| 1 | Q. | Are you the same David L. Taylor who filed direct and rebuttal testimony in |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | this case? |
| 3 | A. | Yes. |
| 4 | Q. | What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony? |
| 5 | A. | My surrebuttal testimonypresents a revised version of proposed Schedule 32 that |
| 6 | | incorporates the changes to the tariff that I addressed in my rebuttal testimony in |
| 7 | | this docket. The revised schedule is attached as RMP Exhibit(DLT-1SR) and |
| 8 | | RMP Exhibit(DLT-2SR). |
| 9 | Q. | Please describe RMP Exhibit(DLT-1SR) and RMP Exhibit(DLT- |
| 10 | | 2SR). |
| 11 | A. | RMP Exhibit(DLT-1SR) is a revised version of proposed Schedule 32. RMP |
| 12 | | Exhibit(DLT-2SR) is a redline version of Schedule 32 that shows the |
| 13 | | changes from the version of Schedule 32 presented as RMP Exhibit(DLT-1) |
| 14 | | in my direct testimony in this docket. The revisions to Schedule 32 reflect the |
| 15 | | proposed changes that I discussed in my rebuttal testimony in this docket. |
| 16 | Q. | What are the specific revisions to Schedule 32? |
| 17 | A. | There are three revisions to proposed Schedule 32. First, the proposed tariff now |
| 18 | | includes prices for service to customers smaller than 1MW. Second, the sections |
| 19 | | of the tariff that referred to Back-up or Maintenance Service have been removed. |
| 20 | | Third, the prices for Daily Power Charges, as shown in RMP Exhibit(DLT- |
| 21 | | 1R) and Table 1 of my rebuttal testimony, have been incorporated into the tariff. |
| 22 | | This change is a result of the removal of the Generation Back-up Facilities |
| 23 | | Charge. Each of these changes was discussed in detail in my rebuttal testimony. |

| 24 | Q. | Since all of these changes were addressed in your rebuttal testimony, why |
|----|----|---|
| 25 | | was the revised Schedule 32 not included with your rebuttal testimony? |
| 26 | A. | There are two reasons I did not include the revised tariff sheets with my rebuttal |
| 27 | | testimony. First, at the time rebuttal testimony was filed, the parties in the case |
| 28 | | were involved in settlement discussions which may have resulted in different or |
| 29 | | additional revisions to proposed Schedule 32 from those I presented in my |
| 30 | | rebuttal. Second, some of the parties may have made arguments or proposals in |
| 31 | | their rebuttal testimony that would convince the Company to consider additional |
| 32 | | modifications to proposed Schedule 32. Either of these would have required that |
| 33 | | the Company file yet another revision to the tariff. |
| 34 | Q. | Were the parties able to reach a settlement in the docket? |
| 35 | A. | No. |
| 36 | Q. | Did any of the parties present arguments or proposals in their rebuttal |
| 37 | | testimony that caused the Company to further revise its position on Schedule |
| 38 | | 32? |
| 39 | A. | No. |
| 40 | Λ | Does this conclude your suppobutted testimony? |

41

A.

Yes.