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JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be on the record.
Good morning. It is Wednesday, April 5th, and the time is 9:03 A.M.

My name is Michael Howard. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission. And I am presiding in this matter along with the Commissioners, who will join us shortly.

We're here for an evidentiary hearing in Docket TP-220513. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission versus Puget Sound Pilots.

Let's start by taking appearances beginning with PSP.
MR. HAGLUND: Michael Haglund, Haglund Kelly, and my colleague Eric Brickenstein are here for Puget Sound Pilots.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Could we hear from Staff?
MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, Assistant Attorney General, on behalf of Commission Staff. With me is Jaclynn Simmons and Mike Young.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Can we hear from Pacific Merchant Shipping Association or PMSA?

MS. DeLAPPE: Good morning. Michelle DeLappe on behalf of

PMSA.
JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
And could we hear from TOTE Maritime Alaska LLC or TOTE. MR. BLOCK: Yes, good morning, Your Honor. Steve Block, Lane Powell, appearing for TOTE Maritime Alaska.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
I want to start out by giving a roadmap for our plans for the hearing over the next two days.

I will start by ruling on the seven pending motions.
I'll then be asking the parties whether they stipulate to the admission of any prefiled testimony or whether they have any objections.

After the Commissioners join us, in about a half hour from now, we'll then allow the parties an opportunity to provide brief opening statements limited to 15 minutes each.

We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the order of presentation that $I$ circulated to the parties earlier.

Because we have post-hearing briefing in this case, I do not plan on providing for oral closing statements.

I also want to remind the parties to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking and only to use video for those portions of the hearing they have a speaking role.

If you're having any technical issues or you observe that
someone has dropped off the call, please mention in the chat. The chat should be reserved for technical issues and requests for the breaks only.

Are there any questions or housekeeping matters before we continue?

MS. DeLAPPE: Your Honor, as housekeeping matters, I did have -- if this case this hearing goes on to Friday -- and I know that we're trying to avoid that, but my witness is Captain Moore and Kathy Metcalf would not be available on

Friday, if you could take that into consideration, please. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.

MS. DeLAPPE: Thank you.
JUDGE HOWARD: That was Moore and Metcalf?
MS. DeLAPPE: Yes. Thank you.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, I do have one small matter.
Staff is going to withdraw its objections to the admission
of Exhibit $\mathrm{SM}-15 \mathrm{X}$ and 16X. Thank you.
JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Thank you.
On the issue of managing our time, I'm going to suggest that we start at 9 A.M. tomorrow as well.

Does anyone have any concerns with that? Instead of 9:30. MR. HAGLUND: None for PSP.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
I'm hearing no objections. Okay.

Moving -- do we have the court reporter joining us at this point? Okay.

I'm going to continue on with my rulings on the seven pending motions in this docket.

I am not necessarily going to rule on these in the order that they were filed.

First, we have Staff's motion in limine to reject PSP supplemental testimony. Under WAC 480-07-540 and other Commission rules, a party normally needs to take leave to file supplemental testimony.

I am granting Staff's motion in limine. PSP has filed supplemental testimony on March 24 th, outside of the procedural schedule and without asking leave. Allowing unauthorized submissions prejudices the other parties and undermines the orderly administration of the case. A party does not create a right to supplement the record by referring to future plans additions in his testimony.

I've considered PSP's response but find it unpersuasive. In Order 4, paragraph 14, I observed that a motion to supplement the record may be simply denied as departing from Commission practice and the rules. This seems to have been overlooked.

I am, therefore, rejecting Exhibits SB-11T; SB-12; SB-13;
SB-14; JJN-6T; JJN 7; SM-8T; SM-9; SM-10; and SM-11.
I'm also rejecting Exhibits MM-77X through MM-81X.

Hold on a moment.
Actually, I -- I'm going to decline to reject Exhibits MM-77X through MM-81X because those were submitted by the deadline for cross-exhibits.

I have reviewed MM-105X, but this does not appear to be identical to any supplemental testimony or exhibits as Staff suggested. So I am not rejecting MM-105X at this time. (Conclusion of excerpted proceedings)
(Court reporter joins at 9:10 a.m.)
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