:7 138:22	266:11,12,20,21	193:7,8 199:25	283:22
243:25 245:24	139:12,13,20,25	267:15,16,21	206:11,17,23	<b>court</b> 46:10 52:3,3
<b>copy</b> 46:9 81:23	140:1 141:2,3,21	268:1,2,10 269:3	207:3,8,20,21,21	52:6 93:16,17,25
82:4 98:12 99:1	141:25 142:21	269:14 270:9	207:24 208:5,8,12	222:13,14
238:9 243:20	143:7 144:12,18	271:17,25 273:25	208:19 210:17	cover 276:22
254:16,20 255:18	144:24 145:6,10	274:3 276:19,25	214:23 215:18	coverage 58:25
256:23 257:21	145:14 149:15	277:6,7 278:10	217:3 235:4	covered 117:5
258:19	153:17,19 156:6	282:2,19	242:18 247:21	120:13
<b>corner</b> 153:25	158:1 160:20	correction 48:21	248:4 250:24	<b>COVID</b> 59:5,12
275:7 276:6	161:15 162:12,13	179:17,21	251:21 252:3	79:3 84:24 85:1,1
Corp 41:22	162:16,17,20,23	corrections 47:20	265:4,10 268:10	85:3 103:1,3
corporate 117:23	163:2,3,5,9,10	48:19 49:6 50:14	268:23 270:2,20	113:23,24 120:6
corporation 27:8	165:4,5,9,16,17	124:3 136:15	280:23	133:11 216:19
129:17	166:1,4,23,24	161:16 179:13,15	counsel 28:18	COVID-19 56:9
correct 48:16,18	167:2,14 168:17	179:24 180:1	32:13,14 36:15	70:21 149:14,17
53:6,15,16,25	168:23 169:12	237:9 272:22	40:15,17,18,20,23	150:15
54:1 55:12,13,15	170:7,8,17,18	correctly 46:1,4	41:5 42:5 45:5,8	craft 36:10 163:19
55:19 56:6,11,12	171:1,5,14,15,23	135:11,14 271:22	45:23 51:8 52:24	create 59:1,12
56:22 57:1,4,6,11	173:24 181:12,13	corresponding	56:8 57:14,16,21	234:13
57:12 58:18,23	182:12,13 185:22	234:8	58:13 65:24 87:25	created 92:3
60:12 62:3 71:11	185:23 187:19	<b>cost</b> 32:5 36:11	88:10 113:12	211:11
72:7,8,12,13,17	188:1,2 190:19,20	37:11 38:20 39:4	151:11 152:7	credit 38:22 59:5
72:19 73:20 74:24	191:4,24,25 192:4	39:6 40:13 41:13	159:10 162:4	64:12 65:4,8 66:4
75:5,6,9,10,20	192:5,8,13,14	41:15,18,23 42:17	165:3 183:25	66:24 86:8 99:23
76:2,3,5,6,10,24	193:9,10 194:7,16	46:19 47:1,7 51:9	194:1 196:2	117:21
76:25 77:2,13,14	194:17,21 195:12	52:1 80:8 84:22	198:15 222:5	criteria 219:15
77:17,18 78:2,9	197:23 198:5,6	95:14,20 100:8,15	284:9 285:8	262:23 263:6
78:17 79:18 80:4	201:21 202:16	105:16 115:15	286:22	critical 134:16
80:23,24 81:6,17	203:10,11,14,15	121:7,13 128:22	<b>Counsel's</b> 42:7,9	critique 88:20,25
82:12,13,16,21	204:20 205:2,6,7	130:2,10 133:21	50:21 53:11 54:13	<b>CRM</b> 37:11
83:10,12,23 84:2	207:14,19 208:25	147:23 159:4	55:4 66:23 171:16	<b>CRM-1T</b> 36:19
84:4 85:7 87:2	210:15,21 211:19	164:12 193:1	283:21	cross 62:21 66:7
88:7,15,18,19	221:14,15,19,20	196:25 197:9	<b>count</b> 138:24	69:13,16 87:8
89:18,19,25 90:1	221:23 222:3,8	201:11 207:17	217:22 218:7,13	94:4 96:1 97:10
90:5,9 91:2,4,9,10	237:7 238:16,17	208:7 211:7 230:9	<b>COUNTY</b> 288:4	104:7 110:9 137:7
91:12,13,16,17	239:7,8,10,11	239:24 240:2,14	<b>couple</b> 64:2 174:18	144:5 159:11,13
			I	I

159:14 190:12	current 31:22	33:5 34:7 128:1	228:13,14 229:24	days 246:25
196:7 201:1	61:18 73:5 77:8	135:8,10,13,17,22	230:3 233:8	<b>DCF</b> 39:4 41:19,20
218:17 237:15	89:17 212:20	135:23 136:5,6,22	239:16 240:1,19	67:16,22,24 68:9
262:17 269:16	249:10 259:17,17	137:11,16,19,25	241:17 249:20	68:25 69:7,8
282:25 283:5	282:6	139:11 151:15,20	250:8 252:3,4	73:23 74:3,6,14
cross-answering	currently 32:5	154:20 155:24	253:12 264:1,9	74:18,22 75:4
38:12 42:6,19	127:4 208:1	159:8,16,18	266:13,17 267:14	81:16 82:7,10,18
51:12,23 88:13	<b>Curve</b> 39:12	188:25 195:14,22	267:17,25 268:8	83:21,25 84:6,22
112:4 233:10	customer 35:10,17	196:3,9 201:2	269:5 270:15	85:5,9,16,23 86:2
cross-examination	35:22 36:5 126:10	207:3 216:16	date 33:8 34:6	86:3,4 88:6,21
45:23 49:13 50:18	130:25 131:2	222:22 242:10	60:14,17,20,23	89:1,3,23 90:4,8
52:16,18 69:12	134:14 153:19	251:3	72:10,11 126:8	90:17 91:1,23
78:20 87:18 122:7	155:11 172:12	Darras' 196:4	127:5 142:10	100:2 101:20
136:24 137:1	203:14 206:8	200:2 203:6	144:16 145:13	102:3,7 104:19
161:23 177:25	210:12 217:22	Darras's 151:20	146:17,19 147:2	117:4 119:12
180:7 196:5	218:7,13 269:14	154:16 210:23	147:10,14,23	120:25 121:7
235:17 237:13	customers 126:3	211:13,15 213:8	149:18 150:9	DCF-derived 89:17
263:24 267:14	129:18 130:24	222:1 239:6,9	156:15,21 157:10	DCP 74:21 79:19
269:10 271:8	154:8,11 155:2,4	241:3 251:22	157:12,14,15	<b>DCP-1</b> 90:23
273:2,4 278:23	195:17 218:1,3,5	265:16	181:8,20 188:5,10	DCP-10 39:5,17
283:3,19,24 284:3	234:7 250:24	data 32:12,13,15	197:8,9 198:2	90:11
cross-examine	268:22 278:6	32:20,22,24 33:4	201:11 221:19	DCP-11 39:6,14
92:12	279:17	33:6,11,13,15	223:9 251:6,7,8	<b>DCP-12</b> 39:7,14,15
cross-exhibit 54:4	cut 165:19 194:1	36:9,13,15 37:3	254:2,4,6 257:7	39:17 75:22 76:4
54:13,18 55:3	195:24 213:2	37:17,18,20 38:5	258:1,8 260:12	78:4
56:16 59:18 64:3	214:3 259:18,23	38:6,8,9,11,15,16	261:21 270:11	<b>DCP-13</b> 39:8
71:19 72:3,15	cutoff 254:6 259:24	40:14,15,17,18,20	282:6	<b>DCP-14</b> 39:9,17
100:4 145:4	cutoffs 245:4	40:21,23 41:3,5,7	dated 73:17 250:17	DCP-15 39:10
164:24 165:2,22	<b>Cuts</b> 59:4,6	41:9,10 42:5,8,9	253:22	50:12
166:20 168:14	cutting 255:15	42:16,21,22 54:14	dates 126:14	DCP-16x 39:11
174:25 195:20	<b>cycle</b> 114:8	54:19 55:4,11,18	145:18,18,19,22	71:15
198:17 242:21		55:24 56:1,4,5,8	146:24 156:9	DCP-17X 39:13
247:6 264:5	D	56:10,13,13 61:6	190:4 193:16	73:10 77:10
274:12 276:1	<b>D</b> 44:4 136:5	61:24 62:19 64:4	195:23 196:25	DCP-18X 39:15
cross-exhibits	<b>D3</b> 29:11	64:9 65:11,17,18	199:24 215:17	78:19 79:20
71:13 94:14	<b>DAF</b> 261:12	65:23 66:11,12,15	227:1 240:18,19	DCP-19X 39:16
137:20 180:18	<b>Daily</b> 39:11	90:3 94:20 95:11	249:23 250:16	DCP-1T 38:18
256:14 274:15	<b>Danner</b> 31:7 44:18	107:23 124:22	251:2 255:11	50:12 70:17 71:4
cross-reference	45:17 71:1,5	125:8,12 126:10	257:12 268:9	74:10 89:11,20
148:14	121:15 122:12,13	141:8,24,25 142:7	270:7,12,19	90:23 91:6
cross-referencing	152:7,12 177:16	143:5 156:5,10	David 29:15,18	<b>DCP-2</b> 38:19
252:22	177:18,19 228:24	157:1,11 165:3	30:5 31:9 32:23	DCP-20X 39:18
<b>CSR</b> 199:7	229:3 230:10,17	173:23 174:2,5,6	33:3,10,12 38:14	<b>DCP-3</b> 38:20 39:13
cstokes@cablehu	235:13 271:10	174:7,10 188:21	39:13,17 235:20	39:17
29:6	286:12	196:22 200:16	236:5,13,23	DCP-4 38:21
culprit 96:19	<b>Darras</b> 29:17 30:18	213:10 225:21	<b>day</b> 273:14	<b>DCP-5</b> 38:22

DCP-9 39:4,13         default 201:7 286:7         depends 129:8         details 278:22         59:1           90:11,12         deft 127:16 153:9         130:18 224:22         determination         digit 97:19,24           dealing 133:10         238:23 230:15         deplot 131:25         139:197:10,18         ligits 117:10,11           134:13 286:25         231:20         76:4         199:19 217:10         digit 97:19,24           detor 15:2         deferrals 234:12         deploy 131:25         276:18         32:7,16 33:16           32:6 41:15 42:17         234:13         deployment 133:20         l21:6 127:7         48:14,16 58:20           decades 115:9         define 244:13         203:25 204:5,18         determine 119:10         d11:8 105:1           December 32:22         definitely 242:13         derailed 96:1         225:15,19 197:6         111:23 123:25           149:6 183:11         277:21 244:17         210:9,13         197:13         136:9 137:21           164:10 151:24         definition 151:24         derailed 96:1         212:18,18 270:1         180:19 188:3           222:2,3,9 270:58         definitions 184:19         103:9 204:21         210:11,18 211:15         106:9         189:1 202:25           23:11         defayed 146:14         139:19,23 152:2         208:24 20					: «ge <u>1</u> ee
DCP-7 38:24         decinctel 127:10         depending 130:22         detailed 125:17         169:20 264:24           DCP-3 39:3         defaul 201:7 286:7         depends 129:8         details 278:22         59:1           90:11,12         defar 127:16 153:9         130:18 224:22         details 278:22         59:1           134:13 286:25         231:20         76:4         189:3 197:10,18         digits 177:10,11           32:6 41:15 42:17         234:13         133:15         determination         digits 117:10,11         33:7,16 33:16           decades 115:9         deforred 232:6,13         deprociation 40:10         203:16 247:12         61:20 71:14 74:12         determine 119:10         34:91 35:2,02           decades 115:9         define 244:13         203:25 204:5,18         125:15,19 197:6         111:23 123:25           149:6 183:11         227:21 244:17         210:91,3         197:13         169:17 179:9,18           194:15,20 195:1,8         definition 51:24         deraile 96:1         212:18,18 270:1         189:19 120:22           22:22,3,9 270:5,8         definition 11:44         139:19,23 15:24         101:24 125:12         208:24 209:2           270:10         delayed 146:14         139:19,23 15:24         101:24 125:12         208:10 88:3           decide 23:11	DCP-6 38:23	35:22 36:24	dependable 250:14	242:11	<b>difficult</b> 62:25 94:2
DCP-8 39:3         deemed 223:23         if7:4,5         242:15         difficulty 58:22           DCP-9 39:4,13         default 201:7 286:7         depends 129:8         details 278:22         59:1           90:11,12         defer 127:16 153:9         130:18 224:22         details 278:22         59:1           debt 31:23,24 32:4         deferral 39:0         deploted 66:23         189:3 197:10,18         digits 117:10,11           debt 31:23,24 32:4         deferral 39:0         deployment 133:20         121:6 127:7         34:9,11 35:5,23           dest 31:5:9         define 244:13         203:25 204:5,18         determine 119:10         34:9,11 35:5,23           decamed 51:5:9         define 244:13         203:25 204:5,18         determining 126:7         111:23 123:25           definite 92:21         definite 94:21         derived 76:8 90:10         deterlimining 126:7         189:1 93:22.2           decide 253:11         164:21 217:4         describe 55:21         develop 90:13         189:1 202:25           decide 150:19         deligning 157:18,19         27:13 240:23         106:9         111:8 11:18 11:18           decide 253:11         164:21 217:4         describe 53:21         develop 90:13         189:1 202:25           decide 150:19         delayed 146:14         139:19,23 152:24					
DCP-9 39:4,13         default 2017 28:67         depends 129:8         details 278:22         59:1           90:11,12         dealing 133:10         228:23 23:01:5         130:18 224:22         details 133:10         degized 66:23         189:3 197:10,18         digit 97:19.24           debt 31:23,24 32:4         deferrals 39:20         deploy 131:25         276:18         199:19 217:10         32:7,16 33:16           details 173:24         deferrals 234:12         deploy 131:25         276:18         32:7,16 33:16           details 11         227:71         24:17         23:31:20         deferrals 23:22         02:31:6 247:12         61:20 71:14 74:12           decades 115:9         define 244:13         203:25 204:5,18         determine 119:10         101:18 105:1           124:96 183:11         227:21 24:41         203:16 247:12         61:20 71:14 74:12         123:25           134:91         define 49:03         204:25 205:5,8,13         125:15,19 197:6         110:18 105:1           194:15,20 195:1,8         definition 15:14         deraile 96:1         212:18,18 270:1         188:1 202:25           222:2,3.9 270:5,8         definition 15:14         deraile 76:8 90:10         develop 90:13         189:1 202:25           235:1         delayed 146:14         139:19,23 152:24         developed 127:	<b>DCP-8</b> 39:3		- 0	242:15	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			· ·		•
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	,		-	determination	digit 97:19,24
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-		depicted 66:23		0
debt 31:23,24 32:4         deferral 39:20         deploy 131:25         276:18         32:7,16 33:16           32:6 41:15 42:17         234:13         133:15         133:15         34:17         177:23,24         deferrals 234:12         deployment 133:20         121:6 127:7         34:14,115:5,23           131:24         deferred 232:6,13         depreciation 40:10         203:16 247:12         61:20 71:14 74:12           december 32:22         defined 90:3         204:25 205:5,8,13         125:15,19 197:6         111:23 123:25           149:6 183:11         227:21 244:17         210:9,13         197:13         136:9 137:21           194:15 20 195:1,8         definition 151:24         derived 76:8 90:10         determining 126:7         164:17 179:9,18           194:15 20 195:1,8         definitions 184:19         103:9 204:21         91:25 235:2         208:24 209:2           270:10         delay 150:7,20         247:4         develop 90:13         189:1 202:25           decide 253:11         164:21 217:4         describe 55:21         develop 90:13         211:16 22:23           126:14 175:2         delay 150:7,12         247:14         develop 90:13         211:16 22:23           decide 253:11         164:21 217:4         describe 55:21         develop 90:13         210:11,18 251:2			-	,	0
32:6 41:15 42:17         234:13         f33:15         determine 119:10         34:9,11 35:5,23           42:17 117:23,24         deferred 23:6(1,3)         deployment 133:20         121:6 127:7         48:14,16 58:20           decades 115:9         define 244:13         203:25 204:5,18         determined 119:10         101:18 105:1           December 32:22         define 246:22         derailed 90:3         204:25 205:5,813         125:15,19 197:6         111:23 123:25           149:6 183:11         227:21 244:17         210:9,13         197:13         136:9 137:21         164:17 179:9,18           194:15,20 195:1,8         definitely 242:13         derailed 96:1         derevel 76:8 90:10         develop 90:13         189:1 202:25           270:10         delay 150:7,20         247:4         developed 127:23         208:24 200:2         208:24 200:2           206:16 150:1         164:21 217:4         describe 63:2         101:24 125:12         208:24 200:2         208:24 200:2         208:24 200:2         232:12           158:1         197:13         developed 127:23         developed 127:23         210:11,18 211:15           decided 150:19         delayed 146:14         139:10,23 135:24         101:24 125:12         208:24 23:22.3         201:21 12:24 23:2         201:12 12:15         204:71,9 209:25         <	debt 31:23,24 32:4	deferral 39:20	deploy 131:25	276:18	-
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	32:6 41:15 42:17	234:13		determine 119:10	,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	42:17 117:23,24	deferrals 234:12	deployment 133:20		
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	131:24	deferred 232:6,13	1 0	203:16 247:12	61:20 71:14 74:12
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	decades 115:9	<b>define</b> 244:13	-	determined 119:10	101:18 105:1
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	December 32:22	defined 90:3	204:25 205:5,8,13	125:15,19 197:6	111:23 123:25
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	149:6 183:11	227:21 244:17	210:9,13	197:13	136:9 137:21
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	188:8 193:20,23	defines 246:22	derail 94:3	determining 126:7	164:17 179:9,18
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	194:15,20 195:1,8	definitely 242:13	derailed 96:1	U	180:19 188:3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	215:8 221:19	definition 151:24	derived 76:8 90:10	develop 90:13	189:1 202:25
decide 253:11164:21 217:4describe 55:21developing 90:13211:16 222:23158:6149:11 150:14139:19,23 152:24101:24 125:12232:12158:6149:11 150:14217:21developmentsdirected 188:3decides 216:11157:24 200:9,10described 63:2developments189:6 195:22decision 67:12215:2166:1 67:10 210:23differ 119:19196:3 233:2149:16 150:7delays 141:17,19248:17103:2 149:5directing 77:9200:5 201:5deliver 154:10describes 153:18157:13 174:4directing 77:9200:5 201:5deliverability209:22 241:4201:11 255:3204:7,19 209:25216:14 217:5155:3201:21 204:24177:8 193:12director 185:7200:15188:20describing 130:4differences 118:7232:25150:19 151:1demonstrated153:13 154:1283:2 98:1 108:4Director's 40:12206:4182:15155:5,9 242:15108:14,16 109:18directors 164:1165:14 217:15209:24design 36:21119:20 120:12,15disagree 144:20102:18 189:10150:13designate 284:15131:2 146:4,21,22213:18declined 61:14departing 244:21designate 198:16147:8 169:5,17Discounted 41:1970:23 95:9 102:20department 39:11235:16 242:21175:12 176:1241:20106:6 112:23,24129:22,23 167:18271:7 774:15137:2 203:15,15discovere 25:2declined 61:14departing 244:21designate 19	222:2,3,9 270:5,8	definitions 184:19	103:9 204:21	91:25 235:2	208:24 209:2
decided 150:19 158:6delayed 146:14 149:11 150:14139:19,23 152:24 217:21101:24 125:12 developments232:12 directed 188:3decides 216:11 decision 67:12 149:16 150:7 198:13 199:7,12 200:5 201:5157:24 2009,10 delaying 157:18,19 delaying 157:18,19 delaying 157:18,19 227:13 240:23106:9 differ 119:19 103:2 149:5189:6 195:22 direct 77:21 difference 77:21 267:22,23200:5 201:5 216:14 217:5deliver 154:10 deliver 154:10describes 153:18 describes 153:18 209:22 241:4103:2 149:5 direct 77:21 difference 77:21 directing 77:9200:5 201:5 216:14 217:5deliverability 155:3 201:21 204:24209:22 241:4 177:8 193:12204:7,19 209:25 direct 71:9 209:25200:5 201:5 216:14 217:5demonstrate 188:20188:24 245:21,25 description 153:7 different 56:25179:4200:15 216:4188:10 188:20descriptions 211:8 description 153:7109:19,21 110:4 different 56:25Director's 40:12 disagree 144:20 disagree 144:20216:4 216:4182:15 209:24155:5,9 242:15 design 36:21 102:18 189:10150:13 designate 284:15 disignet 284:15109:19,21 110:4 131:2 146:4,21,22 213:18165:8 disagree 144:20 disagree 144:20 disagree 144:20 disagree 144:20declined 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24department 39:11 235:16 242:21 235:16 242:21175:12 176:12 175:12 176:12 41:2013:20 44:20declined 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6:112:23,24departments designate 198:16 235:13,13 100:23 495:115:1 120:9 270:15 282:9263:14 265:23 26	270:10	delay 150:7,20	247:4	developed 127:23	210:11,18 211:15
158:6149:11 150:14217:21developmentsdirected 188:3decides 216:11 $157:24 200:9,10$ described 63:2 $106:9$ $189:6 195:22$ 149:16 150:7delaying 157:18,19 $227:13 240:23$ differ 119:19 $196:3 233:2$ 149:16 150:7delaying 157:18,19 $227:13 240:23$ difference 77:21 $126:3 23:2$ 200:5 201:5deliver 154:10describes 153:18 $157:13 174:4$ directing 77:9200:5 201:5deliver 154:10describes 153:18 $157:13 174:4$ directing 25:20216:14 217:5 $155:3$ $201:21 204:24$ $177:8 193:12$ directing 185:15200:15deliverability $209:22 241:4$ $201:11 255:3$ $204:7,19 209:25$ decision-making $154:7,25$ describing 130:4differences 118:7 $232:25$ 150:19 151:1demonstrate $188:24 245:21,25$ $119:15$ director 161:9200:15 $188:20$ description 153:7different 56:25 $179:4$ 200:15 $188:20$ descriptions 211:8 $109:19,21 110:4$ lifescors 164:1decisionmakingdemonstrated $153:13 154:12$ $83:2 98:1 108:4$ lifescors 164:1165:14 217:15 $209:24$ design 36:21 $113:24 119:13,19$ directors 164:1102:18 189:10 $150:13$ designated 198:16 $147:8 169:5,17$ lisagree 144:20102:18 189:10 $150:13$ designated 198:16 $147:8 169:5,17$ liscover 255:2declined 61:14departing 244:21designated 198:16 $147:8 169:5,17$ liscover 255:2 </td <td>decide 253:11</td> <td>164:21 217:4</td> <td>describe 55:21</td> <td>developing 90:13</td> <td>211:16 222:23</td>	decide 253:11	164:21 217:4	describe 55:21	developing 90:13	211:16 222:23
decides 216:11157:24 200:9,10described 63:2106:9189:6 195:22decision 67:12215:2166:1 67:10 210:23differ 119:19196:3 233:2149:16 150:7delaying 157:18,19227:13 240:23difference 77:21267:22,23198:13 199:7,12delays 141:17,19248:17103:2 149:5directing 77:9200:5 201:5deliver 154:10describes 153:18157:13 174:4directing 77:9200:5 201:5deliver ability209:22 241:4201:11 255:3204:7,19 209:25220:4 263:10demonstrate158:24 245:21,25119:15director 161:9200:15188:20describing 130:4differences 18:7232:25150:19 151:1demonstrate153:13 154:1283:2 98:1 108:4Director's 40:1220:6:4182:15155:5,9 242:15108:14,16 109:18directors 164:1decisions 126:2demonstrated153:13 154:1283:2 98:1 108:4Director's 40:12165:14 217:15209:24design 36:21113:24 119:13,19disagree 144:20decline 61:12 77:24demonstrateg125:20119:20 120:12,15disagree 144:20102:18 189:10150:13designate 284:15131:2 146:4,21,22213:18100:61 112:23,24129:22,23 167:18271:7 274:15177:2, 230:15,15discover 255:2declining 71:8167:20283:18,23 284:2243:24 245:23,24discovery 250:395:13,13 100:23departmentsdesignation 191:17256:20 263:5,6discovery 250:3106:5,7 111:121	decided 150:19	delayed 146:14	139:19,23 152:24	101:24 125:12	232:12
decision 67:12215:2166:1 67:10 210:23differ 119:19196:3 233:2149:16 150:7delaying 157:18,19227:13 240:23difference 77:21267:22,23198:13 199:7,12delays 141:17,19248:17103:2 149:5directing 77:9200:5 201:5deliver 154:10describes 153:18157:13 174:4direction 225:20216:14 217:5155:3201:21 204:24177:8 193:12directing 77:9200:5 201:0deliverability209:22 241:4201:11 255:3204:7,19 209:25202:4 263:10deliverability209:22 241:4201:11 255:3204:7,19 209:25decision-making154:7,25describing 130:4differences 118:7232:25150:19 151:1demonstrate188:24 245:21,25119:15director 161:9200:15188:20description 153:7different 56:25179:4decisionmaking182:15155:5,9 242:15108:14,16 109:18director's 40:12216:4182:15155:5,9 242:15108:14,16 109:18director's 40:12165:14 217:15209:24design 36:21113:24 119:13,19disagree 144:20decline 61:12 77:24demonstrating125:20119:20 120:12,15disagreement102:18 189:10150:13designate 198:16147:8 169:5,17Discounted 41:1970:23 95:9 102:20department 39:11235:16 242:21175:12 176:1241:20106:6 112:23,24129:22,23 167:18271:7 274:15177:2,2 230:15,15discover 255:2declining 71:8167:20233:1	158:6	149:11 150:14	217:21	developments	directed 188:3
149:16 150:7 198:13 199:7,12 200:5 201:5delaying 157:18,19 delays 141:17,19 delays 141:17,19 248:17227:13 240:23 248:17difference 77:21 103:2 149:5267:22,23 directing 77:9200:5 201:5 216:14 217:5deliver 154:10 155:3describes 153:18 201:21 204:24157:13 174:4direction 225:20 directly 185:1520:20:4 263:10 deliverabilitydeliverability 209:22 241:4201:11 255:3 201:11 255:3204:7,19 209:25decision-making 150:19 151:1 200:15154:7,25 description 153:7description 153:7 differences 118:7 19:15director 161:9 director 161:9200:15188:20 demonstrateddescription 153:7 155:5,9 242:15different 56:25 179:4179:4decisions 126:2 165:14 217:15demonstrates descriptions 211:8dos:14.16 109:18 165:8directors 164:1 disagree 144:20decline $61:12$ 77:24 decline $61:12$ 77:24demonstrating departing 244:21 designate 284:15131:2 146:4,21,22 131:2 146:4,21,22213:18 disagree 144:20decline $61:12$ 77:24 departing 244:21 designate 284:15designate 284:15 131:2 146:4,21,22disagree 144:20 disagree 144:20102:18 189:10 100:6 112:23,24 109:24129:22,23 167:18 167:20271:7 274:15 271:7 274:15177:2,2 230:15,15 177:2,2 230:15,15discover 255:2 discover 255:2 discovere 255:2declining 71:8 95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12 167:17designation 191:17 designation 191:17 256:20 263:5,6discovered 149:8 discovered 149:8 discovere 250:3113:19departments departmentsdesignatio	decides 216:11	157:24 200:9,10	described 63:2	106:9	189:6 195:22
198:13199:7,12 200:5delays141:17,19 deliver248:17 describes103:2149:5 157:13directing77:9 directing200:5201:5 201:4155:3 201:21201:21204:24 209:22157:13174:4 direction177:8193:12 200:11directly185:15 202:2520:4263:10 deliverability 150:19154:7,25 describing130:4 188:20177:8193:12 209:22204:7,19209:25 202:53decision-making 200:15154:7,25 demonstratedescribing130:4 188:20differences118:7 232:25232:25 different56:25 179:4decisionmaking 216:4demonstrated 188:15155:5,9242:15 155:5,9108:14,16109:18 directors165:8 disagree165:14 disagree102:18129:24designate284:15 designate131:2146:4,21,22 119:20213:18 disagree144:20 disagreedecline 61:1277:24 departingdeparting244:21 designatedesignate182:15 131:2131:2146:4,21,22 213:18decline 61:14 70:2395:9102:20 department192:12 235:16242:21 243:24175:12 175:12175:12 175:12141:20 discover213:18 discoverdeclining13:8 167:20167:17 designation191:17 256:20263:5,6 263:14265:13 263:14266:10113:19departments departabilitydesignation191:17 256:20263:14265:23 263:14	decision 67:12	215:21	66:1 67:10 210:23	differ 119:19	196:3 233:2
200:5 201:5 216:14 217:5 220:4 263:10deliver 154:10 155:3describes 153:18 201:21 204:24 209:22 241:4157:13 174:4 177:8 193:12 201:11 255:3direction 225:20 directly 185:15 204:7,19 209:25decision-making 150:19 151:1 200:15154:7,25 demonstratedescribing 130:4 188:20differences 118:7 different 56:25204:7,19 209:25 232:25decisionmaking 200:15188:20 description 153:7different 56:25 179:4179:4decisions 126:2 165:14 217:15demonstrates 209:24lescriptions 211:8 design 36:21109:19,21 110:4 113:24 119:13,19Director's 40:12 disagree 144:20 disagreementdecline 61:12 77:24 102:18 189:10demonstrating 150:13125:20 designate 284:15131:2 146:4,21,22 175:12 176:12Discounted 41:19 41:20decline 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24167:20 167:17 167:17235:16 242:21 283:18,23 284:2 284:2177:2,2 230:15,15 243:24 245:23,24Discounted 41:19 41:20discovere 149:8 designation 191:17 167:17 113:19designation 191:17 256:20 263:5,6 263:14 265:23263:14 265:23 263:14 265:23	149:16 150:7	delaying 157:18,19	227:13 240:23	difference 77:21	
216:14 217:5155:3201:21 204:24177:8 193:12directly 185:15220:4 263:10deliverability209:22 241:4201:11 255:3204:7,19 209:25decision-making154:7,25describing 130:4differences 118:7232:25150:19 151:1demonstrate188:24 245:21,25119:15director 161:9200:15188:20description 153:7different 56:25179:4decisionmakingdemonstrated153:13 154:1283:2 98:1 108:4Director's 40:12216:4182:15155:5,9 242:15108:14,16 109:18directors 164:1decisions 126:2demonstratesdescriptions 211:8109:19,21 110:4165:8165:14 217:15209:24design 36:21113:24 119:13,19disagree 144:20decline 61:12 77:24demonstrating125:20119:20 120:12,15disagreement102:18 189:10150:13designate 284:15131:2 146:4,21,22213:18declined 61:14departing 244:21designate 198:16147:8 169:5,17Discounted 41:1970:23 95:9 102:20department 39:11235:16 242:21175:12 176:1241:20106:6 112:23,24129:22,23 167:18271:7 274:15177:2,2 230:15,15discovere 255:2declining 71:8167:20283:18,23 284:2243:24 245:23,24discovered 149:895:13,13 100:23departmentsdesignation 191:17256:20 263:5,6discoverey 250:3106:5,7 111:12167:17designation 191:17256:20 263:5,6discoverey 250:3113:19depe	198:13 199:7,12	delays 141:17,19	248:17	103:2 149:5	directing 77:9
220:4 263:10 decision-making 150:19 151:1 200:15deliverability 154:7,25 demonstrate 188:20209:22 241:4 describing 130:4 188:24 245:21,25 description 153:7 differents 56:25204:7,19 209:25 232:25decision-making 200:15154:7,25 demonstrated 188:20describing 130:4 description 153:7 description 153:7differences 118:7 119:15204:7,19 209:25 232:25decision-making 200:15188:20 description 153:7 decisions 126:2 165:14 217:15demonstrated leamonstrates 209:24153:13 154:12 descriptions 211:8 design 36:2133:2 98:1 108:4 109:19,21 110:4 lise 144:109:18 lise 20:12,15Director's 40:12 directors 164:1decline 61:12 77:24 102:18 189:10demonstrating 150:13 department 39:11 235:16 242:21113:24 119:13,19 125:20disagree 144:20 disagreement 213:18declined 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24150:13 167:20designate 198:16 283:18,23 284:2147:8 169:5,17 243:24 245:23,24 discover 255:2 discover 255:2declining 71:8 95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12167:17 167:17 departments 167:17 designation 191:17 256:20 263:5,6discover 250:3 263:14 265:23 263:14 265:23113:19dependabilitydetail 33:21 116:10 differently 131:21266:10	200:5 201:5	deliver 154:10	describes 153:18	157:13 174:4	direction 225:20
decision-making 150:19 151:1154:7,25 demonstratedescribing 130:4 188:20differences 118:7 119:15232:25 director 161:9200:15188:20description 153:7 description 153:7different 56:25 different 56:25179:4decisionmaking 216:4demonstrated 182:15155:5,9 242:15 descriptions 211:8different 56:25 director's 40:12Director's 40:12 directors 164:1decisions 126:2 165:14 217:15demonstrates 209:24descriptions 211:8 design 36:21109:19,21 110:4 113:24 119:13,19165:8 disagree 144:20decline 61:12 77:24 102:18 189:10demonstrating 150:13125:20 designate 284:15 235:16 242:21131:2 146:4,21,22 175:12 176:12213:18 disagreementdeclined 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24departing 244:21 department 39:11 167:20designated 198:16 235:16 242:21147:8 169:5,17 177:2,2 230:15,15Discounted 41:19 41:20discover 255:2 discover 255:2designation 191:17 256:20 263:5,6discover 255:2 263:14 265:23discover 250:3 263:14 265:23106:5,7 111:12 113:19167:17 dependabilitydesign 30:21 116:10270:15 282:9 differently 131:21266:10	216:14 217:5	155:3	201:21 204:24	177:8 193:12	directly 185:15
150:19151:1 200:15demonstrate 188:20188:24 245:21,25119:15 different 56:25director 161:9 179:4200:15188:20description 153:7 153:13 154:12different 56:25 83:2 98:1 108:4Director's 40:12 director's 40:12216:4182:15155:5,9 242:15 4esciptions 126:2 165:14 217:15demonstrates 209:24descriptions 211:8 design 36:21109:19,21 110:4 113:24 119:13,19Director's 40:12 director's 40:12decline 61:1277:24 102:18 189:10demonstrating 150:13125:20 designate 284:15113:24 119:13,19 125:20disagree 144:20 disagreementdecline 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24departing 244:21 167:17designate 198:16 283:18,23 284:2147:8 169:5,17 243:24 245:23,24Discounted 41:19 41:20declining 71:8 95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12167:17 167:17 dependabilitydesignation 191:17 designation 191:17256:20 263:5,6 270:15 282:9discovery 250:3 263:14 265:23	220:4 263:10	deliverability	209:22 241:4	201:11 255:3	204:7,19 209:25
200:15188:20description 153:7different 56:25179:4decisionmaking 216:4182:15153:13 154:1283:2 98:1 108:4Director's 40:12decisions 126:2demonstrates155:5,9 242:15108:14,16 109:18directors 164:1165:14 217:15209:24design 36:21113:24 119:13,19disagree 144:20decline 61:12 77:24demonstrating125:20119:20 120:12,15disagreement102:18 189:10150:13designate 284:15131:2 146:4,21,22213:18declined 61:14departing 244:21designated 198:16147:8 169:5,17Discounted 41:1970:23 95:9 102:20department 39:11235:16 242:21177:2,2 230:15,15discover 255:2106:6 112:23,24167:20283:18,23 284:2243:24 245:23,24discover 255:2declining 71:8167:20283:18,23 284:2243:24 245:23,24discover 250:3106:5,7 111:12167:17designation 191:17256:20 263:5,6discover 250:3113:19dependabilitydetail 33:21 116:10differently 131:21266:10	decision-making	154:7,25	describing 130:4	differences 118:7	232:25
decisionmaking 216:4demonstrated 182:15153:13 154:12 155:5,9 242:1583:2 98:1 108:4 108:14,16 109:18Director's 40:12 directors 164:1decisions 126:2 165:14 217:15demonstrates 209:24descriptions 211:8 design 36:21109:19,21 110:4 113:24 119:13,19165:8 disagree 144:20decline 61:12 77:24 102:18 189:10demonstrating 150:13125:20119:20 120:12,15 131:2 146:4,21,22disagree 144:20 disagreementdeclined 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24departing 244:21 129:22,23 167:18designate 284:15 271:7 274:15147:8 169:5,17 175:12 176:12Discounted 41:19 41:20declining 71:8 95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12167:20271:7 274:15 283:18,23 284:2243:24 245:23,24 243:24 245:23,24discovery 250:3 263:14 265:23106:5,7 111:12 113:19167:17 dependabilitydesign 30:21 116:10differently 131:21266:10	150:19 151:1	demonstrate	188:24 245:21,25	119:15	director 161:9
216:4182:15155:5,9 242:15108:14,16 109:18directors 164:1decisions 126:2demonstratesdescriptions 211:8109:19,21 110:4165:8165:14 217:15209:24design 36:21113:24 119:13,19disagree 144:20decline 61:12 77:24demonstrating125:20119:20 120:12,15disagreement102:18 189:10150:13designate 284:15131:2 146:4,21,22213:18declined 61:14departing 244:21designated 198:16147:8 169:5,17Discounted 41:1970:23 95:9 102:20department 39:11235:16 242:21175:12 176:12discover 255:2106:6 112:23,24167:20283:18,23 284:2243:24 245:23,24discover 255:2declining 71:8167:20283:18,23 284:2243:24 245:23,24discover 250:3106:5,7 111:12167:17designation 191:17256:20 263:5,6263:14 265:23113:19dependabilitydetail 33:21 116:10differently 131:21266:10	200:15	188:20	description 153:7	different 56:25	179:4
decisions 126:2 165:14 217:15demonstrates 209:24descriptions 211:8 design 36:21109:19,21 110:4 113:24 119:13,19165:8 disagree 144:20decline 61:12 77:24 102:18 189:10demonstrating 150:13125:20119:20 120:12,15 125:20disagreement 213:12 146:4,21,22declined 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24departing 244:21 department 39:11 129:22,23 167:18designate 198:16 235:16 242:21147:8 169:5,17 175:12 176:12Discounted 41:19 41:20declining 71:8 95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12 113:19167:17 departmentsdesignation 191:17 designation 191:17256:20 263:5,6 270:15 282:9discovery 250:3 263:14 265:23designabilitydetail 33:21 116:10differently 131:21266:10	decisionmaking	demonstrated	153:13 154:12	83:2 98:1 108:4	Director's 40:12
165:14 217:15 decline 61:12 77:24 102:18 189:10209:24 demonstrating 150:13design 36:21 125:20113:24 119:13,19 119:20 120:12,15disagree 144:20 disagreement 213:18declined 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24departing 244:21 department 39:11 129:22,23 167:18designate 284:15 235:16 242:21113:24 119:13,19 125:20disagree 144:20 disagreement 213:18declining 71:8 95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12167:20designation 191:17 departments 167:17235:16 242:21 233:18,23 284:2177:2,2 230:15,15 243:24 245:23,24discover 255:2 discover 255:2designation 191:17 256:20 263:5,6 113:19designation 191:17 266:10263:14 265:23 263:14 265:23	216:4	182:15	155:5,9 242:15	108:14,16 109:18	directors 164:1
decline 61:12 77:24 102:18 189:10demonstrating 150:13125:20119:20 120:12,15disagreement 213:18declined 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24departing 244:21 department 39:11 129:22,23 167:18designate 284:15 235:16 242:21119:20 120:12,15 131:2 146:4,21,22disagreement 213:18declining 71:8 95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12 113:19departments 167:17235:16 242:21 283:18,23 284:2177:2,2 230:15,15 243:24 245:23,24discover 255:2 discover 255:2designation 191:17 256:20 263:5,6discovery 250:3 263:14 265:23106:5,7 111:12 113:19167:17 dependabilitydesignation 191:17 detail 33:21 116:10270:15 282:9 differently 131:21266:10	decisions 126:2	demonstrates	descriptions 211:8	109:19,21 110:4	165:8
102:18 189:10150:13designate 284:15131:2 146:4,21,22213:18declined 61:14departing 244:21designated 198:16147:8 169:5,17Discounted 41:1970:23 95:9 102:20department 39:11235:16 242:21175:12 176:12discover 255:2106:6 112:23,24129:22,23 167:18271:7 274:15177:2,2 230:15,15discover 255:2declining 71:8167:20283:18,23 284:2243:24 245:23,24discover 255:295:13,13 100:23departmentsdesignation 191:17256:20 263:5,6discovery 250:3106:5,7 111:12167:17despite 115:1 120:9270:15 282:9263:14 265:23113:19dependabilitydetail 33:21 116:10differently 131:21266:10	165:14 217:15	209:24	<b>design</b> 36:21	113:24 119:13,19	disagree 144:20
declined 61:14 70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24departing 244:21 department 39:11 129:22,23 167:18designated 198:16 235:16 242:21 271:7 274:15147:8 169:5,17 175:12 176:12 175:12 176:12Discounted 41:19 41:20declining 71:8 95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12 113:19departments dependabilitydesignated 198:16 235:16 242:21 271:7 274:15147:8 169:5,17 175:12 176:12 175:22 230:15,15 243:24 245:23,24 243:24 245:23,24Discounted 41:19 41:20 discover 255:2 discover 255:2departments 167:17 despite 115:1 120:9 113:19departments 270:15 282:9 263:14 265:23Discounted 41:19 41:20	<b>decline</b> 61:12 77:24	demonstrating	125:20	119:20 120:12,15	0
70:23 95:9 102:20 106:6 112:23,24department 39:11 129:22,23 167:18235:16 242:21 271:7 274:15175:12 176:12 177:2,2 230:15,1541:20 discover 255:2declining 71:8 95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12 113:19departments 167:17designation 191:17 despite 115:1 120:9256:20 263:5,6 270:15 282:9discovery 250:3 263:14 265:23detail 33:21 116:10differently 131:21266:10	102:18 189:10	150:13	designate 284:15	131:2 146:4,21,22	213:18
106:6 112:23,24 declining 71:8129:22,23 167:18 167:20271:7 274:15 283:18,23 284:2177:2,2 230:15,15 243:24 245:23,24discover 255:2 discovered 149:8 discovered 149:895:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12 113:19departments 167:17 dependabilitydesignation 191:17 despite 115:1 120:9 detail 33:21 116:10270:15 282:9 270:15 282:9discover 255:2 discover 250:3 263:14 265:23	declined 61:14	<b>i</b> U	0	147:8 169:5,17	Discounted 41:19
declining 71:8167:20283:18,23 284:2243:24 245:23,24discovered 149:895:13,13 100:23departmentsdesignation 191:17256:20 263:5,6discovery 250:3106:5,7 111:12167:17despite 115:1 120:9270:15 282:9263:14 265:23113:19dependabilitydetail 33:21 116:10differently 131:21266:10		-			
95:13,13 100:23 106:5,7 111:12departments 167:17designation 191:17 despite 115:1 120:9256:20 263:5,6 270:15 282:9discovery 250:3 263:14 265:23113:19dependabilitydetail 33:21 116:10differently 131:21266:10		,			
106:5,7 111:12167:17despite 115:1 120:9270:15 282:9263:14 265:23113:19dependabilitydetail 33:21 116:10differently 131:21266:10	declining 71:8			· · · · ·	
113:19         dependability         detail 33:21 116:10         differently 131:21         266:10	,	-		,	•
	,		-		
Decoupling 35:9,16         154:6,25         239:13,15,18,19         145:24 267:22         discrete 131:15				•	
	<b>Decoupling</b> 35:9,16	154:6,25	239:13,15,18,19	145:24 267:22	<b>discrete</b> 131:15
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 490 200
139:20,24 140:2,6	35:15,21 53:14,22	194:22 200:14	270:4 283:23	earnings 75:13,16
140:11,17,22	65:20 83:15,19	201:5 216:3	drafted 238:14	80:11 85:22 86:3
141:2,6 148:24	84:11 118:21	documents 144:23	dramatically 53:5	91:18 119:16
150:11 157:19	245:14	157:14 228:7	driven 101:3	earplug 49:23
158:6 188:25	<b>district</b> 190:14	244:2	driver 114:23	earplugs 49:24
189:22 190:18,22	214:20	<b>dog</b> 136:5	drove 117:20	50:1
191:3,23 192:2	<b>divided</b> 120:16	doing 119:21	<b>DRs</b> 252:14,22	easier 99:7 167:18
193:13,17,19	dividend 69:7	193:11 194:13	253:8 268:6	East 92:18
194:18,25 196:25	82:15,19 84:12,19	208:22 263:24	due 96:9 150:14	economic 32:8
200:21 215:24	102:8,13,17,21	266:3	155:10 200:11	36:13 38:21 278:6
239:20 251:24	103:1,6 104:13,17	<b>dollar</b> 194:24	226:22 284:21	economist 50:8
260:16	105:2,6,17,20,22	<b>dollars</b> 126:19,20		<b>Ed</b> 67:8
<b>discuss</b> 46:15,18	120:14,16,16,18	126:21 127:9,19	E	<b>Edison</b> 64:19
102:13 106:9,11	120:21,24 121:2	157:4 158:23	<b>E</b> 28:1,1 29:1,1	<b>EDIT</b> 33:21 232:8
107:20 209:19	<b>dividends</b> 117:4	167:6,9 190:3	40:3 44:4,4 48:4	233:3,9,12
284:8	<b>DJP-10X</b> 38:15	245:18 262:10,14	49:19 51:1 52:21	<b>EDITs</b> 232:10
discussed 52:1	264:5	dominate 245:18	63:22 70:9 87:22	<b>Educational</b> 42:3
133:7,8 149:19	<b>DJP-11X</b> 38:16	<b>dot</b> 67:7,9	92:14 113:16	effect 68:25 182:12
252:12 260:1	<b>DJP-1T</b> 37:24	<b>dots</b> 66:5 67:1,3,4	123:13 124:11	182:20 183:12,24
264:14 267:13	237:6 238:7	<b>double</b> 117:10,11	128:11 136:1	184:12 198:1
283:2	<b>DJP-2</b> 38:3	double-check	137:14 155:22	203:25
discusses 58:24	<b>DJP-3</b> 32:23 38:5	206:14	161:1 162:1	<b>effective</b> 33:8 34:6
59:3 211:4	<b>DJP-4</b> 38:6	downgraded 64:21	174:22 178:20	163:10 181:7
discussing 65:18	<b>DJP-5</b> 33:3 38:8	64:25	180:12 212:3	188:5 198:2
66:3 108:10	253:2,15 256:18	downgrades 59:3	218:21 225:4	effort 126:13
282:18	258:25	64:15 66:1,3,24	226:8 229:2	188:23
discussion 113:3	<b>DJP-6</b> 33:10 38:9	downgrading 65:5	230:21 232:1	efforts 132:11
117:1 230:24	<b>DJP-7</b> 33:12 38:11	downward 76:12	233:21 236:19	eight 79:22,24 80:5
247:7 249:7	<b>DJP-8T</b> 38:12	114:8	237:20 267:5	85:14 248:15
282:24	237:6	<b>Dr</b> 37:12 42:3	272:10 273:10	265:6
discussions 132:10	<b>DJP-9X</b> 38:13	48:25 51:3,24	281:18 288:1,1	<b>eight-inch</b> 146:12
133:13 225:21	242:21	52:5 57:14,16,21	EAP 36:9	either 104:15
227:8 228:8	docket 27:4 44:14	58:13 68:2 69:22	earlier 172:1	122:10,14 129:3
dispense 47:19	150:18 179:23	70:1 88:10,12,20	190:12 212:5	130:19 178:3
dispositions 201:25	182:10 185:22	88:25 89:7 92:12	224:21 241:23	189:18 208:9
<b>dispute</b> 280:15,16	243:15 274:19	92:16 93:6,9 94:9	248:18 250:4	223:4,11 238:14
<b>distinct</b> 217:12	284:17	95:4 96:12,18	251:4 252:9,12	284:2,4
260:18	document 55:24	98:15,24 99:10,11	253:20,24 258:15	<b>electric</b> 59:20,22
distinction 176:10	97:13 98:21 139:3	99:14 113:8,10,18	260:1 264:14	82:23 83:7,8,9,11
246:12 260:15	141:7 142:5 143:2	142:13 143:13,22	early 176:20	101:1,3,6,8
distinguishes	143:23 144:2,13	144:22,22 240:12	earmarked 127:9	117:19 118:11,12
245:16	145:5 153:25	250:12,13,20,21	earned 57:10,22	118:16,18,20,22
distinguishing	154:4 168:24	250:22 251:22	58:14 77:24 86:8	227:5 245:10,17
245:9	175:13 256:4	252:20 253:12	earnest 125:11	246:13
distracting 242:19	documentation	258:15 267:17,20	earning 183:22	electrics 118:19
distribution 35:8	150:18 151:1	267:22 268:1	184:10 212:19	electronic 98:12
	l	l	l	1

	105.05		11.51	106 5 100 11
255:4,6 256:7	185:25	evaluating 128:22	116:1	186:7 190:11
electronically	entitled 56:8	129:6 130:19	excluded 80:4	191:6,7 192:18
256:5	entity 131:1	200:5 216:13	223:24 224:2	198:21,22 201:16
elevated 109:4	<b>envelope</b> 193:11	217:6	excludes 251:24	209:8,9,14 214:7
<b>eleven</b> 76:13,13	194:13	evaluation 252:18	252:6	238:7 241:3 243:5
eliminated 162:14	<b>EOP</b> 39:23 219:10	282:5	excluding 39:15	243:8 244:7,12
<b>else's</b> 92:25	219:21 225:7	event 203:8,9	79:21 234:25	245:22 247:7
email 98:15 99:7,13	equal 68:22	206:10,16,21,24	<b>excuse</b> 59:15	253:5,5,15 256:15
256:22	equally 246:15	events 206:15	142:20 151:11	256:18 258:18,25
emphasis 170:8	equipment 227:7	282:6	excused 121:20	259:8 263:1,19,20
emphasized 176:8	equity 32:11 38:24	eventually 190:16	135:1 159:19	264:9 274:24,24
employ 118:3	51:10 52:1 53:6	everybody 71:18	177:22 271:6	275:5 276:5
<b>employed</b> 48:8,9	65:8 77:25 79:16	evidence 46:8,12	283:16	278:15,18,19,22
49:21 50:6 123:19	79:20 85:3,10,13	58:21 188:18	excuses 148:8	278:23 282:12
136:6 161:7,8	86:15,17,18 95:9	199:12,23 200:4	executive 276:24	284:16
179:3,4 236:25	95:12 100:15,23	209:23 210:10	exhibit 31:16 32:1	<b>exhibit's</b> 153:24
272:15	105:16 113:19	211:17	32:23 33:1,3,5,9	<b>exhibits</b> 31:17 32:2
<b>employee</b> 162:12	121:7 131:21,25	evidentiary 27:11	33:10,12 34:1,7	33:2 34:2 35:2
278:2	132:1 168:10	44:13	35:1 36:1 37:1	36:2 37:2 38:2
employees 129:14	169:3	exact 146:17	38:1 39:1 40:1	39:2,13,17 40:2
163:23 164:19	equivalent 57:10	148:15 285:1	41:1 42:1 43:1	41:2 42:2,11 43:2
170:15 276:13	<b>errors</b> 270:6	exactly 119:4 141:7	45:24 46:10,11	45:20,22,23 46:8
encompass 153:1	especially 114:14	153:4 257:17	47:24 48:15 53:1	46:13 47:18,22
encourage 189:12	115:19,22 241:16	examination 30:1	53:9,17 54:8,11	48:12,14,15,17
encouraged 167:16	essentially 91:15	31:1 69:25 212:6	54:22 55:8,25	50:12,15 51:13,14
<b>endeavor</b> 285:12	165:11 270:5	<b>examine</b> 265:10	58:2,5 60:4,10	51:17 52:11 65:19
ended 126:7 148:20	establish 95:7	examining 137:11	64:16,18 66:23	136:10,13,16
148:22 183:11	125:14,19 223:15	example 79:8 83:17	67:15 71:2,15,25	137:21 150:12,25
215:25	established 67:22	84:16,23 91:21	72:9 73:10,10,12	161:11 179:7,9,11
<b>ends</b> 108:16	77:16	118:18 126:14	73:21 76:17,21	182:15,20 183:4
<b>energy</b> 29:8 36:10	establishing 172:18	129:11 185:6	78:4,7,20,23	200:13 237:4,6,9
45:13,15,18 48:9	estimate 145:12	206:24,24 213:12	80:25 81:19,21,22	238:19 252:15
56:8 65:3,6	215:18 248:5	227:6 262:19,21	88:13 89:11,20	272:20,23
117:15,16,25,25	251:5,7	examples 128:20	91:5 95:5 101:11	<b>existed</b> 219:16
118:4 129:13	estimated 145:18	262:22	101:13 102:14	existing 186:22
284:2 285:24	145:23 146:23	exceeded 74:3	103:22 104:24	exists 211:17
<b>engage</b> 247:19	147:14 157:13	Excellent 70:14	107:4,5,8 108:2,9	expand 214:4
engagement 57:13	215:17 240:14	exception 46:9,14	108:10,11 110:13	expanded 203:24
88:9	249:23,25 251:2	excerpt 36:9,12	110:16 138:15,17	204:3
engineer 147:1	257:7	39:18 42:24,25	138:18 142:2	expect 111:17
engineering 136:7	<b>et</b> 127:24 133:16,21	43:3 55:25 56:15	153:21 154:16,17	119:3
146:25 159:3	154:9 155:3	247:24	156:3,23 165:6	expectation 62:8
engineers 163:25	evaluate 51:9 129:3	excess 232:6,16	166:5 168:16,20	expected 41:17
<b>entered</b> 182:4,8	196:16 199:23	Exchange 107:24	170:11 172:21,23	119:16 221:19
entire 128:15 139:3	evaluated 126:4	108:21,24 109:6	174:25 175:1	<b>expense</b> 40:8 138:8
entirety 129:24	131:15 150:1	109:16 111:2	184:5 185:15	202:2 206:7
				l

				ÿ
209:25	<b>fact</b> 101:4 143:14	243:25	113:2 114:9	<b>finish</b> 187:5
expenses 149:2	146:18 158:16,19	<b>farms</b> 246:17	116:22 133:12	firm 45:12 282:16
151:5 153:19	183:22 184:10	feature 96:9	141:18 145:22	<b>firms</b> 116:7,14
154:13 155:6	186:19 244:24	February 27:15	148:5 157:25	first 46:19 55:8
183:6,17 192:11	factor 34:14 37:8	44:1,7 60:21	181:18 189:23	61:22 64:3 69:20
250:17	59:2 85:2 195:5	61:13 70:22 72:11	196:17 259:20	88:4 118:2 123:15
experience 38:19	203:4,13 205:4,9	73:17 181:24	265:20 266:19	133:6 143:9
42:3 238:22	205:14,21,24	182:5 207:1	270:17 284:17	144:16 169:9
241:11,22	207:13,25 208:2	feedback 92:22	<b>files</b> 254:1	179:17,18 204:6
<b>expert</b> 153:10	209:23 211:6	93:3,8 95:1 96:7	filing 132:17	209:22 210:11
explain 66:13	217:25	feel 94:1 129:2	137:25 140:10,13	214:15 232:7
67:17 68:15 103:9	factors 110:2 111:4	133:18 213:19	182:10,14 183:2,5	265:17 267:7,17
106:14 107:21	134:1 164:12	263:25 271:16	183:16 190:7	267:19 274:14,18
146:6,21 147:17	187:8,18 188:19	feeling 252:25	196:22 203:12	275:18
162:10 174:1	197:16 201:15,21	feels 118:9	212:25 217:1	Fitch 32:3 59:8
185:6 190:15	201:23 202:3,7,12	Fees 40:12	219:23,24 220:14	five 114:12 141:1,5
199:10 201:11	202:18,19,23	<b>fell</b> 120:22	220:15 221:4,13	158:23 173:21
207:3 225:16	203:16,19,24	felt 217:25	221:16 223:11	174:5 282:8
231:2 246:20	204:4 208:12,20	<b>FERC</b> 233:3	224:19 240:3	five-year 171:4,7
275:20	209:20 210:21,24	FERCs 229:23	241:8 265:5	171:13
explained 75:15	211:5,18 252:13	<b>ffitch</b> 29:9 45:16,17	266:11	fixed 125:22 126:7
104:5,12 110:25	269:25	285:24	filings 132:8,12	126:12,18 227:4
196:22 234:12	failed 198:12 199:6	field 163:20	<b>filling</b> 164:21	229:21
explaining 66:12	199:11	Fifth 28:20 29:4	final 113:7 146:13	flexibility 263:22
66:13	<b>fair</b> 62:2 73:5 74:4	figuratively 99:2	148:15 195:17	flip-flop 85:8,16
explains 79:2	75:18,21 85:25	figure 65:10,16	196:25 199:24	floating 99:8
244:16	88:2 95:10 106:2	105:12 183:23	263:12 265:4	flow 41:19,20
explanation 166:18	124:19 151:10	184:11 191:10,15	268:9 270:20	131:18,20 132:4
175:8,9 213:3,4	157:5 182:3	191:15,18,20	276:18	flowing 147:3
213:25 214:3	194:24 202:5	192:1,11 193:16	Finally 284:19	fluctuate 172:16
explicitly 144:10	207:23 279:20	193:19,23,25	finance 51:7	fluctuates 62:10
224:10	fairly 62:6 64:24	194:14 195:7	financial 41:14	172:14
explore 196:10	172:2 238:25	222:1 251:14	59:12 239:16,24	fluctuation 62:12
explored 219:15	fall 56:25 65:22	264:15	financing 131:12	focus 62:13 89:6
Explorer 256:4	213:1	figures 139:12	<b>find</b> 84:10 89:3	169:23 189:12
expressed 233:11	fallout 56:9	197:1 212:8 240:7	90:2 105:5 146:3	focused 169:2
extent 189:13	falls 89:24	240:9,14,15,16,17	167:24 198:12,25	176:10
195:21 196:7	<b>familiar</b> 55:10 56:3	file 81:24 133:25	199:5 210:4,20	focusing 67:24
211:9 250:5	56:5 64:4 71:23	134:6 219:18	252:1 256:9 262:5	163:8 275:12
external 132:1	72:25 79:4 124:23	220:18 257:4	277:20	folks 146:21
extracted 268:12	124:25 191:20	<b>filed</b> 68:14,16,20	<b>finding</b> 242:18	follow 60:1 64:2
extremely 120:8	196:8 198:7	71:10 72:14,15	262:22	93:16 127:21
	199:18 209:5	73:3,15,15 81:1,4	<b>fine</b> 49:24 50:3	182:24 183:25
$\frac{\mathbf{F}}{\mathbf{F}^{200}}$	238:23,25 241:13	81:5 97:12,16	82:6 137:18 217:9	228:25 233:18
<b>F</b> 288:1	241:24 242:3	98:20 100:7,11	254:24 286:1,6	253:9 263:9
facing 278:7	<b>far</b> 67:9 78:16	104:21 112:2	fingers 94:4	264:24 269:6
	I	l	I	l

				. «90 00=
<b>follow-up</b> 66:14	260:19 266:18	236:21 252:13	63:16 66:6,10,15	258:1,8 264:19
128:4 130:14,16	267:8,15 268:7	272:12	67:14 87:17,20,23	Gateway 257:15
171:25 185:9	269:1,21 275:2,21	<b>fully</b> 140:11 187:8	87:24 92:5 98:4,8	gather 212:1
267:20	276:12,21	189:24	98:11,14,25 99:4	<b>GDP</b> 41:24
following 59:5 77:3	formalize 228:18	function 82:14,19	99:6,12 101:10	gears 125:18
224:7 266:8,8,10	formally 228:1	105:17,19,21	113:13,17 121:10	220:11
270:14	formas 184:22	funding 152:25	159:11,12 161:24	general 28:7,20
<b>follows</b> 56:1	185:5 212:18	153:6,14 240:23	161:25 162:2.4	32:8 44:14 45:2,7
food 108:19	format 96:22	241:5,8,14 242:1	164:7,10,23	74:23 75:10
footnote 143:12	formatted 48:25	248:7 249:4,5	169:18 170:1	113:25 117:15,17
145:8 152:6,11,15	formatting 48:21	250:17,23 251:17	174:14 175:4	118:4 164:12
179:22 201:17,20	forms 146:4,22	252:7 258:6	176:8 284:8,11,18	176:3 181:11
footnotes 209:3	147:8	259:18 260:2,7,9	285:7,7 286:22	184:23 198:8
force 164:20	formulated 285:19	260:18 262:25	Garlinghouse	208:10,18 212:12
foreclosed 113:6	formulating 84:7	263:2 264:18,22	27:20 288:6,11	216:10 219:11
foregoing 288:8	<b>forth</b> 49:9 136:19	265:11 266:14	<b>Garrett</b> 40:3	226:23,24 235:1
form 91:8 145:25	180:2	<b>furlough</b> 164:2,19	283:24,25	251:10 267:7
146:2	fortunate 148:1	furloughing 164:5	Garrison's 191:13	277:22,23
<b>forma</b> 37:15 38:3,4	forward 125:18	164:11	201:10	generally 64:4,5
42:18 138:2,9	126:14 130:13	<b>further</b> 63:17 65:2	gas 27:7 28:10	68:22 115:14
141:1 142:16	133:5,9 134:5	92:6 134:22,23	41:22 53:13,22	124:23,25 153:1
143:25 144:11	158:7 214:23	166:5 174:1,14	56:14,21 57:22	153:15 198:10
148:25 150:11	234:21	175:10 177:12	58:14,21 59:23	209:7 241:13,24
151:6 154:13,14	found 121:3 182:2	188:15 196:22	60:11 61:3 62:14	279:14 280:12
155:6,7 184:17,20	192:6 229:17	211:22 213:4	64:18,22,25 65:19	generating 245:18
184:24 185:3,13	244:15 264:20	218:15 224:24	77:19 82:23 83:6	246:18
185:17 186:16,20	foundational 88:5	226:2 235:10,11	83:8,9,11,14	geographical
187:25 190:9,19	118:2	266:23 270:24	84:11,17 86:6,8	214:17
190:23 192:8	four 140:14,21	281:2 283:10	86:14 97:3 99:21	gesture 238:5
193:13 194:16	177:25 221:5	future 125:20	99:25 101:1,6	getting 88:3 93:2
195:1 197:23	229:5	134:7 224:9,13	102:18 103:1	116:19 148:18
198:5 200:23	Fourth 27:22	229:22 235:1,2	104:18 106:4	151:19 217:2
202:9 204:1,20	frame 74:21	240:18 251:6	107:17,20 110:20	246:10 252:25
205:1,10,15 206:6	frankly 240:5	~	118:11,15,19	253:8 259:4
207:14 209:25	free 94:1 271:17	G	123:21 136:8	<b>Gibson</b> 28:13 44:20
210:4,15 211:18	frequency 56:21	<b>G</b> 42:13 43:3 44:4	147:2 154:6,10,25	178:17
212:8,14 220:12	132:7	138:15,21 139:11	155:3 161:8 179:5	give 74:6 91:20
220:13,18,22	frequently 244:4	144:2,3 157:3	207:7 245:10,14	112:6,11 123:7
221:17,17 230:23	front 95:6 197:12	254:11 261:19,20	Gate 125:15 144:24	124:22 128:19
231:6,15 238:15	213:8 218:6 236:9	262:8	145:6 193:23	151:24 185:6
238:19,24 239:13	243:7 253:19	Gafken 28:19 30:4	194:5,6,8 195:8	209:1,12 257:19
239:20 241:12,23	254:16 255:18	30:8,11,23 45:6,7	195:11 215:1,1	given 115:22 166:6
242:12 244:8	264:8	46:3,6 50:20,22	221:7,8,18 222:6	199:25 282:6
245:4 248:3 249:9	fuel 118:24	51:2 52:10,15,17	222:11,20 223:3	glad 84:9 202:24
251:24 252:11	full 136:3 178:24	52:19,22,24 54:18	223:10 251:17	243:19 258:19
254:13,13 258:12	183:9,9,10,13	54:23 57:18,20	255:10 257:11	gladly 255:19

<b></b>				5
glass 254:19	175:22 176:5,6	256:24 275:11	guiding 188:20	181:5 218:25
<b>Global</b> 32:3 54:20	177:3 180:17	greater 59:11 69:3	gun 246:25	222:14 236:10,12
55:10	184:25 186:15	106:25 128:18	<b>gui</b> 2 10.25	237:24 238:2
<b>go</b> 47:21 49:25 53:1	189:10 197:17.24	188:21 263:1	H	253:23 256:6
59:19 62:3 72:9	200:20 209:14	greatest 57:3,6	<b>H</b> 259:15	278:17 280:2
83:21 85:16 89:11	214:16,23 215:19	147:14	H-u-a-n-g 272:14	heard 115:2 133:1
89:21 90:13 91:6	218:9 220:11	<b>Gresham</b> 178:1,3	half 79:22,22,24,24	137:6 158:4
105:5 107:25	225:20 227:15	Gresham's 185:15	80:5,6 85:13,14	221:11 226:15
108:2 112:12	230:1 231:2	190:10 213:24	85:14,14 166:7	250:4 251:4
114:5 115:4	232:12,24 233:1,5	214:7	182:11,17 183:1	253:20 283:22
122:11 126:8,14	246:24 256:20	group 78:17 82:22	212:16 213:16	hearing 27:11
134:1,5 138:5	274:11 277:8	82:22 83:6,7,9	246:6	44:13 46:16,18
140:20 162:6	278:20,21,25	84:12,17 89:18,24	hand 123:1 135:16	92:23,24 95:2
164:12 166:19	282:12,23	97:3 99:22 102:6	160:14 178:12	96:4 121:18
168:1,3,8 170:11	good 44:18,25 45:1	102:18 104:18	236:7 272:2	134:25 135:7
170:19 171:18	45:6,11,16 48:2,6	110:21,24 147:9	handed 248:6	159:18 177:15,21
175:16,17,22	48:7 50:2 52:23	147:10 163:23	handle 230:5	178:6 223:12
176:18 179:16	61:16 70:5,11,13	groups 41:14	handling 123:5	228:19 235:14,19
188:4,12 193:3	87:24 88:1,2	119:24 177:3,9	273:4	271:11 283:15
195:17 197:16,17	92:16,18 94:8,8	growth 36:5 41:24	happen 133:20	284:6,13
198:1 206:14,18	94:10,10 121:21	68:1 80:11 82:15	159:6	heart 245:3
217:13 227:5	124:13,13 128:13	82:20,25 84:20	happened 61:8	heightened 53:5
230:17,17 234:21	128:14 130:3	91:3 105:18,22	63:2 87:5 117:2	134:11
240:4 242:4	137:16 146:20	120:21,24 121:6	120:5 195:17	Hello 237:23
276:16 277:8,9	159:21 160:20	138:8 151:5	206:21 222:18	help 98:4,17 127:11
278:13 280:3	162:3 171:8 172:8	152:24 153:19	269:9	146:5 198:18
goals 171:8 172:9,9	178:22,23 180:14	154:5,13,24 155:6	happening 115:11	helpful 83:20 94:24
172:16	186:12 218:23,24	155:11 202:1,20	happy 58:9	98:1 139:8 222:5
goes 62:11 94:2	226:10,11 227:25	202:21 206:8	hard 99:1 164:16	256:23
174:7 189:17	232:3,4 237:22	210:12	harder 167:20	hesitating 197:15
234:12 247:22	271:15,16,25	guess 63:13 93:12	hashmark 60:16	hiccups 287:1
275:14	273:12,13 286:12	96:24 97:7 101:22	hate 95:22,23	Higby 283:19,20
going 66:6,7 74:19	goodness 238:9	115:14 129:10	head 132:13 227:16	high 29:10 49:25
79:10 85:4 93:1	gotten 126:24	139:2 140:15	242:7	54:3 61:4 90:8
93:15 107:21	176:20 234:16	144:19 145:21	header 261:19	97:3 99:21,24
117:1,11 118:2	graph 67:16,18	158:14 184:4	heads-up 180:25	100:1 102:2,5
119:9,18,19 120:2	118:14	216:17,21 225:15	hear 46:19 47:15	116:8,9 117:3
120:3 122:13	graphed 65:11	228:4 231:1,10	49:22,23,23,24	120:7 156:12
125:8,12,13,14	graphs 67:15	233:14,23 243:9	50:2,3 52:4,5	221:7,9
126:2,11,14 127:5	<b>GRC</b> 33:22,23,24	guidance 166:12,13	63:24 70:11 72:20	high-dollar 245:17
132:14,18 133:15	34:3,4 184:16	167:15 168:5,7,18	92:17,17,20,21	higher 53:7 54:2
133:16,19,20	188:16 208:25	168:19,20,22,24	93:4,4,20,24 96:6	68:3,4,5,21,23
137:19 138:24	209:6 276:22	169:4 175:13	122:19,22 135:14	74:23 75:8 77:1
139:6 140:6 147:3	great 47:6 64:1	guideline 165:15	135:22 137:3,16	80:3 83:22 84:1
147:6,11,13 150:1	85:2 96:13 160:23	guidelines 165:24	137:18 160:9,21	85:6 100:21,25
158:16,20 159:13	191:19 238:1	166:23 170:4	178:9 180:14	102:4 104:17
	I	l	I	I