

1 **Q. [Accounts 355.1 and 355.2] – As it relates to certain statements made in Mr.**
2 **Wiedmayer’s rebuttal testimony on pages 19 through 23 or in Appendix B pages 2**
3 **through 6, as it applies to Accounts 355.1 and 355.2 – Transmission Poles and**
4 **Fixtures, please prove a detailed narrative identifying and justifying what “proper**
5 **weighting of the original data” specifically is for the account, as referenced on page**
6 **23 of the rebuttal.**

7
8 A. Please refer to: (i) Attachment A to the response to Request for Information CA-NP-084,
9 page 13; (ii) Attachment A to the response to Request for Information CA-NP-088 (notes
10 of management meeting June 18, 2010); (iii) the *2010 Depreciation Study*, page II-26;
11 and (iv) the Expert Rebuttal Evidence, pages 19 through 23 and Appendix B, pages 2
12 through 6.

13
14 As explained in the referenced evidence, the survivor curve estimate proposed by Mr.
15 Wiedmayer represents a better fit of the most representative points in the original data, as
16 can be seen in Figure 1 on page 3 of Appendix B. As explained the Expert Rebuttal
17 Evidence, the 45-R2 survivor curve is actually the better fit curve for the most
18 representative data points. That is, it is the better fit for ages 0 through 47.5 and for age
19 32.5 (or 80% surviving) through age 47.5. However, as explained in evidence and the
20 Depreciation Study, the 47-R2 was selected due to additional factors external to the data.