In the Matter of the Applications of DTG Enterprises, Inc., d/b/a DTG Recycle

Docket No. TG-240583 and TG-240584 - Vol. I

October 30, 2024



1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 Bellingham | Everett | Tacoma | Olympia | Yakima | Spokane Seattle 206.287.9066 Tacoma 253.235.0111 Eastern Washington 509.624.3261

www.buellrealtime.com email: audio@buellrealtime.com

```
Page 1
                                                                                                                                        Page 3
               BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
                                                                             1
                                                                                            APPEARANCES
           UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
                                                                             2
                                                                             3
                                                                                   FOR PROTESTANT WASTE MANAGEMENT OF WASHINGTON, INC.:
                                                                                      Walter Stanovsky
      In the Matter of the Applications ) DOCKET TG-240583
                                                                             4
                                                                                      WalkerStanovsky@dwt.com
                                                                                      Davis Wright Tremaine
                          ) and
                                                                             5
                                                                                      929 108th NE Ste 1500
                                                                                      Bellevue, Washington 98004
      DTG ENTERPRISES, INC., D/B/A
                                        ) DOCKET TG-240584
                                                                             6
                                                                                      Ame Lewis
      DTG RECYCLE.
                                                                                      ALewis6@wm.com
                                                                             7
                                                                                      Senior Legal Counsel, Pacific Northwest
                                                                                      7227 NE 55th Avenue
      For Authority to Operate as a Solid )
                                                                             8
                                                                                      Portland, Oregon, 97218
      Waste Collection Company in
                                                                             9
      Washington,
                                                                                   FOR PROTESTANTS RUBATINO REFUSE REMOVAL LLC,
                                                                            10
                                                                                         SUNSHINE DISPOSAL AND RECYCLING:
                          ) PAGES 1-35
                                                                            11
                                                                                      Reid G. Johnson
                                                                                      riohnson@lukins.com
                                                                                      Lukins & Annis, P.S.
                                                                            12
                                                                                      717 W. Sprague Avenue, Suite 1600
          VIRTUAL PREHEARING CONFERENCE - VOLUME I
                                                                            13
                                                                                      Spokane, Washington 99201
         BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE BIJAN HUGHES
                                                                            14
                October 30, 2024
                                                                                   FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:
                                                                            15
                                                                                      Robert D. Sykes
                                                                            16
                                                                                      robert sykes@atg wa gov
                 Held via Zoom
                                                                                      Office of the Attorney General
        Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
                                                                            17
                                                                                      Public Counsel Unit
              621 Woodland Square Loop SE
                                                                                      800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
                                                                            18
                                                                                      Seattle, Washington 98104
              Lacey, Washington 98504
                                                                            19
                                                                                   ALSO PRESENT:
                                                                            20
                                                                                      Janusz Baisarowicz
                                                                            21
                                                                            22
                                                                            23
      TRANSCRIBED BY: ELIZABETH PATTERSON HARVEY, WA CCR 2731
                                                                            24
                                                                            25
                                                            Page 2
                                                                                                                                         Page 4
              APPEARANCES
                                                                                                 October 30, 2024
                                                                              1
                                                                              2
                                                                                                     -000-
     FOR THE APPLICANT:
 3
        Donna Barnett
                                                                              3
        dbarnett@perkinscoie.com
                                                                              4
                                                                                            JUDGE HUGHES: Good afternoon. We are now on
        Becca Human
        rhuman@perkinscoie.com
 5
                                                                              5
                                                                                    the record. The time is 1:31 p.m.
        Perkins Coie LLP
                                                                              6
         10885 Northeast Fourth Street, Suite 700
                                                                                            My name is Bijan Hughes, and I'm an
 6
        Bellevue, Washington 98004
                                                                              7
                                                                                    administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities
 8
     FOR COMMISSION STAFF:
                                                                              8
                                                                                    and Transportation Commission.
        Lisa W. Gafken
                                                                              9
                                                                                            We're here today for a prehearing conference
        lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov
 9
        Office of the Attorney General
                                                                            10
                                                                                    in Dockets TG-240583 and 240584, which is captioned In
10
         P.O. Box 40128
                                                                            11
                                                                                    the Matter of the Application of DTG Enterprises Inc.,
        Olympia, Washington 98504
                                                                            12
                                                                                    doing businesses as DTG Recycle, for Authority To Operate
     FOR PROTESTANTS SANITARY SERVICE COMPANY, INC.; WASTE
           CONNECTIONS OF WASHINGTON; BASIN DISPOSAL;
                                                                            13
                                                                                    as a Solid Waste Collection Company in Washington. So
13
           RABANCO LTD and KENT-MERIDIAN DISPOSAL CO.;
                                                                            14
                                                                                    this conference is a chance for the parties to state
           BAINBRIDGE DISPOSAL, INC.:
14
        David W. Wiley
                                                                            15
                                                                                    their positions on the petition for intervention and to
        dwiley@williamskastner.com
                                                                            16
                                                                                    discuss the procedural schedule.
        Michael S. Howard
15
        mhoward@williamskastner.com
                                                                            17
                                                                                            After today's conference, I will enter an
16
        Williams Kastner & Gibbs, PLLC
                                                                            18
                                                                                    order setting out the procedural schedule and a ruling on
        601 Union Street, Suite 4100
17
        Seattle, Washington 98101
                                                                            19
                                                                                    the petition for intervention, and setting a date for the
18
                                                                            20
                                                                                    hearing itself.
     FOR PROTESTANT WASHINGTON REFUSE AND RECYCLING ASSOCIATION:
19
        Rod Whittaker
                                                                             21
                                                                                            Okay. So let's start by taking short
20
        rod@wrra.org
        4160 Sixth Avenue SE, Suite 205
                                                                            2.2
                                                                                    appearances, beginning with staff.
21
        Lacey, Washington 98503
                                                                            23
                                                                                            ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Good afternoon. My name is
22
23
                                                                             24
                                                                                    Lisa Gafken, assistant attorney general appearing on
24
                                                                             25
                                                                                    behalf of commission staff.
```

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

-	Dave C		Dama 7
	Page 5		Page 7
1	JUDGE HUGHES: Welcome.	1	JANUSZ BAJSAROWICZ: Thank you.
2	Washington Refuse and Recycling Association?	2	JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Very good.
3	ATTORNEY WHITTAKER: Good afternoon. Rod	3	ATTORNEY LEWIS: And I'm sorry, your Honor.
4	Whittaker with the Washington Refuse and Recycling	4	Ame Lewis. I'm also for inhouse counsel for Waste
5	Association.	5	Management of Washington.
6	JUDGE HUGHES: Welcome.	6	JUDGE HUGHES: Welcome.
7	And for what I'll refer to as the joint	7	ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Apologies, Ame. I
8	protestants, which include Sanitary Service Company,	8	didn't see.
9	Waste Connections of Washington, Basin Disposal, Rabinico	9	JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Did I miss
10	[sic], Bainbridge Disposal, and Waste Management of	10	anybody? And my apologies if I did. But we've all
11	Washington?	11	appeared?
12	ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, Dave Wiley and	12	ATTORNEY JOHNSON: For the record, Reid
13	Mike Howard appearing for Sanitary Service, Waste	13	Johnson here is also on board representing Sunshine
14	Connections companies, Rabanco, and Kent-Meridian	14	Disposal and Recycling.
15	Disposal, Basin and Ed's Disposal et al., and Bainbridge	15	JUDGE HUGHES: Very good.
16	Disposal, protestants.	16	ATTORNEY BARNETT: Sorry. Is public counsel
17	ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And your Honor, Walker	17	on?
18	Stanovsky of Davis Wright Tremaine, appearing for Waste	18	JUDGE HUGHES: Oh, that's a fair question.
19	Management of Washington. So note that we do have	19	ATTORNEY BARNETT: I just got an e-mail from
20	separate representation from the other protestants.	20	Rob, who's having trouble getting on.
21	JUDGE HUGHES: Oh, okay.	21	STACEY BREWSTER: This is Stacey Brewster.
22	ATTORNEY WILEY: I believe Mr. Johnson is	22	I'll send him the link right now.
23	also here.	23	ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks. (Inaudible).
24	JUDGE HUGHES: Yes, for Rubatino Refuse	24	JUDGE HUGHES: We'll just take a minute.
25	Removal?	25	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: I also just sent Rob Sykes
	Daga 6		Dago 8
	Page 6		Page 8
1	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I	1	the link through our AGO chat feature.
2	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too.	2	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the
2	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney	2 3	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a
2 3 4	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present?	2 3 4	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are.
2 3 4 5	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say	2 3 4 5	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom.
2 3 4 5 6	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG?	2 3 4 5 6	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes?
2 3 4 5 6 7	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal.	2 3 4 5 6 7	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here. JUDGE HUGHES: Cool. Very good.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here. JUDGE HUGHES: Cool. Very good. And DTG Recycle, then?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very good. So we have a written petition to intervene
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here. JUDGE HUGHES: Cool. Very good. And DTG Recycle, then? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, thank you, Judge	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very good. So we have a written petition to intervene from Washington Refuse and Recycling Association. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here. JUDGE HUGHES: Cool. Very good. And DTG Recycle, then? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, thank you, Judge Hughes. Donna Barnett and Becca Human from Perkins Coie	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very good. So we have a written petition to intervene from Washington Refuse and Recycling Association. And before we get into the merits of that, is there anyone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here. JUDGE HUGHES: Cool. Very good. And DTG Recycle, then? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, thank you, Judge Hughes. Donna Barnett and Becca Human from Perkins Coie on behalf of DTG.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very good. So we have a written petition to intervene from Washington Refuse and Recycling Association. And before we get into the merits of that, is there anyone else on the call who wishes to intervene who has not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here. JUDGE HUGHES: Cool. Very good. And DTG Recycle, then? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, thank you, Judge Hughes. Donna Barnett and Becca Human from Perkins Coie on behalf of DTG. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very good. So we have a written petition to intervene from Washington Refuse and Recycling Association. And before we get into the merits of that, is there anyone else on the call who wishes to intervene who has not? Okay. Hearing nothing, we'll move on. I'd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here. JUDGE HUGHES: Cool. Very good. And DTG Recycle, then? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, thank you, Judge Hughes. Donna Barnett and Becca Human from Perkins Coie on behalf of DTG. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. JANUSZ BAJSAROWICZ: Good afternoon. I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very good. So we have a written petition to intervene from Washington Refuse and Recycling Association. And before we get into the merits of that, is there anyone else on the call who wishes to intervene who has not? Okay. Hearing nothing, we'll move on. I'd like to give each party a chance to respond to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here. JUDGE HUGHES: Cool. Very good. And DTG Recycle, then? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, thank you, Judge Hughes. Donna Barnett and Becca Human from Perkins Coie on behalf of DTG. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. JANUSZ BAJSAROWICZ: Good afternoon. I'm Janusz Bajsarowicz. I'm the director of compliance for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very good. So we have a written petition to intervene from Washington Refuse and Recycling Association. And before we get into the merits of that, is there anyone else on the call who wishes to intervene who has not? Okay. Hearing nothing, we'll move on. I'd like to give each party a chance to respond to the petition to intervene, but at first I'd like to ask
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ATTORNEY WILEY: And Sunshine Disposal, I believe, too. JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Is the attorney present? ATTORNEY BARNETT: I'm sorry; did you say DTG? JUDGE HUGHES: No, Rubatino Refuse Removal. I was trying to clarify which attorney that was. We'll get to you. ATTORNEY WILEY: That would be Mr. Johnson. I don't know if he's on the line yet, but he has filed notices of appearance. ATTORNEY JOHNSON: (Inaudible). Thank you. I had the incorrect meeting ID. And so I just got on, but counsel for Rubatino Refuse is here. JUDGE HUGHES: Cool. Very good. And DTG Recycle, then? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, thank you, Judge Hughes. Donna Barnett and Becca Human from Perkins Coie on behalf of DTG. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. JANUSZ BAJSAROWICZ: Good afternoon. I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the link through our AGO chat feature. JUDGE HUGHES: And I apologize for the confusion with the link. I'm not entirely sure how a meeting ID goes bad, but here we are. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: The mysteries of Zoom. JUDGE HUGHES: Mr. Sykes? ATTORNEY SYKES: Yes, I'm here for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: I apologized. I introduced the matter. But I'm sure you know what this is. We're taking short appearances. So go ahead. ATTORNEY SYKES: Rob Sykes for public counsel. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. Welcome. Okay. That has to be the last party, right? Very good. So we have a written petition to intervene from Washington Refuse and Recycling Association. And before we get into the merits of that, is there anyone else on the call who wishes to intervene who has not? Okay. Hearing nothing, we'll move on. I'd like to give each party a chance to respond to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

petition.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY WHITTAKER: Sure. Thank you, Judge. WRRA has been a long time involved in the commission proceedings. We've intervened in proceedings involving solid waste policy going back, you know, decades at this point.

So this particular -- these particular applications involve two pretty novel applications that have a potential to set policy for the rest of the industry, so WRRA's interest here is both in the industry as a whole and members that have these certificates that are not represented here in these proceedings.

And we are a person under the commission's intervention rules. So.

JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. So I would like to hear each party's position on the petition. I'll move through this probably quickly.

Staff, any objections?

ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff has no objections to any of the petitions for intervention.

So I can address each one as they come up, or if this statement is sufficient, then we can leave it there. But staff has no objection to any of the

JUDGE HUGHES: That sounds good.

solid waste plans or asked for by a local government, and typically, that is the basis for setting service. So that one is novel there.

Page 11

Page 12

And the second application, the MRF residual application, is also fairly novel and not the type of service that is typically, you know, requested under a D certificate application. It's typically for, you know, collection from specific residences and locations throughout the state. This is for one particular set of facilities and to move waste between those, not within any particular geographic territory.

So there are a number of issues and also just deficiencies in the applications that we could continue to get into, too, and other questions, too. But they just bear a full discussion in anticipation from the industry here. And there are --

> JUDGE HUGHES: Do you --ATTORNEY WHITTAKER: Yes.

JUDGE HUGHES: May I ask, there's quite a few parties here. And do you feel you have something beyond what they have to share?

ATTORNEY WHITTAKER: Yes, WRRA very much would. You know, we represent the industry as a whole. There are regulated companies here that this has the potential to set policy for that are not represented in

Page 10

DTG?

ATTORNEY BARNETT: DTG does oppose interventions.

And I apologize. Are we taking both of these dockets together? I don't -- I see we're taking them together, but I don't see that they've been consolidated.

So if we're taking them together, we object to both of them, and would -- we think that the intervenor has not shown that they are not likely to duplicate efforts. I don't see any of their members that are not being represented or that have an interest in these -- either of these applications.

They are not intended to be novel by any means at all. I don't think that they are novel.

And to the extent that their interests are addressed, they can be covered by the individual members that are being represented here individually.

JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Noted.

WRRA, would you like to respond to that

ATTORNEY WHITTAKER: Sure. Yes. In terms of -- I guess I will try to bifurcate the arguments, too.

The E-Waste application, the WRRA member interest there is that they've applied for a D certificate for authority that isn't included in local

this hearing.

And WRRA has always weighed in and tried to be a good intervenor, not broadening the issues. We do not intend to call any witnesses or broaden the issues beyond those already stated, but to just give the perspective of the full industry there.

And that's something that the commission has found valuable in the past. WRRA has intervened in many of these throughout the past, including some where our own members have been on the other side of the proceedings, too. So we've tried to always, you know, make our participation meaningful and warranted.

JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Well, I'm going to take that -- unless anyone else has anything further to say, I will take that under advisement, and deal with it in the PHC order.

ATTORNEY WILEY: Dave Wiley for the protestants. If I could just speak from experience, the WRRA has not only a unique role to play in a proceeding like this, but they also address policy issues in a way that's unique to them as a trade association.

And the commission has offered them extraordinary standing by virtue of the rule recognizing their interests in solid waste proceedings. I have never been involved in a solid waste application proceeding in

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

Page 15 Page 13 1 decades where they haven't been granted intervention, and there's overlap and some inherent efficiencies there, the 1 2 I would advocate for that here. 2 issues, the legal and factual issues, are sufficiently 3 JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. I'll take it under 3 distinct that I think it would be very cumbersome to 4 consideration. 4 develop testimony that weaves between both dockets. I 5 I would -- I guess I would ask the parties --5 think Ms. Barnett would probably agree with that, too, as 6 I inherited this case. So I apologize. I didn't realize 6 the applicant counsel. 7 it hasn't been consolidated. 7 We certainly believe that as protestant for 8 Are there any objections to consolidating? 8 responsive testimony, and we believe the -- again, the ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Yes, your Honor, unless 9 9 issues are very severable and not related factually and 10 any of the parties would like to go first. 10 legally. JUDGE HUGHES: Let's start with the 11 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. On -- down my list. 11 12 Rubatino Refuse Removal? applicant. 12 13 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, we do object to 13 ATTORNEY JOHNSON: Yes. We concur that we 14 consolidation. 14 also agree that a consolidation would not be appropriate. 15 We didn't intend -- we filed two separate 15 I would basically be rehashing many of the same 16 applications. They are very different. They're 16 arguments. 17 different issues, different parties, different sources of 17 But we do feel that the legal issues are 18 work, different scopes. 18 novel. And, you know, providing there's going to be 19 We expect one -- actually, just have -- while 19 likely several days of testimony, especially in the 20 the legal issues just on a general application for solid 20 consolidated matter, attempting to parse out testimony waste may be similar, everything else generally about it 21 relating to each of these applications may be overly 21 22 is different. And so we would think that it would 22 cumbersome. So we would object to the consolidation as 23 actually more efficient keeping these separated. 23 well. 24 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Staff? 24 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Noted. 25 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Sorry. I was trying to get 25 Public counsel? Page 14 Page 16 1 ATTORNEY SYKES: Public counsel has no 1 my unmute button going. 2 You know, I don't know that we feel strongly 2 position. 3 one way or another whether they're consolidated or not. 3 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Well, it does feel pretty close to consensus. 4 I'll note that there is overlap. I went and 4 5 looked at all the parties that are showing up in both of 5 ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Your Honor, for the 6 these dockets, and there is overlap. There was one 6 record, Waste Management hasn't been heard yet. May I? 7 additional protestant, I think, in the docket that ends 7 JUDGE HUGHES: (Inaudible) Go ahead. 8 ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Thank you. with a 4. But otherwise, all of the parties are the 8 We agree with what I think the applicant, as 9 9 10 10 To the extent that there's different legal well as the other protestants, have said so far. questions in each docket, I think we could deal with them 11 11 I would just note specifically a few either separately or together. 12 12 differences between the dockets that cover, as far as we 13 13 So that's a lot to say that we don't have a can tell, different geographies; and so, therefore, strong opinion on whether they should be consolidated or 14 14 direct competition with probably a different subset of 15 not. 15 haulers that cover presumably different evidence of It does seem like it would be efficient, 16 16 public convenience and necessity that would be required; 17 though, given that there is overlap of the parties, and 17 different collection logistics, on-demand collection at, 18 it would be efficient to have one procedural schedule 18 you know, residences versus hauling of waste from the 19 rather than two. 19 applicants own MRFs. 2.0 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Noted. 2.0 And I think there are different legal issues 21 Let's start with the joint protestants, then. 21 as well, though the overall framework, of course, is that 22 ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, if you're 22 of the commission's, you know, standards for granting an 23 referring to me in terms of the group that we represent, 23 application.

The E-Waste one seems like it could implicate

issues of state law specific to handling E-Waste and kind

24

25

24

25

we agree with Ms. Barnett. We believe that the issues

are -- while I acknowledge, as Ms. Gafken says, that

Page 19 Page 17 of extended producer responsibility there. 1 unclear on exactly what these applications are asking for 1 2 2 The C&D docket implicates, you know, in some regards. 3 exceptions for certain commercial collection that are not 3 It seems clear that neither of them thus far 4 applicable to residential. 4 meets all of the commission's requirements for an 5 5 And we'll probably talk about this later, but application to be complete. 6 the C&D application is considerably less complete than 6 And so we would propose that the intervenors 7 the E-Waste application, too. So we think potentially, 7 and protestants not be required to respond to any 8 there's already a sort of procedural disconnect that's 8 discovery until after the applications are complete. 9 9 been introduced. We think it's the applicant's burden to prove 10 And so for all those reasons and what the 10 their case and to meet the commission's requirements. 11 And so starting, potentially, to seek information from 11 other parties have said, we would oppose consolidation. 12 others before they have sort of met that threshold for 12 Thank you. 13 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Well, I've never seen 13 entry, we think wouldn't be appropriate. JUDGE HUGHES: Would the applicant like to 14 all parties agree to that extent, so we will not 14 15 consolidate. I will treat this as a prehearing 15 respond to that? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, I object to that. 16 conference for both, if that is okay, and we can develop 16 17 two procedural schedules if that suits the parties. We 17 This is a prehearing conference. These are separate 18 will get to procedural schedules in a second here. 18 adjudications. It is now an adjudication; and therefore, 19 Would the parties like to have the discovery 19 we should be entitled to discovery as every other 20 rules available, starting with the applicant? 20 adjudication. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes. Thanks. 21 I'm not saying that we have any intention on 21 asking any discovery of any parties at all in either 22 JUDGE HUGHES: Staff? 22 23 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Actually, and I don't know 23 case, but I don't want to foreclose or forbid an if this is part of discovery, but we do see a protective 24 applicant just because they're the applicant in an 24 25 order being required in this case. 25 adjudication. Page 18 Page 20 1 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Thank you. 1 JUDGE HUGHES: That's coming up. So very 2 2 Okay. Waste Management, do you intend to good. 3 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks. 3 bring a summary motion of some sort if you believe the JUDGE HUGHES: Well, we'll ask both at the 4 4 application is insufficient? 5 same time, then. 5 ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: You know, we thought 6 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Okay. 6 about that possibility, frankly. 7 JUDGE HUGHES: Staff, discovery and/or 7 But it seems likely that the remedy would be 8 8 dismissal without prejudice and that the applicant would protective order? 9 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Yes on discovery. 9 probably be free to file a completed application. I'm 10 10 And I defer to the applicant on protective surmising at this point. But that doesn't seem 11 order. We certainly wouldn't have an objection to that. 11 productive, to go through a whole other cycle of 12 JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. 12 interventions and appearances and whatever else. 13 13 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Just to be clear, are we So no, I don't think we intend to move for 14 talking about discovery and protective order in both of 14 dismissal, but I think we would essentially argue that 15 the two dockets? I assume yes, but just for clarity. 15 things shouldn't really move forward as if this were a normal case until the normal requirements for application 16 ATTORNEY BARNETT: That's a good question. 16 17 We would request one for both. Thanks. 17 have been met. 18 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Any objections to 18 ATTORNEY BARNETT: May I respond? 19 that? 19 JUDGE HUGHES: Go ahead. 20 ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Sorry; to clarify, your 20 ATTORNEY BARNETT: I think that if the normal 21 Honor, objections to a protective order? 21 application -- I think that the normal procedure would be 22 JUDGE HUGHES: A protective order and opening 22 if the application were insufficient or deficient on its 23 23 face, the commission would have kicked it out. The of the discovery rules. 24 24 ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: As to discovery, I would commission would have said try it again. 25 25 suggest that Waste Management, at least, is a little So I think the fact that we're here says that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 21

we've gone at least this far. And if things need to be corrected, which certainly they might, or provide more information, then we can do that within the context of an adjudication.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. I'm inclined to let --Mr. Howard?

ATTORNEY HOWARD: Oh, sorry, your Honor. If it's appropriate for me to offer additional comment in support of our clients we're appearing for today, I just wanted to clarify a couple points that we have similar concerns as raised by Waste Management with the completeness of the applications, particularly the residuals application in 240584.

If your Honor looks at WAC Rule 480-70-091, that contains the various requirements for applications. And I think it's very notable that in residuals application, as I recall, we don't even have a proposed tariff or statements from shippers.

So I would also quibble some with DTG's comment that the commission did not kick this filing, and that therefore we are here. That was a judgment call apparently made by staff to docket this. And, of course, your Honor and the commissioners are the appropriate deciding officials for whether this application is sufficient, and not the actions of regulatory services.

Page 23

ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: (Inaudible) your Honor. I'm not sure, but it seems like you're suggesting that the appropriate remedy would be a dispositive motion if the parties are concerned about the applicant's failure to fully apply; is that correct?

JUDGE HUGHES: Yes. If you would like your -- it seems you are collectively claiming that this application is not sufficient to proceed, that we shouldn't even be at this prehearing conference. Should we? Is that your position?

ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Not exactly. As I said, you know, I recognize there's already been a lot of ink spilled on this docket even to reach this point, just procedurally to get the parties in, to put together a protest, all of which would be largely the same. And I don't think it would be a good use of anyone's time or resources to go through it again if it could be solved as simply as the applicant filing a complete application and pausing this proceeding in the meantime, rather than shutting it down and starting all over.

JUDGE HUGHES: Well, very good. I'm going to allow discovery.

If discovery is received by you and is, you believe, prejudicial or erroneous, please bring a motion so saying.

Page 22

So I would go so far as to suggest that the company, DTG, should demonstrate good cause for why it's not complying with commission rules and why the commission should exempt it from commission rules and require us to proceed, and why the other parties should be required to proceed for the next few months engaging in discovery when we don't have a proposed tariff from the applicant and other essential information.

But I will conclude, unless your Honor has questions. Thank you.

JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

Okay. This has all been interesting. However, you will have to file a motion, one of you, if you would like to pursue this.

We are at the prehearing conference. We are planning the procedural schedule. And I'm going to say -- I'm going to -- under 480-07-400, I'm allowed to -discovery is available in any proceeding at the discretion of the commission. So I will allow discovery to be open.

Please feel free to object to any discovery requests.

And if the application is materially deficient, I don't think the prehearing conference is the place to deal with that. So I will --

Page 24

On that, the commission has limited resources, and it's fielding quite a number of adjudications right now. So it is my intent to require in the PHC order that the parties in this matter confer with one another prior to bringing a discovery matter to my attention. Does any party object to that?

ATTORNEY GAFKEN: No objection from staff. ATTORNEY BARNETT: None.

9 ATTORNEY WILEY: No objection. 10

(Overlapping speakers.)

JUDGE HUGHES: Did I hear an objection 11 12 there?

> ATTORNEY SYKES: No objection from public counsel.

ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And from Waste Management, no objection.

I would like to note that I'd like to be heard on one additional point about confidential information at some point. I'm not clear whether we're coming back to that issue or not, but I don't want it to be missed.

JUDGE HUGHES: Sure. Let's do that unless anyone else has anything to say about talking to one another about discovery before coming to me.

Good. Go ahead, Waste Management, then.

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

Docket No. TG-240583 and TG-240584 - Vol. I - 10/30/2024 Page 25 Page 27 unable to reach an agreement. Thank you. 1 ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Yes. Thank you, your 1 2 Honor. 2 (Recess) 3 3 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Have the parties come Just to make the point that again, it's not 4 to an agreement? 4 entirely clear to Waste Management, and as we understand 5 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: They have, on a schedule, 5 it, to a number of the other parties, exactly what the or two schedules. 6 applicant is seeking to do here. And with those gaps 6 7 being present, it's also difficult, given the 7 JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. I'm ready, if you 8 8 would be so kind. fact-intensive nature of the commission standards for 9 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Okay. I am going to share 9 issuing a certificate, it's hard to know what the actual my screen so you can follow along. You should see a Word 10 factual issues will be or what discovery might be sought 10 document that has something that looks like a schedule. 11 11 or information requested. 12 We don't plan on seeking highly confidential 12 JUDGE HUGHES: I'm just going to screen print 13 here. Why don't we do this every time? 13 protection at this time, but just want to make the ATTORNEY GAFKEN: I can also e-mail this out, 14 commission and the parties aware that it's an issue we 14 15 will keep an eye on and reserve the right to move for 15 because it's going to get a little bit complicated. It's not too bad. 16 highly confidential protection if merited by information 16 17 that's asked for. 17 So we have the two dockets. We have the 18 18 E-Waste and the MRF dockets. JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. 19 Does any other party have anything to say 19 And so taking TG-240584, which is the MRF about protective orders, discovery, or highly 20 docket, the parties have agreed to meet on December 10, 20 21 2024, to talk in a confidential settlement agreement --21 confidential information before we move on to the 22 or sorry; settlement conference. So the rest of the 22 procedural schedule? 23 Hearing nothing, I'm going to ask, given the 23 dates don't apply to the MRF docket. number of you, have the parties had the opportunity to 24 If we don't -- if the parties don't come to 24 25 25 an agreement on December 10, then we would work together discuss a procedural schedule? Page 26 Page 28 Do you have any agreement? to come up with a procedural schedule that would fill out 1 1 2 2 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: I did send out a proposed the rest of that docket. 3 procedural schedule. I think that conversation is going 3 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: So the rest of the dates 4 to be a little bit complicated if we have two -- I mean, 4 5 5 that are on the screen apply to TG-240583, the E-Waste we will have two procedural schedules coming out of this 6 6 if they're not consolidated. docket. 7 And so with that -- and I can just read them 7 So I only heard back from one. We don't have 8 an agreement, but we do at least have something to talk 8 in, even though there's a screenshot, but I know there's 9 9 also a record that goes along with this. about. 10 So for the oral record, applicant testimony 10 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. In that case, I'm not and exhibits would be due on December 10, 2024. 11 11 going to go through the requirements of the schedule. I 12 12

believe all of you have appeared many times here.

So we can take a brief recess to allow the parties some time to discuss.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We're going to do two procedural schedules. And if they could maybe not be the same, we could stagger them, that would be my preference. We did not do that with the general rate cases well enough, and living and learning.

So please let me know whether there's a need for legal brief after the evidentiary hearing. And -yeah.

So I will exit the call so I'm not participating, and then would someone please buzz me when the parties reach an agreement or determine that you are

There would be a settlement conference with

all of the parties on January 8, 2025. Response testimony from protestants,

intervenors, and staff would be due on February 13, 2025. Rebuttal and cross-answering testimony would

be due on March 13, 2025. The discovery deadline would be April 11,

2025. There's just a note there that assuming with the ten-day turnaround, responses to DR's served on April 11 would be due on April 25.

The next deadline is the exhibit list, cross-examination exhibits, witness list, time estimates, and exhibit errata. Those would be due on April 29, 2025.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	Page 29		Page 31
1	We're proposing an evidentiary hearing on May	1	So to be clear, on 240584, the parties are
2	5, 2025.	2	good with settlement discussion, and then delaying if you
3	ATTORNEY WILEY: May 6.	3	were to so continue?
4	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: I'm sorry? Oh, yes, May 6.	4	I suppose that would be the applicant. The
5	ATTORNEY WILEY: May 6.	5	applicant is okay with that, to delay the
6	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Too many 5's on the screen.	6	ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes, thanks for that.
7	May 5, 2025, for the evidentiary hearing.	7	JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Okay. Well, thank you
8	And post-hearing briefs due on June 5, 2025.	8	for the proposed schedules. I will incorporate them into
9	JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Has there been	9	the prehearing conference order.
10	discussion about desire for in person versus hybrid?	10	Do any of the parties no, we already
11	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: We did not discuss that.	11	covered that.
12	JUDGE HUGHES: That's fair. I don't think I	12	All right. I'm going to read some things I
13	brought it up. My preference is to do it in person, just	13	have to read.
14	because the breakout rooms can be a little tricky with	14	Electronic filings, electronic service: I
15	confidential information. But if there are strong	15	want to remind the parties that documents should be filed
16	objections to that, I can certainly accommodate a hybrid.	16	online through the electronic filing link on the
17	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: I would sorry.	17	commission's web page.
18	ATTORNEY HUMAN: Before we move on, I wanted	18	If the parties intend to submit exhibits,
19	to clarify. On the screenshot, it says applicant direct	19	there will be requirements for filing exhibits: An
20	testimony December 17, but Lisa, I think you said out	20	exhibit list in advance of the hearing, which will only
21	loud December 10.	21	be done electronically.
22	ATTORNEY WILES: Yes.	22	I will issue a prehearing order with details
23	ATTORNEY HUMAN: So I want to make sure that	23	on this topic.
24	we're December 17 for the direct testimony and exhibits.	24	Also, the commission's rules provide for
25	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: That's a good	25	electronic service of documents. The commission will
	D 20		
	Page 30		Page 32
1	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF	1	Page 32 serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve
2	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584	2	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically.
2	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony,	2 3	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our
2 3 4	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry.	2 3 4	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written
2 3 4 5	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my	2 3 4 5	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at
2 3 4 5 6	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is	2 3 4 5 6	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible).
2 3 4 5 6 7	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10.	2 3 4 5 6 7	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have handy. So expect to be able to confirm that within 24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good. Okay. Is there anything else we need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have handy. So expect to be able to confirm that within 24 hours at the most, but would appreciate forestalling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good. Okay. Is there anything else we need to address today?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have handy. So expect to be able to confirm that within 24 hours at the most, but would appreciate forestalling issuing that order until we can confirm, and then we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good. Okay. Is there anything else we need to address today? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes. Your Honor. I had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have handy. So expect to be able to confirm that within 24 hours at the most, but would appreciate forestalling issuing that order until we can confirm, and then we don't have to change it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good. Okay. Is there anything else we need to address today? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes. Your Honor. I had it on my to-do list to officially correctly notice our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have handy. So expect to be able to confirm that within 24 hours at the most, but would appreciate forestalling issuing that order until we can confirm, and then we don't have to change it. JUDGE HUGHES: I have far too many exhibit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good. Okay. Is there anything else we need to address today? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes. Your Honor. I had it on my to-do list to officially correctly notice our DTG's e-mail address because I've seen three so far, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have handy. So expect to be able to confirm that within 24 hours at the most, but would appreciate forestalling issuing that order until we can confirm, and then we don't have to change it. JUDGE HUGHES: I have far too many exhibit lists to make to get this order out that quickly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good. Okay. Is there anything else we need to address today? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes. Your Honor. I had it on my to-do list to officially correctly notice our DTG's e-mail address because I've seen three so far, and we are missing emails.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have handy. So expect to be able to confirm that within 24 hours at the most, but would appreciate forestalling issuing that order until we can confirm, and then we don't have to change it. JUDGE HUGHES: I have far too many exhibit lists to make to get this order out that quickly. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Fair enough. Just to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good. Okay. Is there anything else we need to address today? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes. Your Honor. I had it on my to-do list to officially correctly notice ourDTG's e-mail address because I've seen three so far, and we are missing emails. So could I put on the record that our e-mail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have handy. So expect to be able to confirm that within 24 hours at the most, but would appreciate forestalling issuing that order until we can confirm, and then we don't have to change it. JUDGE HUGHES: I have far too many exhibit lists to make to get this order out that quickly. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Fair enough. Just to be safe. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good. Okay. Is there anything else we need to address today? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes. Your Honor. I had it on my to-do list to officially correctly notice ourDTG's e-mail address because I've seen three so far, and we are missing emails. So could I put on the record that our e-mail address for DTG of course everything should go to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	clarification. So the settlement testimony in the MRF docket, 240584 ATTORNEY BARNETT: Not settlement testimony, settlement conference. Sorry. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: What is happening with my words today? Settlement conference for the MRF docket is December 10. And then the applicant direct testimony and exhibits are December 17 for the E-Waste Docket 240583. ATTORNEY HUMAN: Thank you. ATTORNEY BARNETT: Thanks, Becca. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: And one other clarification, your Honor, which is the May 6 hearing date, my client, that tentatively works, but has to do a final check with some information that they don't have handy. So expect to be able to confirm that within 24 hours at the most, but would appreciate forestalling issuing that order until we can confirm, and then we don't have to change it. JUDGE HUGHES: I have far too many exhibit lists to make to get this order out that quickly. ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: Fair enough. Just to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	serve parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our master service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or e-mail it to me at Bijan.Hughes@utc.wa.gov, (inaudible). All right. I skipped over this. So during the proceedings the commission parties issue a first data request, asking that any subsequent data request responses are shared with every party. Would it make it easier on the parties if I included this in the prehearing conference order? Is there any objection to me including that requirement? Seeing head shakes, very good. Okay. Is there anything else we need to address today? ATTORNEY BARNETT: Yes. Your Honor. I had it on my to-do list to officially correctly notice ourDTG's e-mail address because I've seen three so far, and we are missing emails. So could I put on the record that our e-mail

,	Page 33		Page 35
1	Sorry for all the confusion.	1	CERTIFICATE
2	JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Thank you. Reducing	2	STATE OF WASHINGTON)
3	bouncebacks always reduces my stress. So thank you.	3) ss
4	Any other issues?	4	COUNTY OF KING)
5	ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: I hesitate to even	5	COUNTY OF KING
6	mention this, but, Donna, I thought I heard you spell	6	I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified
7	"recycle" without the second C.	7	Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter
8	ATTORNEY BARNETT: Oh, I swear to God.	8	within and for the State of Washington, do hereby
9	Sorry.	9	certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing legal
10	ATTORNEY STANOVSKY: It could have been me.	10	recordings were transcribed under my direction; that I
11	Like I say, I	11	received the electronic recording in the proprietary
12	(Overlapping speech)	12	format; that I am not a relative or employee of any
13	JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you for catching that.	13	attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor
14	ATTORNEY BARNETT: It is info@DTGrecycle.com.	14	financially interested in its outcome.
15	I was on the application, it said info@DTGrecycling,	15	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
16	so that's what I'm trying to correct.	16	hand this November 13, 2024.
17	And then there was another one that went to	17	
18	DTG at something else.	18	
19	So it's info@DTGrecycle.com.	19	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR
20	JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Noun, not a verb. I	20	SI AUGUSTA
21	think we should all be able to remember that moving	21	Clifiller Jaixerallisty
22	forward.	22	Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, CCR 2731
23	So good. I will issue an order shortly	23	
24 25	containing the procedural schedule and other guidelines	24	
2 5	for disposition of this case, including the motion for	25	
	Page 34		
1	intervention.		
2	We are adjourned. Thank you, and let us be		
3	off the record.		
4	(Proceedings concluded at 2:45 p.m.)		
5	1		
6	1		
7	!		
8	1		
10	1		
11	1		
12	1		
13	1		
14	1		
15	1		
16	1		
17	1		
18	!		
19	1		
20	1		
21 22	1		
23	1		
23 24	1		
25	1		

	Ì		I	I
A	apologies 7:7,10	argument 10:20	Bainbridge 2:13	buzz 26:24
able 30:16 33:21	apologize 8:2 10:4	arguments 10:22	5:10,15	
accommodate	13:6	15:16	Bajsarowicz 3:20	<u> </u>
29:16	apologized 8:9	asked 11:1 25:17	6:22,23 7:1	C 2:1 3:1 33:7 35:1
acknowledge 14:25	apparently 21:22	asking 19:1,22 32:9	Barnett 2:3 6:5,18	35:1
actions 21:25	appearance 6:12	assistant 4:24	6:19 7:16,19,23	C&D 17:2,6
actual 25:9	32:5,24	association 2:19	10:2 13:13 14:24	call 8:20 12:4 21:21
additional 14:7	appearances 4:22	5:2,5 8:18,24	15:5 17:21,23	26:23
21:8 24:18	8:11 20:12	12:21	18:3,6,16 19:16	captioned 4:10
address 9:21 12:20	appeared 7:11	assume 18:15	20:18,20 24:8	case 13:6 17:25
32:17,20,23,25	26:12	assuming 28:19	30:3,11 31:6	19:10,23 20:16
addressed 10:16	appearing 4:24	attempting 15:20	32:18 33:8,14	26:10 33:25
adjourned 34:2	5:13,18 21:9	attention 24:6	basically 15:15	cases 26:18
adjudication 19:18	applicable 17:4	attorney 2:9 3:16	Basin 2:12 5:9,15	catching 33:13
19:20,25 21:4	applicant 2:3 6:24	4:23,24 5:3,12,17	basis 11:2	cause 22:2
adjudications	13:12 15:6 16:9	5:22 6:1,3,5,8,10	bear 11:15	CCR 1:24 35:22
19:18 24:3	17:20 18:10 19:14	6:13,18 7:3,7,12	Becca 2:4 6:19	certain 17:3
administrative	19:24,24 20:8	7:16,19,23,25 8:5	30:11	certainly 15:7
1:12 4:7	22:8 23:18 25:6	8:7,12 9:2,19 10:2	beginning 4:22	18:11 21:2 29:16
advance 31:20	28:10 29:19 30:8	10:21 11:18,22	behalf 4:25 6:20	certificate 10:25
advisement 12:15	31:4,5	12:17 13:9,13,25	believe 5:22 6:2	11:7 25:9
advocate 13:2	applicant's 19:9	14:22 15:13 16:1	14:24 15:7,8 20:3	certificates 9:11
afternoon 4:4,23	23:4	16:5,8 17:21,23	23:24 26:12	Certified 35:6
5:3 6:22	applicants 16:19	18:3,6,9,13,16,20	Bellevue 2:6 3:5	certify 35:9
AGO 8:1	application 4:11	18:24 19:16 20:5	beyond 11:20 12:5	chance 4:14 8:22
agree 14:24 15:5,14	10:23 11:4,5,7	20:18,20 21:7	bifurcate 10:22	change 30:19
16:9 17:14	12:25 13:20 16:23	23:1,11 24:7,8,9	Bijan 1:12 4:6	chat 8:1
agreed 27:20	17:6,7 19:5 20:4,9	24:13,15 25:1	Bijan.Hughes@u	check 30:15
agreement 26:1,8	20:16,21,22 21:13	26:2 27:5,9,14	32:6	claiming 23:7
26:25 27:1,4,21	21:17,24 22:23	28:4 29:3,4,5,6,11	bit 26:4 27:15	clarification 30:1
27:25	23:8,18 33:15	29:17,18,22,23,25	board 7:13	30:13
ahead 8:11 16:7	applications 1:4	30:3,5,10,11,12	bouncebacks 33:3	clarify 6:8 18:20
20:19 24:25	9:8,8 10:12 11:13	30:22 31:6 32:18	Box 2:10	21:10 29:19
al 5:15	13:16 15:21 19:1	33:5,8,10,14	breakout 29:14	clarity 18:15
ALewis6@wm.c	19:8 21:12,15	35:13	Brewster 7:21,21	clear 18:13 19:3
3:6	applied 10:24	authority 1:7 4:12	brief 8:25 26:13,21	24:19 25:4 31:1
allow 22:19 23:22	apply 23:5 27:23	10:25	briefs 29:8	client 30:14
26:13	28:5	available 17:20	bring 20:3 23:24	clients 21:9
allowed 22:17	appreciate 30:17	22:18	bringing 24:5	close 16:4
Ame 3:6 7:4,7	appropriate 15:14	Avenue 2:20 3:7,12	broaden 12:4	Coie 2:5 6:19
and/or 18:7	19:13 21:8,23	3:17	broadening 12:3	collection 1:8 4:13
Annis 3:12	23:3	aware 25:14	brought 29:13	11:8 16:17,17
anticipation 11:15	April 28:18,20,21		burden 19:9	17:3
anybody 7:10	28:24	<u>B</u>	businesses 4:12	collectively 23:7
anyone's 23:16	argue 20:14	back 9:5 24:20 26:7	button 14:1	come 9:21 27:3,24
		bad 8:4 27:16		28:1
	•	•	•	•

	1	1	1	
coming 18:1 24:20	5:9,14	D/B/A 1:6	25:10,20 28:18	easier 32:11
24:24 26:5	consensus 16:4	data 32:9,10	discretion 22:19	Ed's 5:15
comment 21:8,20	considerably 17:6	date 4:19 30:14	discuss 4:16 25:25	efficiencies 15:1
commercial 17:3	consideration 13:4	dates 27:23 28:4	26:14 29:11	efficient 13:23
commission 1:2,16	consolidate 17:15	Dave 5:12 12:17	discussion 11:15	14:16,18
2:8 4:8,25 9:4	consolidated 10:6	David 2:14	29:10 31:2	efforts 10:10
12:7,22 20:23,24	13:7 14:3,14	Davis 3:4 5:18	dismissal 20:8,14	either 10:12 14:12
21:20 22:3,4,4,19	15:20 26:6	days 15:19	Disposal 2:12,13,13	19:22
24:1 25:8,14	consolidating 13:8	dbarnett@perki	3:10 5:9,10,15,15	electronic 31:14,14
31:25 32:8	consolidation	2:4	5:16 6:1 7:14	31:16,25 35:11
commission's 9:13	13:14 15:14,22	deadline 28:18,22	disposition 33:25	electronically
16:22 19:4,10	17:11	deal 12:15 14:11	dispositive 23:3	31:21 32:1,2
31:17,24	containing 33:24	22:25	distinct 15:3	Elizabeth 1:24 35:6
commissioners	contains 21:15	decades 9:6 13:1	docket 1:4,6 14:7	35:22
21:23	context 21:3	December 27:20,25	14:11 17:2 21:22	emails 32:21
companies 5:14	continue 11:13	28:11 29:20,21,24	23:13 27:20,23	employed 35:13
11:24	31:3	30:7,9	28:2,6 30:2,6,9	employee 35:12
company 1:8 2:12	convenience 16:16	deciding 21:24	32:4	ends 14:7
4:13 5:8 22:2	conversation 26:3	defer 18:10	dockets 4:10 10:5	engaging 22:6
competition 16:14	Cool 6:16	deficiencies 11:13	14:6 15:4 16:12	enter 4:17
complete 17:6 19:5	correct 23:5 33:16	deficient 20:22	18:15 27:17,18	Enterprises 1:6
19:8 23:18	corrected 21:2	22:24	document 27:11	4:11
completed 20:9	corrections 32:3	delay 31:5	documents 31:15	entirely 8:3 25:4
completeness 21:12	correctly 32:19	delaying 31:2	31:25	entitled 19:19
compliance 6:23	counsel 3:7,15,17	demonstrate 22:2	doing 4:12	entry 19:13
complicated 26:4	6:15 7:4,16 8:8,13	desire 29:10	Donna 2:3 6:19	errata 28:24
27:15	15:6,25 16:1	details 31:22	33:6	erroneous 23:24
complying 22:3	24:14 32:24 35:13	determine 26:25	DR's 28:20	especially 15:19
concerned 23:4	COUNTY 35:4	develop 15:4 17:16	DTG 1:6,6 4:11,12	essential 22:8
concerns 21:11	couple 21:10	differences 16:12	6:6,17,20,24 10:1	essentially 20:14
conclude 22:9	course 16:21 21:22	different 13:16,17	10:2 22:2 32:23	estimates 28:23
concluded 34:4	32:23	13:17,17,18,22	32:25 33:18	et 5:15
concur 15:13	Court 35:7	14:10 16:13,14,15	DTG's 21:19 32:20	evidence 16:15
confer 24:4	cover 16:12,15	16:17,20	due 28:11,15,17,21	evidentiary 26:21
conference 1:11 4:9	covered 10:16	difficult 25:7	28:24 29:8	29:1,7
4:14,17 17:16	31:11	direct 16:14 29:19	duplicate 10:10	exactly 19:1 23:11
19:17 22:15,24	cross-answering	29:24 30:8	dwiley@williams	25:5
23:9 27:22 28:12	28:16	direction 35:10	2:14	exceptions 17:3
30:4,6 31:9 32:12 confidential 24:18	cross-examination	director 6:23	$oxed{\mathbf{E}}$	exempt 22:4
25:12,16,21 27:21	28:23 cumbersome 15:3	disconnect 17:8	E 2:1,1 3:1,1 35:1,1	exhibit 28:22,24 30:20 31:20
29:15	15:22	discovery 17:19,24 18:7,9,14,23,24	e-mail 7:19 27:14	exhibits 28:11,23
confirm 30:16,18	cycle 20:11	19:8,19,22 22:7	32:5,20,22,25	29:24 30:9 31:18
confusion 8:3 33:1	Cycle 20.11	22:18,19,21 23:22	E-Waste 10:23	31:19
Connections 2:12		23:23 24:5,24	16:24,25 17:7	exit 26:23
Connections 2.12	D 3:15 10:24 11:6	43.43 44.3,44	27:18 28:5 30:9	CAIL 40.43

	_			. 1
expect 13:19 30:16	format 35:12	18:16 22:2 23:16	8:6,9,14 9:15,25	inherent 15:1
experience 12:18	forward 20:15	23:21 24:25 25:18	10:18 11:17,19	inherited 13:6
extended 17:1	33:22	27:7 29:25 31:2	12:13 13:3,11,24	inhouse 7:4
extent 10:15 14:10	found 12:8	32:15 33:23	14:20 15:11,24	ink 23:12
17:14	Fourth 2:6	government 11:1	16:3,7 17:13,22	insufficient 20:4,22
extraordinary	framework 16:21	granted 13:1	18:1,4,7,12,18,22	intend 12:4 13:15
12:23	frankly 20:6	granting 16:22	19:14 20:1,19	20:2,13 31:18
eye 25:15	free 20:9 22:21	group 14:23	21:5 22:11 23:6	intended 10:13
	full 11:15 12:6	guess 10:22 13:5	23:21 24:11,22	intent 24:3
F	fully 23:5	guidelines 33:24	25:18 26:10 27:3	intention 19:21
F 35:1	further 12:14		27:7,12 28:3 29:9	interest 9:10 10:11
face 20:23		H	29:12 30:20,24	10:24
facilities 11:10	G	hand 35:16	31:7 33:2,13,20	interested 35:14
fact 20:25	G 3:11	handling 16:25	Human 2:4 6:19	interesting 22:12
fact-intensive 25:8	Gafken 2:8 4:23,24	handy 30:16	29:18,23 30:10	interests 10:15
factual 15:2 25:10	7:25 8:5 9:19	happening 30:5	hybrid 29:10,16	12:24
factually 15:9	13:25 14:25 18:9	hard 25:9		intervene 8:17,20
failure 23:4	18:13 24:7 26:2	Harvey 1:24 35:6	I	8:23
fair 7:18 29:12	27:5,9,14 28:4	35:22	i-n-f-o@D-T-G	intervened 9:4 12:8
30:22	29:4,6,11,17,25	haulers 16:15	32:25	intervenor 10:9
fairly 11:5	30:5	hauling 16:18	ID 6:14 8:4	12:3
far 16:10,12 19:3	gaps 25:6	head 32:15	implicate 16:24	intervenors 19:6
21:1 22:1 30:20	general 2:9 3:16	hear 9:16 24:11	implicates 17:2	28:15
32:20	4:24 13:20 26:18	heard 16:6 24:18	inaudible 6:3,13	intervention 4:15
feature 8:1	generally 13:21	26:7 33:6	7:23 16:7 23:1	4:19 9:14,20 13:1
February 28:15	geographic 11:11	hearing 4:20 8:21	32:6	34:1
feel 11:20 14:2	geographies 16:13	12:1 25:23 26:21	inclined 21:5	interventions 9:24
15:17 16:3 22:21	getting 7:20	29:1,7 30:13	include 5:8	10:3 20:12
fielding 24:2	Gibbs 2:16	31:20	included 10:25	introduced 8:9
Fifth 3:17	give 8:22 12:5	Held 1:15	32:12	17:9
file 20:9 22:13 32:4	given 14:17 25:7,23	hereto 35:13	including 12:9	involve 9:8
filed 6:11 13:15	go 8:11 13:10 16:7	hereunto 35:15	32:13 33:25	involved 9:3 12:25
31:15 32:24	20:11,19 22:1	hesitate 33:5	incorporate 31:8	involved 9.5 12.25
filing 21:20 23:18	23:17 24:25 26:11	highly 25:12,16,20	incorrect 6:14	issue 24:20 25:14
31:16,19	32:23	Honor 5:12,17 7:3	individual 10:16	31:22 32:9 33:23
filings 31:14	God 33:8	13:9 14:22 16:5	individually 10:17	issues 11:12 12:3,4
fill 28:1	goes 8:4 28:9	18:21 21:7,14,23	industry 9:10,10	12:20 13:17,20
final 30:15	going 9:5 12:13	22:9 23:1 25:2	11:16,23 12:6	14:24 15:2,2,9,17
financially 35:14	14:1 15:18 22:16	30:13 32:18	info@DTGrecycl	16:20,25 25:10
first 8:23 13:10	22:17 23:21 25:23	hours 30:17	33:14,19	33:4
32:9	26:3,11,15 27:9	Howard 2:15 5:13	info@DTGrecycl	issuing 25:9 30:18
follow 27:10	27:12,15 31:12	21:6,7 22:11	33:15	135umg 43.7 30.10
forbid 19:23	good 4:4,23 5:3	Hughes 1:12 4:4,6	information 19:11	J
foreclose 19:23	6:16,21,22 7:2,15	5:1,6,21,24 6:3,7	21:3 22:8 24:19	January 28:13
foregoing 35:9	8:14,16 9:15,25	6:16,19,21,25 7:2	25:11,16,21 29:15	Janusz 3:20 6:22
forestalling 30:17	12:3 13:3 18:2,12	7:6,9,15,18,24 8:2	30:15	6:23 7:1
10100000000000000000000000000000000000	12.3 13.3 10.2,12	7.0,2,10,210.2	30.10	0.25 /.1

Johnson 3:11 5:22	leave 9:22	means 10:14	16:11 24:17 28:19	Operate 1:7 4:12
6:10,13 7:12,13	legal 3:7 13:20	meet 19:10 27:20	Noted 10:18 14:20	opinion 14:14
15:13	14:10 15:2,17	meeting 6:14 8:4	15:24	opportunity 25:24
joint 5:7 14:21	16:20 26:21 35:9	meets 19:4	notice 32:5,19,24	oppose 10:2 17:11
judge 1:12 4:4,7	legally 15:10	member 10:23	notices 6:12	oral 28:10
5:1,6,21,24 6:3,7	let's 4:21 13:11	members 9:11	Noun 33:20	order 4:18 12:16
6:16,18,21,25 7:2	14:21 24:22	10:10,16 12:10	novel 9:8 10:13,14	17:25 18:8,11,14
7:6,9,15,18,24 8:2	Lewis 3:6 7:3,4	mention 33:6	11:3,5 15:18	18:21,22 24:4
8:6,9,14 9:2,15,25	limited 24:1	merited 25:16	November 35:16	30:18,21 31:9,22
10:18 11:17,19	line 6:11	merits 8:19	number 11:12 24:2	32:12 33:23
12:13 13:3,11,24	link 7:22 8:1,3	met 19:12 20:17	25:5,24	orders 25:20
14:20 15:11,24	31:16	mhoward@willi		Oregon 3:8
16:3,7 17:13,22	Lisa 2:8 4:24 29:20	2:15	0	outcome 35:14
18:1,4,7,12,18,22	lisa.gafken@atg	Michael 2:15	o0o- 4:2	overall 16:21
19:14 20:1,19	2:9	Mike 5:13	object 10:7 13:13	overlap 14:4,6,17
21:5 22:11 23:6	list 15:11 28:22,23	minute 7:24	15:22 19:16 22:21	15:1
23:21 24:11,22	31:20 32:4,19	missed 24:21	24:6	Overlapping 24:10
25:18 26:10 27:3	lists 30:21	missing 32:21	objection 9:23	33:12
27:7,12 28:3 29:9	little 18:25 26:4	months 22:6	18:11 24:7,9,11	overly 15:21
29:12 30:20,24	27:15 29:14	motion 20:3 22:13	24:13,16 32:13	6 veri y 13.21
31:7 33:2,13,20	living 26:18	23:3,24 33:25	objections 9:18,19	P
judgment 21:21	LLC 3:10	move 8:21 9:16	13:8 18:18,21	P 2:1,1 3:1,1
June 29:8	LLP 2:5	11:10 20:13,15	29:16	p.m 4:5 34:4
June 27.0	local 10:25 11:1	25:15,21 29:18	October 1:13 4:1	P.O 2:10
K	locations 11:8	moving 33:21	offer 21:8	P.S 3:12
Kastner 2:16	logistics 16:17	MRF 11:4 27:18,19	offered 12:22	Pacific 3:7
keep 25:15	long 9:3	27:23 30:1,6	Office 2:9 3:16	page 31:17
keeping 13:23	looked 14:5	MRFs 16:19	officially 32:19	PAGES 1:9
Kent-Meridian	looks 21:14 27:11	mysteries 8:5	officials 21:24	parse 15:20
2:13 5:14	Loop 1:17		Oh 5:21 7:18 21:7	part 17:24
kick 21:20	lot 14:13 23:12	N	29:4 33:8	participating 26:24
kicked 20:23	loud 29:21	N 2:1 3:1	okay 4:21 5:21 7:2	participation 12:12
kind 16:25 27:8	Lukins 3:12	name 4:6,23	7:9 8:14,21 10:18	particular 9:7,7
KING 35:4		nature 25:8	12:13 13:24 14:20	11:9,11
know 6:11 8:10 9:5	M	NE 3:5,7	15:11,24 16:3	particularly 21:12
11:6,7,23 12:11	Management 3:3	necessity 16:16	17:13,16 18:6,18	parties 4:14 11:20
14:2,2 15:18	5:10,19 7:5 16:6	need 21:1 26:20	20:1,2 21:5 22:12	13:5,10,17 14:5,8
16:18,22 17:2,23	18:25 20:2 21:11	32:16	26:10 27:3,9 28:3	14:17 17:11,14,17
20:5 23:12 25:9	24:16,25 25:4	neither 19:3	29:9 30:24 31:5,7	17:19 19:22 22:5
26:20 28:8	March 28:17	never 12:24 17:13	31:7 32:16 33:2	23:4,14 24:4 25:5
	master 32:4	normal 20:16,16,20	33:20	25:14,24 26:14,25
L	materially 22:23	20:21	Olympia 2:10	27:3,20,24 28:13
Lacey 1:18 2:21	matter 1:4 4:11	Northeast 2:6	on-demand 16:17	31:1,10,15,18
largely 23:15	8:10 15:20 24:4,5	Northwest 3:7	online 31:16	32:1,1,9,11 35:13
law 1:12 4:7 16:25	mean 26:4	notable 21:16	open 22:20	party 8:15,22 24:6
learning 26:19	meaningful 12:12	note 5:19 14:4	opening 18:22	25:19 32:11

party's 9:16	present 3:20 6:4	8:7,12 15:25 16:1	refer 5:7	resources 23:17
Patterson 1:24 35:6	25:7	16:16 24:13	referring 14:23	24:2
35:22	presumably 16:15	pursue 22:14	Refuse 2:19 3:10	respond 8:22 10:19
pausing 23:19	pretty 9:8 16:4	put 23:14 32:22	5:2,4,24 6:7,15	19:7,15 20:18
penalty 35:9	print 27:12	put 23.14 32.22	8:18,24 15:12	Response 28:14
1 2	prior 24:5	Q	· ·	_
perjury 35:9 Perkins 2:5 6:19	1 -	question 7:18 18:16	regards 19:2 Registered 35:7	responses 28:20 32:10
	probably 9:17 15:5	questions 11:14	O	
person 9:13 29:10	16:14 17:5 20:9	14:11 22:10	regulated 11:24	responsibility 17:1
29:13	procedural 4:16,18	quibble 21:19	regulatory 21:25	responsive 15:8
perspective 12:6	14:18 17:8,17,18	quickly 9:17 30:21	rehashing 15:15	rest 9:9 27:22 28:2
petition 4:15,19	22:16 25:22,25		Reid 3:11 7:12	28:4
8:17,23 9:1,16	26:3,5,15 28:1	quite 11:19 24:2	related 15:9	rhuman@perkin
petitions 9:20	33:24	R	relating 15:21	2:5
PHC 12:16 24:4	procedurally 23:14	$R = \frac{R}{13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:1$	relative 35:12	right 7:22 8:15
place 22:25	procedure 20:21	Rabanco 2:13 5:14	remedy 20:7 23:3	24:3 25:15 31:12
plan 25:12	proceed 22:5,6		remember 33:21	32:7
planning 22:16	23:8	Rabinico 5:9	remind 31:15	rjohnson@lukin
plans 11:1	proceeding 12:19	raised 21:11	Removal 3:10 5:25	3:11
play 12:19	12:25 22:18 23:19	raising 30:24	6:7 15:12	Rob 7:20,25 8:12
please 22:21 23:24	proceedings 9:4,4	rate 26:18	Reporter 35:7,7	Robert 3:15
26:20,24 32:4	9:12 12:11,24	reach 23:13 26:25	represent 11:23	robert.sykes@at
PLLC 2:16	32:8 34:4	27:1	14:23	3:16
point 9:6 20:10	producer 17:1	read 28:7 31:12,13	representation	Rod 2:19 5:3
23:13 24:18,19	productive 20:11	ready 27:7	5:20	rod@wrra.org
25:3	Professional 35:7	realize 13:6	represented 9:12	2:20
points 21:10	propose 19:6	really 20:15	10:11,17 11:25	role 12:19
policy 9:5,9 11:25	proposed 21:17	reasons 17:10	representing 7:13	rooms 29:14
12:20	22:7 26:2 31:8	Rebuttal 28:16	request 18:17 32:9	Rubatino 3:10 5:24
Portland 3:8	proposing 29:1	recall 21:17	32:10	6:7,15 15:12
position 9:16 16:2	proprietary 35:11	received 23:23	requested 11:6	rule 12:23 21:14
23:10	protection 25:13,16	35:11	25:11	rules 9:14 17:20
positions 4:15	protection 25.13,10 protective 17:24	recess 26:13 27:2	requests 22:22	18:23 22:3,4
positions 4.13 possibility 20:6	18:8,10,14,21,22	recognize 23:12	require 22:5 24:3	31:24
post-hearing 29:8	25:20	recognizing 12:23	required 16:16	ruling 4:18
potential 9:9 11:25	protest 23:15	record 4:5 7:12	17:25 19:7 22:6	1 umig 4.10
1 -	*	16:6 28:9,10		S
potentially 17:7 19:11	protestant 2:19 3:3	32:22 34:3	requirement 32:14	S 2:1,15 3:1
	14:7 15:7	recording 35:11	requirements 19:4	safe 30:23
preference 26:17	protestants 2:12	recordings 35:10	19:10 20:16 21:15	Sanitary 2:12 5:8
29:13	3:10 5:8,16,20	recycle 1:6 4:12	26:11 31:19	5:13
prehearing 1:11	12:18 14:21 16:10	6:17 33:7	reserve 25:15	saying 19:21 23:25
4:9 17:15 19:17	19:7 28:14	Recycling 2:19	residences 11:8	
22:15,24 23:9	prove 19:9	3:10 5:2,4 7:14	16:18	says 14:25 20:25 29:19
31:9,22 32:12	provide 21:2 31:24	8:18,24	residential 17:4	
prejudice 20:8	providing 15:18	reduces 33:3	residual 11:4	schedule 4:16,18
prejudicial 23:24	public 3:15,17 7:16	Reducing 33:2	residuals 21:13,16	14:18 22:16 25:22
		Reducing 33.2		25:25 26:3,11
	-	-	-	-

				. ago 11
27:5,11 28:1	showing 14:5	20:5 23:1,11	13:3 26:13	today's 4:17
33:24	shown 10:9	24:15 25:1 30:12	talk 17:5 26:8	topic 31:23
schedules 17:17,18	shutting 23:20	30:22 33:5,10	27:21	trade 12:21
26:5,15 27:6 31:8	sic 5:10	start 4:21 13:11	talking 18:14 24:23	transcribed 1:24
scopes 13:18	side 12:10	14:21	tariff 21:18 22:7	35:10
screen 27:10,12	similar 13:21 21:10	starting 17:20	tell 16:13	Transportation 1:2
28:5 29:6	simply 23:18	19:11 23:20	ten-day 28:20	1:16 4:8
screenshot 28:8	Sixth 2:20	state 4:14 11:9	tentatively 30:14	treat 17:15
29:19	skipped 32:7	16:25 35:2,8	terms 10:21 14:23	Tremaine 3:4 5:18
SE 1:17 2:20	solid 1:7 4:13 9:5	stated 12:5	territory 11:11	tricky 29:14
Seattle 2:17 3:18	11:1 12:24,25	statement 8:25	testimony 15:4,8,19	tried 12:2,11
second 11:4 17:18	13:20	9:22	15:20 28:10,14,16	trouble 7:20
33:7	solved 23:17	statements 21:18	29:20,24 30:1,3,8	try 10:22 20:24
see 7:8 10:5,6,10	sorry 6:5 7:3,16	Ste 3:5	TG-240583 1:4	trying 6:8 13:25
17:24 27:10	13:25 18:20 21:7	Street 2:6,16	4:10 28:5	33:16
Seeing 32:15	27:22 29:4,17	stress 33:3	TG-240584 1:6	turnaround 28:20
seek 19:11	30:4 33:1,9	strong 14:14 29:15	27:19	two 9:8 13:15 14:19
seeking 25:6,12	sort 17:8 19:12	strongly 14:2	thank 6:13,18 7:1	17:17 18:15 26:4
seen 17:13 32:20	20:3	submit 31:18	9:2 16:8 17:12	26:5,15 27:6,17
send 7:22 26:2	sought 25:10	subsequent 32:10	20:1 22:10,11	type 11:5
Senior 3:7	sounds 9:25	subset 16:14	25:1 27:1 30:10	typically 11:2,6,7
sent 7:25	sources 13:17	sufficient 9:22	30:23,24 31:7	
separate 5:20 13:15	speak 12:18	21:25 23:8	33:2,3,13 34:2	<u>U</u>
19:17	speakers 24:10	sufficiently 15:2	thanks 7:23 17:21	unable 27:1
separated 13:23	specific 11:8 16:25	suggest 18:25 22:1	18:3,17 30:11	unclear 19:1
separately 14:12	specifically 16:11	suggesting 23:2	31:6	understand 25:4
serve 32:1,1	speech 33:12	Suite 2:6,16,20	things 20:15 21:1	Union 2:16
served 28:20	spell 33:6	3:12,17	31:12	unique 12:19,21
service 2:12 5:8,13	spilled 23:13	suits 17:17	think 10:8,14 13:22	Unit 3:17
11:2,6 31:14,25	Spokane 3:13	summary 20:3	14:7,11 15:3,5	unmute 14:1
32:4	Sprague 3:12	Sunshine 3:10 6:1	16:9,20 17:7 19:9	updates 32:3
services 21:25	Square 1:17	7:13	19:13 20:13,14,20	use 23:16
set 9:9 11:9,25	ss 35:3	support 8:25 21:9	20:21,25 21:16	Utilities 1:2,16 4:7
35:15	Stacey 7:21,21	suppose 31:4	22:24 23:16 26:3	$oxed{\mathbf{V}}$
setting 4:18,19 11:2	staff 2:8 4:22,25	sure 8:3,10 9:2	29:12,20 33:21	valuable 12:8
settlement 27:21,22	9:18,19,23 13:24	10:21 23:2 24:22	thought 20:5 33:6	various 21:15
28:12 30:1,3,4,6	17:22 18:7 21:22	29:23	three 32:20	various 21.13 verb 33:20
31:2	24:7 28:15	surmising 20:10	threshold 19:12	versus 16:18 29:10
severable 15:9	stagger 26:16	swear 33:8	time 4:5 9:3 18:5	VIRTUAL 1:11
shakes 32:15	standards 16:22	Sykes 3:15 7:25 8:6	23:16 25:13 26:14	virtue 12:23
share 11:21 27:9	25:8	8:7,12,12 16:1	27:13 28:23	VOLUME 1:11
shared 32:10	standing 12:23	24:13	times 26:12	
shippers 21:18	Stanovsky 3:3 5:17	T	to-do 32:19	W
short 4:21 8:11	5:18 7:7 13:9	T35:1,1	today 4:9 21:9 30:6	W 2:8,14 3:12
shortly 33:23	16:5,8 18:20,24	take 7:24 12:13,15	32:17	WA 1:24
		tant 1.24 12.13,13		

				raye 42
WAC 21:14	12:17 14:22 24:9	28:11 35:16	98104 3:18	
Walker 5:17	29:3,5	2025 28:13,15,17	98503 2:21	
WalkerStanovsk	Williams 2:16	28:19,25 29:2,7,8	98504 1:18 2:10	
3:4	wishes 8:20	205 2:20	99201 3:13	
3.4 Walter 3:3	witness 28:23 35:15		99201 3.13	
want 19:23 24:20	witnesses 12:4	240583 30:9		
25:13 29:23 31:15	Woodland 1:17	240584 4:10 21:13		
wanted 21:10 29:18	Word 27:10	30:2 31:1		
wants 8:24	words 30:6	25 28:21		
warranted 12:12	work 13:18 27:25	2731 1:24 35:22		
Washington 1:1,8	works 30:14	29 28:24		
1:16,18 2:6,10,12	wouldn't 18:11	3		
2:17,19,21 3:3,5	19:13	30 1:13 4:1		
3:13,18 4:7,13 5:2	Wright 3:4 5:18	30 1:13 4:1		
5:4,9,11,19 7:5	written 8:17 32:4	4		
8:18,24 35:2,8	WRRA 9:3 10:19	4 14:8		
waste 1:8 2:12 3:3	10:23 11:22 12:2	40128 2:10		
4:13 5:9,10,13,18	12:8,19	4100 2:16		
7:4 9:5 11:1,10	WRRA's 9:10			
12:24,25 13:21	T 7	4160 2:20		
16:6,18 18:25	X	480-07-400 22:17		
20:2 21:11 24:15	Y	480-70-091 21:14		
24:25 25:4		5		
way 12:20 14:3	yeah 26:22	5 29:2,7,8		
we'll 6:9 7:24 8:21	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	5's 29:6		
17:5 18:4	Zoom 1:15 8:5	55th 3:7		
we're 4:9 8:10 10:5	Zoom 1.13 6.3	33th 3.7		
10:7 20:25 21:9	0	6		
24:19 26:15 29:1		6 29:3,4,5 30:13		
29:24	1	601 2:16		
we've 7:10 9:4	1-35 1:9	621 1:17		
12:11 21:1	1:31 4:5	021 1.17		
weaves 15:4	10 27:20,25 28:11	7		
web 31:17	29:21 30:7	700 2:6		
weighed 12:2	10885 2:6	717 3:12		
Welcome 5:1,6	108th 3:5	7227 3:7		
6:21,25 7:6 8:14	11 28:18,20			
went 14:4 33:17	13 28:15,17 35:16	8		
WHEREOF 35:15	1500 3:5	8 28:13		
Whittaker 2:19 5:3	1600 3:12	800 3:17		
5:4 9:2 10:21	17 29:20,24 30:9			
11:18,22		9		
WILES 29:22	2	929 3:5		
Wiley 2:14 5:12,12	2:45 34:4	97218 3:8		
5:22 6:1,10 12:17	2000 3:17	98004 2:6 3:5		
	2024 1:13 4:1 27:21	98101 2:17		
<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>	1	1