

Docket No. UT-190574 - Vol. I

In the Matter of Northwest Fiber, LLC, et al.

July 23, 2019



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the matter of the Joint Application of NORTHWEST FIBER, LLC, FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION, AND FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS ILEC HOLDINGS LLC, For an Order Declining to Assert Jurisdiction Over, or, in the Alternative Approving the Transfer of Control of Frontier Communications Northwest Inc. to Northwest Fiber, LLC,

VOLUME I PREHEARING CONFERENCE

PAGES 1-24

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT THE ABOVE ENTITLED CAUSE CAME ON FOR PREHEARING CONFERENCE ON TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2019, AT 1:30 P.M. BEFORE GREG KOPTA, COMMISSIONER at 621 WOODLAND SQUARE LOOP SE, LACEY, WASHINGTON, 98503.

REPORTED BY: Kandi Kathryn Clark, CCR License #3008

APPEARANCES (continued): For the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission: NASH CALLAGHAN DANIEL TEIMOURI ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504-0128 (360) 664-1187 Fax: (360) 664-5522 Email: nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov daniel.teimouri@utc.wa.gov Public Counsel: NINA MARIE SUETAKE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104-3188 (206) 389-2055 Email: ninas@atg.wa.gov For the U.S. Army Legal Services Agency: KYLE J. SMITH, ESQ. 9275 Gunston Road, Suite 1300 Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060 (703) 693-1274 (Appearing by telephone.)

APPEARANCES: For the Applicant Northwest Fiber, LLC: MARK P. TRINCHERO, ESQ. DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP 1300 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 2300 Portland, Oregon 97201-5630 (503) 778-5318 Fax: (503) 778-5299 Email: marktrinchero@dwt.com The Applicant Frontier Communications Corporation: KEVIN SAVILLE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL 401 Merritt 7 Norwalk, CT 06851 Email: kevin.saville@ftr.com For The Applicant Frontier Communications Corporation: GEORGE BAKER THOMSON, JR. ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL 1800 41st Street Everett, Washington 98201 (425) 261-5844 Email: george.thomson@ftr.com TIMOTHY J. O'CONNELL, ESQ. STOEL RIVES, LLP 600 University Street, Suite 3600 Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 386-7562 Fax: (206) 386-7500 Email: tjocconnell@stoel.com For Charter Communications: LISA F. RACKNER, ESQ. McDOWELL RACKNER GIBSON PC 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 Portlan, Oregon 97205 (503) 595-3925 Email: lisa@mrg-law.com

WHEREUPON, THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HAD: JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be on the record, Docket UT-190574. Caption in the matter of the joint application of Northwest Fiber, LLC; Frontier Communications Corporation; and Frontier Communications ILEC Holdings, LLC. For an order declining to assert jurisdiction over, or, in the alternative, approving the transfer of control of Frontier Communications Northwest, Inc., to Northwest Fiber, LLC. My name is Gregory J. Kopta. I am the administrative law judge who will be presiding this proceeding. We are here today for a prehearing conference to establish schedule and care about the matters. And we will begin by taking appearances beginning with the applicants. MR. TRINCHERO: Thank you, your Honor. Mark Trinchero, Davis Wright Tremaine on behalf of Northwest Fiber, LLC. MR. O'CONNELL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Tim O'Connell with Stoel Rives firm on behalf of Frontier. MR. THOMSON: Good afternoon, Judge. George

Page 5

1 Thomson, I'm in house with Frontier.
 2 MR. SAVILLE: Good afternoon, your Honor,
 3 Kevin Saville, and I'm in house with Frontier, as
 4 well.
 5 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And for commission
 6 staff.
 7 MR. CALLAGHAN: Good afternoon, your Honor.
 8 Nash Callaghan, AAG, on behalf of commission staff.
 9 JUDGE KOPTA: One more.
 10 MR. TEIMOURI: Good afternoon, your Honor.
 11 Daniel Teimouri, AAG, on behalf of commission staff.
 12 MS. SUETAKE: Good afternoon. Nina Suetake
 13 on behalf of public counsel.
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: On behalf of Charter.
 15 MS. RACKNER: Lisa Rackner on behalf of
 16 Charter.
 17 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And I believe we
 18 have someone on the bridge line who wants to make an
 19 appearance.
 20 MR. SMITH: Yes, Kyle Smith on behalf of the
 21 United States Department of Defense and all other
 22 federal executive agencies. I have not filed a formal
 23 appearance. I can do that as soon as possible. I
 24 would also be orally moving to have the United States
 25 Department of Defense and all other federal executive

Page 6

1 agencies intervene in this matter. But if you would
 2 like, I could file something in writing on that, that
 3 would obviously be after today, though.
 4 JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you, Mr. Smith. I don't
 5 think that we will need any subsequent filings, but
 6 we'll see.
 7 Because our next item of business is
 8 interventions.
 9 We have two petitions to intervene. One
 10 written in advance from Charter. And the other, as
 11 Mr. Smith just indicated, is from the Department of
 12 Defense. I'd like to cut this short and see if there
 13 are any objections to either of those entities being
 14 granted intervention.
 15 Mr. Trincherro.
 16 MR. TRINCHERO: Your Honor, on behalf of the
 17 joint applicants, we have no objection to
 18 intervention.
 19 JUDGE KOPTA: Anyone else have an objection?
 20 MR. CALLAGHAN: No objection, your Honor.
 21 MS. SUETAKE: No objection, your Honor.
 22 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will grant
 23 those petitions to intervene.
 24 And as I indicated, Mr. Smith, there's no
 25 need to make a follow up. I think perhaps a full

Page 7

1 notice of appearance might be in order since normally
 2 we rely upon written pleadings to get that
 3 information. So if you could go ahead and give us
 4 your address and contact information so that the court
 5 reporter has that.
 6 MR. SMITH: Absolutely. Would you like me to
 7 do that orally now or file something?
 8 JUDGE KOPTA: Why don't you go ahead and do
 9 it now so that we have it.
 10 MR. SMITH: Okay. My name is Kyle J. Smith.
 11 I am with the United States Army Legal Services
 12 Agency. That is located at 9275 Gunston Road,
 13 G-U-N-S-T-O-N, that's Suite 1300, on Fort Belvoir,
 14 Virginia, 22060. And my email address is
 15 kyle.j.smith124.cid@mail.mil.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And do you have a
 17 telephone number to go along with that?
 18 MR. SMITH: Yes, it's 703-693-1270.
 19 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you. I
 20 believe that's the information we need for now.
 21 Moving on to the next item on the agenda:
 22 Discovery. Do the parties want to have the
 23 commission's discovery rules available in this
 24 proceeding?
 25 Mr. Callaghan.

Page 8

1 MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, your Honor.
 2 MR. TRINCHERO: Yes, your Honor.
 3 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will make
 4 the discovery rules available.
 5 The next order of business is a protective
 6 order. I've had some the conversations with
 7 Mr. Trincherro prior to this proceeding in which
 8 there's an indication that there's a need for highly
 9 confidential protective order in this docket. Is my
 10 understanding correct, Mr. Trincherro?
 11 MR. TRINCHERO: Yes, that's accurate, your
 12 Honor. As a matter of fact, we have filed a motion
 13 for modified protective order. That was just filed
 14 yesterday afternoon. I'm not sure if it has hit your
 15 desk yet. We did try to make sure to get electronic
 16 service to staff of the public counsel and a courtesy
 17 copy to Charter's representative. We did not know
 18 that the DOD, FEA would be an intervenor. We could
 19 send that to them, as well.
 20 We have modeled the requested modified
 21 protective order on prior commission modified
 22 protective orders. We do believe especially given the
 23 that fact that we have intervenors that --
 24 We do believe that given the fact that we
 25 have an intervenor, who is a direct competitor, that

Page 9

1 there is a need for additional protections on some of
 2 the financial projections and similar planning
 3 documents that may be requested through discovery.
 4 And so, we have moved for additional protections.
 5 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. I notice that the
 6 docket does not yet reflect your motion. So we will
 7 deal with it orally here in the prehearing conference.
 8 And I believe you described the information that you
 9 believe would be highly confidential.
 10 Do we have any input from the other parties
 11 in the case of the need for highly confidential
 12 protections?
 13 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, your Honor. The
 14 staff has no objection to the protective order
 15 proposed by counsel.
 16 MS. SUETAKE: Public Counsel does not have
 17 any objections.
 18 MS. RACKNER: And we have not yet had an
 19 opportunity to review the nature of the restrictions
 20 to competitors. And we may be able to comment on them
 21 if Mr. Trincherro wants to take the opportunity now to
 22 outline them or we'd like to the opportunity -- even
 23 so we may need the opportunity to respond in
 24 writing.
 25 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Since we're just

Page 10

1 getting to this now and a standard protective order is
 2 a matter of course in these kinds of proceedings.
 3 Highly confidential provisions the commission takes a
 4 little more caution with and certainly would want to
 5 make sure that all parties are comfortable, if
 6 possible, with having that extra layer of protection
 7 being applicable in this proceeding. So let's table
 8 that for now and perhaps, because I understand there's
 9 not yet agreement on the schedule, we will take a
 10 break. And Ms. Rackner will be able to review what
 11 the applicants are requesting and to see if you have
 12 any concerns that you want to voice at this point.
 13 Let's see. I don't think that we have
 14 anything else except for the schedule at this point.
 15 I have two different schedules: One proposed by staff
 16 and the other proposed by the applicants. Why don't
 17 you, beginning with the applicants, let me know what
 18 your thinking is in terms of why your schedule is
 19 preferable.
 20 MR. THOMSON: Yes, your Honor. We base this
 21 schedule in part on looking at schedules in recent
 22 commission proceedings regarding mergers and
 23 acquisitions in the telecom industry, especially with
 24 respect to the recent CenturyLink Level 3 schedule.
 25 We tried to build in enough time. Our schedule is

Page 11

1 actually a little bit longer than what was originally
 2 adopted in the CenturyLink Level 3. And we are
 3 seeking to, in large part, get a commission decision
 4 as early as possible so that we can close this
 5 transaction and deliver the benefits of the
 6 transaction to the consumers of the State of
 7 Washington. In particular we have a situation where
 8 the existing ILEC is losing lines. We believe that
 9 with an infusion of capital as proposed by the
 10 purchasers, that we can stem that line loss, in effect
 11 grow the company, and deliver benefits especially high
 12 speed broadband to more consumers within the state.
 13 And so, the longer we delay commission decision and
 14 the closing of the transaction, the longer it will
 15 take to get those benefits to consumers in the state
 16 of Washington.
 17 So we've tried to build in time enough for
 18 settlement conferences. And the real sticking point I
 19 think between the two sets of schedules is the time
 20 allotted between when the applicants would file their
 21 direct testimony, which we propose July 31st, and the
 22 time that staff, public counsel, and intervenors would
 23 file their testimony, we have proposed mid-September.
 24 In negotiations with staff, we have offered to extend
 25 that to early October. The staff proposal, on the

Page 12

1 other hand, would have their staff, public counsel,
 2 and intervenor response testimony not coming in until
 3 mid to late November, a near four months after the
 4 applicants file their testimony. We believe that is
 5 an inordinately long amount of time to get their
 6 testimony. We believe that we can get them the
 7 information they need where we've offered to shorten
 8 discovery schedules to the extent necessary to turn
 9 around data to the staff, public counsel, and
 10 intervenors.
 11 And we're just urging your Honor to adopt
 12 a -- at least a slightly more condensed schedule than
 13 what the staff has proposed.
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: Is there an application before
 15 the FCC for approval of this transaction?
 16 MR. THOMSON: Yes, your Honor. And
 17 Mr. Saville is closely monitoring that and probably
 18 has a better feel for the estimated time to decision
 19 the FCC.
 20 JUDGE KOPTA: That would be my next question.
 21 MR. SAVILLE: Your Honor, Kevin Saville.
 22 Yes, we did file a joint application with the FCC back
 23 at the end of June. We received just a couple of
 24 basic follow-up inquiries with the FCC, which we
 25 provided. And the next step in their process will be

Page 13

1 to release a notice seeking public comments on that
 2 application. We're expecting that notice to come out
 3 as early as this week or next week with, you know,
 4 approximately a 30-day comments with an opportunity
 5 for reply comments. So at this point it's our
 6 expectation that we would have an FCC decision in the
 7 November time frame.
 8 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Any other jurisdictions
 9 that need to weigh in on this proposed transaction?
 10 MR. TRINCHERO: Yes, your Honor. We have
 11 filed an application with the Oregon Public Utilities
 12 Commission. We have a jurisdictional argument in that
 13 proceeding that has yet to be resolved. If, in fact,
 14 that case were to move forward, we would be setting
 15 the schedule probably in August.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.
 17 MR. TRINCHERO: We also have an application
 18 before the Montana Public Services Commission. My
 19 understanding is that public notification of that
 20 application should be going out this week. And there
 21 is, I believe it's a 20-day period for interventions
 22 to come in in the state of Montana.
 23 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. At this point we still
 24 don't have a firm grasp of what schedules would be in
 25 the other jurisdictions?

Page 14

1 MR. TRINCHERO: That's correct.
 2 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Saville, did you have
 3 something?
 4 MR. SAVILLE: Your Honor, I was just going to
 5 add to that. The parties also did file with the
 6 Department of Justice on Hart-Scott-Rodino filing.
 7 We've already received that clearance. So that
 8 regulatory approval requirement has been met. Also
 9 because of some of the ownership interests of the
 10 buyer, we will be filing -- we've already filed the
 11 joint draft application with the CFIUS review, which
 12 is the Committee on Foreign Investment. They will
 13 review the transaction, as well. But it's a little
 14 different process. It's not as much of a public
 15 process as the other proceedings. But, you know, just
 16 for purposes of full disclosure, those are the other
 17 regulatory filings that are pending.
 18 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. I appreciate that.
 19 Staff, what's your take on scheduling?
 20 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, your Honor.
 21 Before I forget, staff was going to inquire whether
 22 your Honor would like to hear argument on the
 23 jurisdictional question today?
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: Not at this point.
 25 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay.

Page 15

1 JUDGE KOPTA: No, I'm --
 2 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you. So, your Honor --
 3 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Saville.
 4 MR. SAVILLE: Your Honor, again, just for
 5 purposes of full disclosure, we have also filed 394
 6 applications with the local franchise authorities
 7 associated with some of the video applications. But
 8 those have a federal statutory time frame of 120 days.
 9 So we don't expect those to be, you know, effective.
 10 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.
 11 MR. TRINCHERO: Your Honor, those were filed
 12 at the end of last week.
 13 JUDGE KOPTA: All right, Mr. Callaghan,
 14 proceed with the scheduling.
 15 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, your Honor.
 16 So, your Honor, I begin by noting that the
 17 application in this case was filed June 28th. Under
 18 the statute, the commission has 11 months to resolve a
 19 transaction like this under 80.12.030(2). And that
 20 can additionally be extended for four months. So that
 21 would put the statutory deadline in this case at May
 22 28th of next year.
 23 So, your Honor, when staff received the
 24 proposed procedural schedule from the company, the
 25 staff was taking into consideration the deadlines and

Page 16

1 the goals that the company has for resolving these
 2 matters and getting the transaction done. However, as
 3 you're well aware, the telecom staff at the commission
 4 is dealing with a number of issues, rule makings,
 5 adjudications during this time frame. And so, the
 6 comparison to past cases and past transactions doesn't
 7 really apply because in those cases, the workload for
 8 telecom staff was not nearly as high as it is today.
 9 So the question is not is how fast can staff get their
 10 testimony ready once the company has filed their
 11 testimony; it's how fast can staff get this done
 12 considering all the other workload issues that staff
 13 is dealing with.
 14 So given the statutory deadline, staff
 15 proposed a February 28th deadline for the post hearing
 16 briefs. And staff's position was that that was a
 17 compromise. That was us trying to work with the
 18 company to find a solution that would balance both
 19 interests.
 20 At the end of the day, your Honor, procedural
 21 schedules can be shortened, they can be lengthened.
 22 But the question is what is the default? And the
 23 default here, I think, should be a balance between
 24 these interests and staff's interest in ensuring that
 25 they have enough time to do their due diligence in

1 this case. Thank you.
 2 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.
 3 Public counsel.
 4 MS. SUETAKE: Thank you, your Honor. I
 5 wanted to say a public counsel is incredibly sensitive
 6 to staff's timing and staffing needs with regard to
 7 all of their applications. And I had understood
 8 through conversations with both parties that this
 9 February date was staff's compromise to the original
 10 statutory deadline of May 28th. Public counsel, we
 11 had our own constraints being also part of the state
 12 government with our contracting requirements. So we
 13 are still in the process of getting our expert witness
 14 on board.
 15 Shortening the schedule more than February
 16 creates difficulties, given we don't even have their
 17 testimony yet. So while I am sensitive to speeding
 18 the schedule up, I believe that the February 28th
 19 deadline would be -- final deadline would be a good
 20 compromise.
 21 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Ms. Rackner.
 22 MS. RACKNER: Charter doesn't have a position
 23 on the schedule other than to ensure that our -- we
 24 are available on the specific days that are ultimately
 25 selected.

1 this under advisement and consult with the
 2 commissioners, and see what their preference is since
 3 ultimately it's their decision.
 4 And then since we're not going to take a
 5 break, then we will allow Charter to review the motion
 6 for a protective order. And if you can, within the
 7 next few days, file something, whether it's a we have
 8 no objection or stating any concerns that you have
 9 with highly confidential. And I wouldn't necessarily
 10 look at the proposed order that they have submitted.
 11 The commission has its own standard protective order
 12 for both normal protective and highly confidential
 13 protective protections.
 14 MS. RACKNER: May I ask a clarification on
 15 that point?
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: You may.
 17 MS. RACKNER: So, Judge Kopta, are you
 18 suggesting that both the scope of the highly
 19 confidential designation and the restrictions on who
 20 that information is available to, that we should be
 21 looking to the commission's standard highly
 22 confidential order instead of the proposal by
 23 Frontier?
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: I don't know what the proposal
 25 is and how different it is, if at all from the

1 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Smith, does the Department
 2 of Defense have any position on this having heard this
 3 for the first time this afternoon?
 4 MR. SMITH: (No audible response.)
 5 JUDGE KOPTA: You're on mute if you're
 6 talking.
 7 MR. SMITH: Yes, I was. Excuse me. I said,
 8 "No, I would just echo what Charter's counsel said."
 9 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. So it sounds to me as if
 10 taking a recess for the parties to discuss this would
 11 not be productive; is that a fair assessment?
 12 Mr. Trincherero.
 13 MR. TRINCHERO: We have attempted to work out
 14 a compromise on the schedule, and to date that has not
 15 been productive. I don't know whether additional
 16 discussions may help. Perhaps with some direction
 17 from your Honor on your thoughts on the schedule, we
 18 might be able to have a fruitful discussion.
 19 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, I'm not really in a
 20 position to strong-arm either party. I understand the
 21 desire to close this transaction as soon as reasonably
 22 possible. But I also understand that resources are
 23 limited, and that may not be that possible as quickly
 24 as the company would like. So at this point I'm not
 25 prepared to take a position either way. I will take

1 commission's standard protective order. I would focus
 2 on the standard protective order unless the company is
 3 asking for something substantively different than what
 4 we've done in the past.
 5 MS. RACKNER: Okay. And if they are, I may
 6 be able to work with Mr. Trincherero to come to a
 7 reasonable compromise if we aren't in exactly the same
 8 place.
 9 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. I will note that we try
 10 and keep the highly confidential information as
 11 contained as possible because it does post extra
 12 burdens on the parties and the commission in terms of
 13 making sure that it's protected appropriately.
 14 I'm not saying that anyone here would do it,
 15 but we have had people in the past that are generous,
 16 shall we say, with their designation. And we just as
 17 soon keep them as restrained as possible.
 18 MS. RACKNER: And one thing I would note is
 19 that very quickly reviewing the proposal, it looks
 20 like the proposal is to -- not to restrict the
 21 information only to outside counsel and outside
 22 consultants. And I would guess that that could be a
 23 sticking point, and in particular that the company
 24 might wish to have inside regulatory counsel be in a
 25 position to review the information as well, but

Page 21

1 without having an opportunity to consult which my
 2 client, I don't really know. They may be comfortable
 3 with the proposed restrictions.
 4 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that's always an
 5 issue in these kinds of situations. And it has been
 6 the commission's practice in the past to agree with
 7 that restriction, which is all the more reason why
 8 anything that's designated as highly confidential
 9 needs to be very closely constrained because we want
 10 the parties to have the maximum amount of information.
 11 And not everyone has the resources to have only
 12 outside counsel and outside experts review pertinent
 13 information that may affect their positions or their
 14 take on the issues.
 15 MS. RACKNER: Understood. Thank you.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Mr. Callaghan.
 17 MR. CALLAGHAN: And, your Honor, I just
 18 wanted to make a small amendment. I believe both
 19 proposed procedural schedules have an initial
 20 settlement conference on August 30.
 21 Ms. Rackner informed me earlier that she
 22 would not be available on that day. And I had not had
 23 time to discuss with the parties. But we were hoping
 24 that something earlier that week, either the 28th or
 25 the 27th would be available.

Page 22

1 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, as you know, the
 2 commission always includes in its procedural schedules
 3 at least one settlement conference. And to my mind
 4 it's just merely to make sure that the parties have
 5 such a settlement conference. I am agnostic as far as
 6 what the date happens to be. So if you all can get
 7 together and come up with a different date, I'm happy
 8 to adopt that. And if it needs to change, again that
 9 is something that all you would need to do is notify
 10 me. You don't need to ask permission to change it
 11 because that's really a date for the parties and not
 12 for me.
 13 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, your Honor.
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, I think
 15 that's everything on my list. Does anyone else have
 16 any other issues that we need to address at this
 17 point?
 18 MR. SMITH: This is Mr. Smith on the phone.
 19 I need to clean something up for the record. I gave
 20 one incorrect numerical value for my phone number.
 21 The correct phone is 703-693-1274.
 22 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you for that
 23 correction. The phone company that I know of will
 24 make that automatically so you don't have to have the
 25 right one.

Page 23

1 All right. I think that's it for this
 2 afternoon.
 3 I will be entering a prehearing conference
 4 order, including a schedule in hopefully short order,
 5 and as well as a protective order, whether it includes
 6 highly confidential provisions or not.
 7 And with that we are adjourned.
 8 (Proceedings concluded at 2:00 p.m.)
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 24

1 **CERTIFICATE**
 2 I, KANDI CLARK, a duly authorized Court Reporter in
 3 and for the State of Washington, residing at Olympia,
 4 authorized to administer oaths and affirmations pursuant
 5 to RCW 5.28.010, do hereby certify:
 6
 7 That the foregoing proceedings transcribed by me by
 8 means of computer-aided transcription is a full, true, and
 9 complete transcript of the testimony of said witness
 10 consisting of pages 1 through 24;
 11 That as a CCR in this state, I am bound by the Rules
 12 of Conduct as Codified in WAC 308-14-130; that court
 13 reporting arrangements and fees in this case are offered
 14 to all parties on equal terms;
 15
 16 That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or
 17 counsel of any party to this action or relative or
 18 employee of any such attorney or counsel, and I am not
 19 financially interested in the said action or the outcome
 20 thereof;
 21
 22 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this
 23 6th day of August, 2019.
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55

Kandi Kathryn Clark
 CCR License #3008

A	Appearing 3:16 applicable 10:7 Applicant 2:2,7,11 applicants 4:18 6:17 10:11,16,17 11:20 12:4 application 1:4 4:5 12:14,22 13:2,11 13:17,20 14:11 15:17 applications 15:6,7 17:7 apply 16:7 appreciate 14:18 appropriately 20:13 approval 12:15 14:8 approving 1:9 4:9 approximately 13:4 argument 13:12 14:22 Army 3:13 7:11 arrangements 24:8 asking 20:3 assert 1:8 4:8 assessment 18:11 ASSISTANT 3:4 3:10 ASSOCIATE 2:13 associated 15:7 attempted 18:13 attorney 3:10 24:9 24:10 ATTORNEYS 3:4 audible 18:4 August 13:15 21:20 24:13 authorities 15:6 authorized 24:2,3 automatically 22:24 available 7:23 8:4 17:24 19:20 21:22 21:25	Avenue 2:3,22 3:10 aware 16:3	B	back 12:22 BAKER 2:12 balance 16:18,23 base 10:20 basic 12:24 beginning 4:17 10:17 behalf 4:20,23 5:8 5:11,13,14,15,20 6:16 believe 5:17 7:20 8:22,24 9:8,9 11:8 12:4,6 13:21 17:18 21:18 Belvoir 3:15 7:13 benefits 11:5,11,15 better 12:18 bit 11:1 board 17:14 bound 24:7 Box 3:5 break 10:10 19:5 bridge 5:18 briefs 16:16 broadband 11:12 build 10:25 11:17 burdens 20:12 business 6:7 8:5 buyer 14:10	24:8 cases 16:6,7 CAUSE 1:18 caution 10:4 CCR 1:24 24:7,20 CenturyLink 10:24 11:2 certainly 10:4 certify 24:3 CFIUS 14:11 change 22:8,10 Charter 2:20 5:14 5:16 6:10 17:22 19:5 Charter's 8:17 18:8 clarification 19:14 Clark 1:24 24:2,19 clean 22:19 clearance 14:7 client 21:2 close 11:4 18:21 closely 12:17 21:9 closing 11:14 Codified 24:7 come 13:2,22 20:6 22:7 comfortable 10:5 21:2 coming 12:2 comment 9:20 comments 13:1,4,5 commission 1:2 3:3 5:5,8,11 8:21 10:3 10:22 11:3,13 13:12,18 15:18 16:3 19:11 20:12 22:2 commission's 7:23 19:21 20:1 21:6 COMMISSION... 1:21 commissioners 19:2 Committee 14:12 COMMUNIC...	1:6 Communications 1:6,10 2:7,11,20 4:6,7,10 company 11:11 15:24 16:1,10,18 18:24 20:2,23 22:23 comparison 16:6 competitor 8:25 competitors 9:20 complete 24:5 compromise 16:17 17:9,20 18:14 20:7 computer-aided 24:5 concerns 10:12 19:8 concluded 23:8 condensed 12:12 Conduct 24:7 conference 1:14,19 4:15 9:7 21:20 22:3,5 23:3 conferences 11:18 confidential 8:9 9:9 9:11 10:3 19:9,12 19:19,22 20:10 21:8 23:6 consideration 15:25 considering 16:12 consisting 24:6 constrained 21:9 constraints 17:11 consult 19:1 21:1 consultants 20:22 consumers 11:6,12 11:15 contact 7:4 contained 20:11 continued 3:1 contracting 17:12 control 1:9 4:10
	ATTORNEYS 3:4 audible 18:4 August 13:15 21:20 24:13 authorities 15:6 authorized 24:2,3 automatically 22:24 available 7:23 8:4 17:24 19:20 21:22 21:25	C 24:1,1 Callaghan 3:3 5:7,8 6:20 7:25 8:1 9:13 14:20,25 15:2,13,15 21:16 21:17 22:13 capital 11:9 Caption 4:4 care 4:16 case 9:11 13:14 15:17,21 17:1				

<p>conversations 8:6 17:8 copy 8:17 Corporation 1:6 2:7,12 4:6 correct 8:10 14:1 22:21 correction 22:23 counsel 2:8,13 3:9 5:13 8:16 9:15,16 11:22 12:1,9 17:3 17:5,10 18:8 20:21,24 21:12 24:10,10 couple 12:23 course 10:2 court 7:4 24:2,7 courtesy 8:16 creates 17:16 CT 2:9 cut 6:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <p>Daniel 3:4 5:11 daniel.teimouri... 3:7 data 12:9 date 17:9 18:14 22:6,7,11 Davis 2:3 4:20 day 16:20 21:22 24:13 days 15:8 17:24 19:7 deadline 15:21 16:14,15 17:10,19 17:19 deadlines 15:25 deal 9:7 dealing 16:4,13 decision 11:3,13 12:18 13:6 19:3 declining 1:8 4:8 default 16:22,23 Defense 5:21,25 6:12 18:2</p>	<p>delay 11:13 deliver 11:5,11 Department 5:21 5:25 6:11 14:6 18:1 described 9:8 designated 21:8 designation 19:19 20:16 desire 18:21 desk 8:15 different 10:15 14:14 19:25 20:3 22:7 difficulties 17:16 diligence 16:25 direct 8:25 11:21 direction 18:16 disclosure 14:16 15:5 discovery 7:22,23 8:4 9:3 12:8 discuss 18:10 21:23 discussion 18:18 discussions 18:16 docket 1:5 4:3 8:9 9:6 documents 9:3 DOD 8:18 draft 14:11 due 16:25 duly 24:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <p>E 24:1,1 earlier 21:21,24 early 11:4,25 13:3 echo 18:8 effect 11:10 effective 15:9 either 6:13 18:20 18:25 21:24 electronic 8:15 email 2:5,10,15,19 2:23 3:7,12 7:14 employee 24:9,10</p>	<p>ensure 17:23 ensuring 16:24 entering 23:3 entities 6:13 ENTITLED 1:18 equal 24:8 especially 8:22 10:23 11:11 ESQ 2:2,16,21 3:14 establish 4:16 estimated 12:18 Everett 2:14 exactly 20:7 Excuse 18:7 executive 5:22,25 existing 11:8 expect 15:9 expectation 13:6 expecting 13:2 expert 17:13 experts 21:12 extend 11:24 extended 15:20 extent 12:8 extra 10:6 20:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <p>F 2:21 24:1 fact 8:12,23,24 13:13 fair 18:11 far 22:5 fast 16:9,11 Fax 2:5,18 3:6 FCC 12:15,19,22 12:24 13:6 FEA 8:18 February 16:15 17:9,15,18 federal 5:22,25 15:8 feel 12:18 fees 24:8 Fiber 1:5,10 2:2 4:5 4:11,21 file 6:2 7:7 11:20,23</p>	<p>12:4,22 14:5 19:7 filed 5:22 8:12,13 13:11 14:10 15:5 15:11,17 16:10 filing 14:6,10 filings 6:5 14:17 final 17:19 financial 9:2 financially 24:11 find 16:18 firm 4:23 13:24 first 18:3 focus 20:1 follow 6:25 follow-up 12:24 FOLLOWING 4:1 foregoing 24:4 Foreign 14:12 forget 14:21 formal 5:22 Fort 3:15 7:13 forward 13:14 four 12:3 15:20 frame 13:7 15:8 16:5 franchise 15:6 Frontier 1:5,6,9 2:7 2:11 4:5,6,10,24 5:1,3 19:23 fruitful 18:18 full 6:25 14:16 15:5 24:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <p>G-U-N-S-T-O-N 7:13 GENERAL 2:8,13 3:4,10 generous 20:15 George 2:12 4:25 george.thomson... 2:15 getting 10:1 16:2 17:13 GIBSON 2:21 give 7:3</p>	<p>given 8:22,24 16:14 17:16 go 7:3,8,17 goals 16:1 going 13:20 14:4,21 19:4 good 4:22,25 5:2,7 5:10,12 17:19 government 17:12 grant 6:22 granted 6:14 grasp 13:24 GREG 1:21 Gregory 4:12 grow 11:11 guess 20:22 Gunston 3:14 7:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <p>hand 12:1 24:12 happens 22:6 happy 22:7 Hart-Scott-Rodino 14:6 hear 14:22 heard 18:2 hearing 16:15 help 18:16 hereunto 24:12 high 11:11 16:8 highly 8:8 9:9,11 10:3 19:9,12,18 19:21 20:10 21:8 23:6 hit 8:14 Holdings 1:7 4:7 Honor 4:19,22 5:2 5:7,10 6:16,20,21 8:1,2,12 9:13 10:20 12:11,16,21 13:10 14:4,20,22 15:2,4,11,15,16 15:23 16:20 17:4 18:17 21:17 22:13 hopefully 23:4 hoping 21:23</p>
---	---	---	--	--

house 5:1,3	12:22 14:11	Kyle 3:14 5:20 7:10	matter 1:4 4:4 6:1	ninas@atg.wa.gov
<hr/> I <hr/>	JR 2:12	kyle.j.smith124.c...	8:12 10:2	3:12
ILEC 1:6 4:7 11:8	judge 4:2,13,25 5:5	7:15	matters 4:16 16:2	normal 19:12
includes 22:2 23:5	5:9,14,17 6:4,19	<hr/> L <hr/>	maximum 21:10	normally 7:1
including 23:4	6:22 7:8,16,19 8:3	LACEY 1:22	McDOWELL 2:21	Northwest 1:5,10
incorrect 22:20	9:5,25 12:14,20	large 11:3	means 24:5	1:10 2:2 4:5,10,11
incredibly 17:5	13:8,16,23 14:2	late 12:3	merely 22:4	4:21
indicated 6:11,24	14:18,24 15:1,3	law 4:13	mergers 10:22	Norwalk 2:9
indication 8:8	15:10,13 17:2,21	layer 10:6	Merritt 2:9	note 20:9,18
industry 10:23	18:1,5,9,19 19:16	Legal 3:13 7:11	met 14:8	notice 7:1 9:5 13:1
information 7:3,4	19:17,24 20:9	lengthened 16:21	mid 12:3	13:2
7:20 9:8 12:7	21:4,16 22:1,14	let's 4:2 10:7,13	mid-September	notification 13:19
19:20 20:10,21,25	22:22	Level 10:24 11:2	11:23	notify 22:9
21:10,13	July 1:20 11:21	License 1:24 24:20	mind 22:3	noting 15:16
informed 21:21	June 12:23 15:17	limited 18:23	modeled 8:20	November 12:3
infusion 11:9	jurisdiction 1:8 4:8	line 5:18 11:10	modified 8:13,20	13:7
initial 21:19	jurisdictional	lines 11:8	8:21	number 7:17 16:4
inordinately 12:5	13:12 14:23	Lisa 2:21 5:15	monitoring 12:17	22:20
input 9:10	jurisdictions 13:8	lisa@mrg-law.com	Montana 13:18,22	numerical 22:20
inquire 14:21	13:25	2:23	months 12:3 15:18	<hr/> O <hr/>
inquiries 12:24	Justice 14:6	list 22:15	15:20	O'Connell 2:16
inside 20:24	<hr/> K <hr/>	little 10:4 11:1	motion 8:12 9:6	4:22,23
interest 16:24	Kandi 1:24 24:2,19	14:13	19:5	oaths 24:3
interested 24:11	Kathryn 1:24	LLC 1:5,7,10 2:2	move 13:14	objection 6:17,19
interests 14:9 16:19	24:19	4:5,7,11,21	moved 9:4	6:20,21 9:14 19:8
16:24	keep 20:10,17	LLP 2:3,16	moving 5:24 7:21	objections 6:13
intervene 6:1,9,23	Kevin 2:8 5:3 12:21	local 15:6	mute 18:5	9:17
intervenor 8:18,25	kevin.saville@ftr...	located 7:12	<hr/> N <hr/>	obviously 6:3
12:2	2:10	long 12:5	name 4:12 7:10	October 11:25
intervenor 8:23	kinds 10:2 21:5	longer 11:1,13,14	Nash 3:3 5:8	offered 11:24 12:7
11:22 12:10	know 8:17 10:17	look 19:10	nash.callaghan@...	24:8
intervention 6:14	13:3 14:15 15:9	looking 10:21	3:7	Okay 7:10 13:8,16
6:18	18:15 19:24 21:2	19:21	nature 9:19	13:23 14:18,25
interventions 6:8	22:1,23	looks 20:19	near 12:3	15:10 17:2,21
13:21	Kopta 1:21 4:2,12	LOOP 1:22	nearly 16:8	18:9 20:5,9
Investment 14:12	5:5,9,14,17 6:4,19	losing 11:8	necessarily 19:9	Olympia 3:5 24:2
issue 21:5	6:22 7:8,16,19 8:3	loss 11:10	necessary 12:8	once 16:10
issues 16:4,12	9:5,25 12:14,20	<hr/> M <hr/>	need 6:5,25 7:20	opportunity 9:19
21:14 22:16	13:8,16,23 14:2	making 20:13	8:8 9:1,11,23 12:7	9:21,22,23 13:4
item 6:7 7:21	14:18,24 15:1,3	makings 16:4	13:9 22:9,10,16	21:1
<hr/> J <hr/>	15:10,13 17:2,21	MARIE 3:9	22:19	orally 5:24 7:7 9:7
J 2:16 3:14 4:12	18:1,5,9,19 19:16	Mark 2:2 4:19	needs 17:6 21:9	order 1:8 4:8 7:1
7:10	19:17,24 20:9	marktrincher@...	22:8	8:5,6,9,13,21 9:14
joint 1:4 4:4 6:17	21:4,16 22:1,14	2:5	negotiations 11:24	10:1 19:6,10,11
	22:22		Nina 3:9 5:12	19:22 20:1,2 23:4

23:4,5 orders 8:22 Oregon 2:4,22 13:11 original 17:9 originally 11:1 outcome 24:11 outline 9:22 outside 20:21,21 21:12,12 ownership 14:9	17:22 18:2,20,25 20:25 positions 21:13 possible 5:23 10:6 11:4 18:22,23 20:11,17 post 16:15 20:11 practice 21:6 preferable 10:19 preference 19:2 prehearing 1:14,19 4:15 9:7 23:3 prepared 18:25 PRESIDENT 2:8 presiding 4:13 prior 8:7,21 probably 12:17 13:15 procedural 15:24 16:20 21:19 22:2 proceed 15:14 proceeding 4:14 7:24 8:7 10:7 13:13 proceedings 4:1 10:2,22 14:15 23:8 24:4 process 12:25 14:14 14:15 17:13 productive 18:11 18:15 projections 9:2 proposal 11:25 19:22,24 20:19,20 propose 11:21 proposed 9:15 10:15,16 11:9,23 12:13 13:9 15:24 16:15 19:10 21:3 21:19 protected 20:13 protection 10:6 protections 9:1,4 9:12 19:13 protective 8:5,9,13	8:21,22 9:14 10:1 19:6,11,12,13 20:1,2 23:5 provided 12:25 provisions 10:3 23:6 public 3:9 5:13 8:16 9:16 11:22 12:1,9 13:1,11,18 13:19 14:14 17:3 17:5,10 purchasers 11:10 purposes 14:16 15:5 pursuant 24:3 put 15:21	20:24 relative 24:9,10 release 13:1 rely 7:2 REMEMBERED 1:18 reply 13:5 REPORTED 1:24 reporter 7:5 24:2 reporting 24:8 representative 8:17 requested 8:20 9:3 requesting 10:11 requirement 14:8 requirements 17:12 resent 10:21 residing 24:2 resolve 15:18 resolved 13:13 resolving 16:1 resources 18:22 21:11 respect 10:24 respond 9:23 response 12:2 18:4 restrained 20:17 restrict 20:20 restriction 21:7 restrictions 9:19 19:19 21:3 review 9:19 10:10 14:11,13 19:5 20:25 21:12 reviewing 20:19 right 5:5,17 6:22 7:16,19 8:3 9:5,25 15:13 21:16 22:14 22:22,25 23:1 Rives 2:16 4:23 Road 3:14 7:12 rule 16:4 rules 7:23 8:4 24:7	14:4 15:3,4 saying 20:14 schedule 4:16 10:9 10:14,18,21,24,25 12:12 13:15 15:24 17:15,18,23 18:14 18:17 23:4 schedules 10:15,21 11:19 12:8 13:24 16:21 21:19 22:2 scheduling 14:19 15:14 scope 19:18 SE 1:22 Seattle 2:17 3:11 see 6:6,12 10:11,13 19:2 seeking 11:3 13:1 selected 17:25 send 8:19 SENIOR 2:8 sensitive 17:5,17 service 8:16 Services 3:13 7:11 13:18 set 24:12 sets 11:19 setting 13:14 settlement 11:18 21:20 22:3,5 short 6:12 23:4 shorten 12:7 shortened 16:21 Shortening 17:15 similar 9:2 situation 11:7 situations 21:5 slightly 12:12 small 21:18 Smith 3:14 5:20,20 6:4,11,24 7:6,10 7:10,18 18:1,4,7 22:18,18 solution 16:18 soon 5:23 18:21
P				
P 2:2 p.m 1:20 23:8 P.O 3:5 pages 1:16 24:6 part 10:21 11:3 17:11 particular 11:7 20:23 parties 7:22 9:10 10:5 14:5 17:8 18:10 20:12 21:10 21:23 22:4,11 24:8 party 18:20 24:10 PC 2:21 pending 14:17 people 20:15 period 13:21 permission 22:10 pertinent 21:12 petitions 6:9,23 phone 22:18,20,21 22:23 place 20:8 planning 9:2 pleadings 7:2 point 10:12,14 11:18 13:5,23 14:24 18:24 19:15 20:23 22:17 Portlan 2:22 Portland 2:4 position 16:16				
		Q		
		question 12:20 14:23 16:9,22 quickly 18:23 20:19		
		R		
		R 24:1 Rackner 2:21,21 5:15,15 9:18 10:10 17:21,22 19:14,17 20:5,18 21:15,21 RCW 24:3 ready 16:10 real 11:18 really 16:7 18:19 21:2 22:11 reason 21:7 reasonable 20:7 reasonably 18:21 received 12:23 14:7 15:23 recess 18:10 record 4:2 22:19 reflect 9:6 regard 17:6 regarding 10:22 regulatory 14:8,17		
			S	
			Saville 2:8 5:2,3 12:17,21,21 14:2	

<p>20:17 sounds 18:9 specific 17:24 speed 11:12 speeding 17:17 SQUARE 1:22 staff 5:6,8,11 8:16 9:14 10:15 11:22 11:24,25 12:1,9 12:13 14:19,21 15:23,25 16:3,8,9 16:11,12,14 staff's 16:16,24 17:6,9 staffing 17:6 standard 10:1 19:11,21 20:1,2 state 11:6,12,15 13:22 17:11 24:2 24:7 States 5:21,24 7:11 stating 19:8 statute 15:18 statutory 15:8,21 16:14 17:10 stem 11:10 step 12:25 sticking 11:18 20:23 Stoel 2:16 4:23 Street 2:13,17 strong-arm 18:20 submitted 19:10 subsequent 6:5 substantively 20:3 Suetake 3:9 5:12 5:12 6:21 9:16 17:4 suggesting 19:18 Suite 2:3,17,22 3:10,14 7:13 sure 8:14,15 10:5 20:13 22:4 SW 2:3,22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/>	<p>T 24:1,1 table 10:7 take 9:21 10:9 11:15 14:19 18:25 18:25 19:4 21:14 takes 10:3 talking 18:6 Teimouri 3:4 5:10 5:11 telecom 10:23 16:3 16:8 telephone 3:16 7:17 terms 10:18 20:12 24:8 testimony 11:21,23 12:2,4,6 16:10,11 17:17 24:5 Thank 4:19 6:4 7:19 9:13 14:20 15:2,15 17:1,4 21:15 22:13,22 thereof 24:11 thing 20:18 think 6:5,25 10:13 11:19 16:23 22:14 23:1 thinking 10:18 Thomson 2:12 4:25 5:1 10:20 12:16 thoughts 18:17 Tim 4:23 time 10:25 11:17 11:19,22 12:5,18 13:7 15:8 16:5,25 18:3 21:23 timing 17:6 TIMOTHY 2:16 tjoconnell@stoel... 2:19 today 4:15 6:3 14:23 16:8 transaction 11:5,6 11:14 12:15 13:9 14:13 15:19 16:2 18:21</p>	<p>transactions 16:6 transcribed 24:4 transcript 24:5 transcription 24:5 transfer 1:9 4:9 Transportation 1:2 3:2 Tremaine 2:3 4:20 tried 10:25 11:17 Trincher 2:2 4:19 4:20 6:15,16 8:2,7 8:10,11 9:21 13:10,17 14:1 15:11 18:12,13 20:6 true 24:5 try 8:15 20:9 trying 16:17 TUESDAY 1:20 turn 12:8 two 6:9 10:15 11:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>U.S 3:13 ultimately 17:24 19:3 understand 10:8 18:20,22 understanding 8:10 13:19 understood 17:7 21:15 United 5:21,24 7:11 University 2:17 urging 12:11 UT-190574 1:5 4:3 Utilities 1:2 3:2 13:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <hr/> <p>value 22:20 VICE 2:8 video 15:7 Virginia 3:15 7:14 voice 10:12</p>	<p>VOLUME 1:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <hr/> <p>WAC 24:7 want 7:22 10:4,12 21:9 wanted 17:5 21:18 wants 5:18 9:21 Washington 1:1,22 2:14,17 3:2,5,11 11:7,16 24:2 way 18:25 we'll 6:6 we're 9:25 12:11 13:2 19:4 we've 11:17 12:7 14:7,10 20:4 week 13:3,3,20 15:12 21:24 weigh 13:9 WHEREOF 24:12 wish 20:24 witness 17:13 24:5 24:12 WOODLAND 1:22 work 16:17 18:13 20:6 workload 16:7,12 wouldn't 19:9 Wright 2:3 4:20 writing 6:2 9:24 written 6:10 7:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <hr/> <p>year 15:22 yesterday 8:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <hr/> <p>06851 2:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <hr/> <p>1 24:6 1-24 1:16</p>	<p>1:30 1:20 11 15:18 11th 2:22 120 15:8 1300 2:3 3:14 7:13 1800 2:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <hr/> <p>2:00 23:8 20-day 13:21 2000 3:10 2019 1:20 24:13 206 2:18,18 3:11 22060 3:15 7:14 23 1:20 2300 2:3 24 24:6 261-5844 2:14 27th 21:25 28th 15:17,22 16:15 17:10,18 21:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <hr/> <p>3 10:24 11:2 30 21:20 30-day 13:4 3008 1:24 24:20 308-14-130 24:7 31st 11:21 360 3:6,6 3600 2:17 386-7500 2:18 386-7562 2:18 389-2055 3:11 394 15:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <hr/> <p>400 2:22 401 2:9 40128 3:5 419 2:22 41st 2:13 425 2:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <hr/>
--	--	--	--	--

5.28.010 24:3
503 2:4,5,23
595-3925 2:23
5th 2:3 3:10

6

600 2:17
621 1:22
664-1187 3:6
664-5522 3:6
693-1274 3:15
6th 24:13

7

7 2:9
703 3:15
703-693-1270 7:18
703-693-1274
22:21
778-5299 2:5
778-5318 2:4

8

80.12.030(2) 15:19
800 3:10

9

9275 3:14 7:12
97201-5630 2:4
97205 2:22
98101 2:17
98104-3188 3:11
98201 2:14
98503 1:22
98504-0128 3:5