## Docket Nos. UE-220066 and UG-220067 (Consolidated) - Vol. I

## **WUTC v. Puget Sound Energy**

February 28, 2022



206.287.9066 I 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u>

email: info@buellrealtime.com



	<del></del>
Page 1	Page 3
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	1 APPEARANCES (Cont.)
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND ) DOCKETS UE-220066 and TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, ) UG-220067 ) (Consolidated) Complainant, ) vs. ) PUGET SOUND ENERGY, ) Respondent.	LISA W. GAFKEN  ANN PAISNER  Assistant Attorneys General  Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit  800 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000  Seattle, Washington 98104 206-464-6595  Iisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov ann.paisner@atg.wa.gov pccseaef@atg.wa.gov
VIRTUAL PREHEARING CONFERENCE VOLUME I Pages 1-101 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MICHAEL HOWARD	FOR ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS:  BRENT COLEMAN  Davison Van Cleve PC  1750 Southwest Harbor Way  Suite 450  Portland, Oregon 97201  971-710-1157  blc@dvclaw.com
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast Lacey, Washington 98503  (All participants appeared via videoconference.)	15
DATE TAKEN: FEBRUARY 28, 2022 REPORTED BY: ROSE DETLOFF, RPR, CCR #21036100	21 Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP 396 Hayes Street 22 San Francisco, California 94102 415-552-7272 23 yzakai@smwlaw.com 24 25
Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES	1 APPEARANCES (Cont.)
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	2 FOR THE FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES:
MICHAEL HOWARD  FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI JEFF ROBERSON NASH I. CALLAGHAN HARRY FUKANO JOE M. DALLAS DANIEL J. TEIMOURI Assistant Attorneys General Office of the Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Office of the Attorney General 11 P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 22 Olympia, Washington 98504 360-664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov joe.dallas@utc.wa.gov  FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY:  SHEREE STROM CARSON DAVID STEELE PAM ANDERSON 19 BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 20 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Suite 700 21 Bellevue, Washington 98004 425-635-1400 22 scarson@perkinscoie.com dsteele@perkinscoie.com byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com	RITA LIOTTA Attorney at Law 1 Avenue of the Palms Suite 161, Room 8F San Francisco, California 94130 rita.liotta@navy.mil  FOR NUCOR STEEL SEATTLE:  DAMON XENOPOULOS SHAUN MOHLER LAURA BAKER Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, PC 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW 8th Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007 202-342-0800 dex@smxblaw.com  Washington, DC 20007 12 202-342-0800 dex@smxblaw.com 13 smohler@smxblaw.com 14 FOR WALMART: VICKI BALDWIN Parsons Behle & Latimer 17 201 South Main Street Suite 1800 18 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 801-536-6918 vbaldwin@parsonsbehle.com  FOR SIERRA CLUB:  GLORIA SMITH Sierra Club 85 Second Street 23 Second Floor San Francisco, California 94105 415-977-5532 gloria.smith@sierraclub.org

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

*	Page 5		Page 7
1 A	PPEARANCES (Cont.)	1	APPEARANCES (Cont.)
2 FOR KING	COUNTY:	2	FOR MICROSOFT CORPORATION:
4 K. 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92	EN MAYER &L Gates 25 Fourth Avenue uite 2900 eattle, Washington 98104 06-623-7580 en.mayer@klgates.com  ERNA BROMLEY AUL MARTINEZ ing County Pros. Attys Office 191 Second Avenue uite 1700 eattle, Washington 98101 06-477-1097 erna.bromley@kingcounty.gov aul.martinez@kingcounty.gov	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	TYLER PEPPLE CORINNE MILINOVICH Davison Van Cleve PC 1750 Southwest Harbor Way Suite 450 Portland, Oregon 97201 503-241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com com@dvclaw.com
15 Ei 8' 8' 16 Si 17 2(	AIMINI PAREKH AN HASSELMAN arthjustice 10 Third Avenue uite 610 eattle, Washington 98104 06-343-7340 parekh@earthjustice.org passelman@earthjustice.org	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	* * * *
	Page 6		Page 8
2 FOR THE PU 3 LIS 4 ALL 5 Ind 300 6 Tax 253 7 Ilisa 8 NIC 9 Og 901 10 Sui 11 200 11 200 11 200 11 12 13 FOR FRONT 14 MA Fro 15 155 156 Sui 16 Sex 200 17 Inf 18 FOR COALIT 19 ENERGY: 20 J. F. Law 21 705 Sui 22 Sex 220 22 Sex 200	PEARANCES (Cont.)  JYALLUP TRIBE:  SA ANDERSON EC WROLSON W Office of the Puyallup Tribe of lians J9 East Portland Avenue coma, Washington 98404 3-573-7852 a.anderson@puyalluptribe-nsn.gov c.wrolson@puyalluptribe-nsn.gov c.wrolson@puyalluptribe-nsn.gov c.WrolAS THOMAS den Murphy Wallace PLLC 1 Fifth Avenue 1 te 3500 attle, Washington 98164 6-447-7000 iomas@omwlaw.com  TAND CENTERED: kRIEL THURAISINGHAM iont and Centered D1 East Madison Street tite 250 attle, Washington 98122 6-487-4303 j@frontandcentered.org ITION OF EASTSIDE NEIGHBORHOODS FOR SENSIBLE RICHARD ARAMBURU W Offices of J. Richard Aramburu PLLC 5 Second Avenue tite 1300 attle, Washington 98104 6-625-9515	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PROCEEDINGS  JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. We're here today for a prehearing conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission versus Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by Puget Sound Energy or PSE.  My name is Michael Howard. I use he/him pronouns. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I'll be co-presiding in this matter along with the Commissioners. The Commissioners will not be joining us at this particular prehearing conference today, though.  Let's start by taking appearances, beginning with PSE.  MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy.  Also appearing with me today are David Steele with Perkins Coie and Mr. Steele will be responding to
22 Sea 206	attle, Washington 98104	23 24 25	Also appearing with me today are David Steele with Perkins Coie, and Mr. Steele will be responding to petitions to intervene.

	Page 9		Page 11
1	Pam Anderson and Byron Starkey are also	1	& Latimer on behalf of Walmart.
2	appearing, and we have filed a notice of appearance.	2	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	3	Could we hear from Sierra Club.
4	Could we have an appearance for Staff.	4	MS. SMITH: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.
5	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Good morning, Your	5	This is Gloria Smith for Sierra Club.
6	Honor. This is Jennifer Cameron-Rulkowski, Assistant	6	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
7	Attorney General, appearing on behalf of Staff.	7	Could we have an appearance for King County.
8	And with me in this case are Assistant	8	MR. MAYER: Yes, good morning, Your Honor.
9	Attorneys General, Jeff Roberson, Nash Callaghan, Harry	9	This is Ben Mayer from K&L Gates for King County.
10	Fukano, Joe Dallas, and Daniel Teimouri.	10	I'll be appearing with my partner K&L Gates and
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	11	alongside Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorneys, Verna
12	Could we have an appearance for Public Counsel.	12	Bromley and Raul Martinez of King County.
13	MS. GAFKEN: Good morning, Judge Howard. My	13	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
14	name is Lisa Gafken. I'm an Assistant Attorney General	14	Could we have an appearance for NWEC.
15	appearing on behalf of Public Counsel.	15	MS. PAREKH: Good morning, Your Honor.
16	Also appearing in this case with me is	16	Jaimini Parekh with Earthjustice, and my colleague Jan
17	Assistant Attorney General, Ann Paisner.	17	Hasselman is still on the line. And we are representing
18	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	18	Northwest Energy.
19	Do we have an appearance for AWEC?	19	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
20	MR. COLEMAN: Good morning, Your Honor.	20	Could we have an appearance for the Puyallup
21	Brent Coleman of the law firm Davison Van Cleve on	21	Tribe.
22	behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.	22	MS. ANDERSON: Good morning, Your Honor.
23	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	23	I'm Lisa Anderson. I'm appearing for the Puyallup
24	Could we have an appearance for The Energy	24	Tribe. I am an in-house attorney with The Law Office of
25	Project.	25	the Puyallup Tribe.
			and rayanap ribe.
	Page 10		Page 12
1	MR. FFITCH: Good morning, Your Honor. This	1	With me, I have Alec Wrolson, who is also a
2	is Simon ffitch appearing as counsel for The Energy	2	staff attorney with The Law Office of the Puyallup
3	Project.	3	Tribe, and Nicholas Thomas, who is with Ogden Murphy
4	And in addition, intervening or appearing for	4	Wallace.
5	The Energy Project in this case will be Yochi Zakai, and	5	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
6	our information is provided in the notice appearance and	6	So are there any other organizations on the
7	petition to intervene in the case.	7	call today that would like to give a verbal notice of
8	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	8	appearance here?
9	Could we have an appearance for The Federal	9	MS. THURAISINGHAM: Hello, my name is Mariel
10	Executive Agencies.	10	Thuraisingham. I'm with Front and Centered, and I am
11	MS. LIOTTA: Yes, good morning, Your Honor.	11	here.
12	This is Rita Liotta representing The Federal Executive	12	MR. ARAMBURU: Your Honor, I am Richard
13	Agencies.	13	Aramburu, representing CENSE in these proceedings.
13 14	Agencies.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	13 14	Aramburu, representing CENSE in these proceedings.  JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook
	<u> </u>		
14	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	14	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook
14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.  And could we hear from Nucor Steel Seattle.	14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook I had CENSE in my notes. I apologize. Thank you,
14 15 16	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.  And could we hear from Nucor Steel Seattle.  MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Your Honor.	14 15 16	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook I had CENSE in my notes. I apologize. Thank you, Mr. Aramburu.
14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.  And could we hear from Nucor Steel Seattle.  MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Your Honor.  This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos &	14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook I had CENSE in my notes. I apologize. Thank you, Mr. Aramburu. MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, Your Honor. This
14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And could we hear from Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle. Also appearing with me in this case are Shaun Mohler and Laura Baker of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos &	14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook I had CENSE in my notes. I apologize. Thank you, Mr. Aramburu. MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Tyler Pepple and Corinne Milinovich, both from
14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.  And could we hear from Nucor Steel Seattle.  MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Your Honor.  This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle.  Also appearing with me in this case are Shaun	14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook I had CENSE in my notes. I apologize. Thank you, Mr. Aramburu. MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Tyler Pepple and Corinne Milinovich, both from Davison Van Cleve, here on behalf of Microsoft
14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And could we hear from Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle. Also appearing with me in this case are Shaun Mohler and Laura Baker of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos &	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook I had CENSE in my notes. I apologize. Thank you, Mr. Aramburu.  MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Tyler Pepple and Corinne Milinovich, both from Davison Van Cleve, here on behalf of Microsoft Corporation.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.  And could we hear from Nucor Steel Seattle.  MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Your Honor.  This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle.  Also appearing with me in this case are Shaun Mohler and Laura Baker of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  And could we have an appearance for Walmart.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook I had CENSE in my notes. I apologize. Thank you, Mr. Aramburu.  MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Tyler Pepple and Corinne Milinovich, both from Davison Van Cleve, here on behalf of Microsoft Corporation.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. For first, Front and Centered, and then Microsoft, would the attorneys mind giving the spelling
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And could we hear from Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle. Also appearing with me in this case are Shaun Mohler and Laura Baker of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And could we have an appearance for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good morning, Your Honor.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook I had CENSE in my notes. I apologize. Thank you, Mr. Aramburu.  MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Tyler Pepple and Corinne Milinovich, both from Davison Van Cleve, here on behalf of Microsoft Corporation.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. For first, Front and Centered, and then Microsoft, would the attorneys mind giving the spelling of their names and giving their contact information
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.  And could we hear from Nucor Steel Seattle.  MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Your Honor.  This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle.  Also appearing with me in this case are Shaun Mohler and Laura Baker of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  And could we have an appearance for Walmart.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I did overlook I had CENSE in my notes. I apologize. Thank you, Mr. Aramburu.  MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Tyler Pepple and Corinne Milinovich, both from Davison Van Cleve, here on behalf of Microsoft Corporation.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. For first, Front and Centered, and then Microsoft, would the attorneys mind giving the spelling

Page 13 Page 15 1 1 docket, it hasn't gone through our case's online filing MS. THURAISINGHAM: We may here as soon as 2 2 we make that determination, but it's still being app yet. 3 MS. THURAISINGHAM: I can start. This is 3 discussed by supervisors. And I think we have some time 4 there; is that correct? Do you need to know right now? 4 Mariel Thuraisingham. I'm not an attorney with this 5 5 organization but a staff person. M-A-R-I-E-L, JUDGE HOWARD: Under our rules, the petition 6 Thuraisingham, T-H-U-R-A-I-S-I-N-G-H-A-M. 6 should be filed three business days before the 7 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And can I ask 7 prehearing conference. We can consider a late-filed 8 what your position is with the organization? 8 petition for intervention if there's good cause. 9 9 MS. THURAISINGHAM: Clean Energy Policy So if the organization does file a petition for 10 10 Lead. intervention, I would suggest you do that sooner rather JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And there are 11 than later, and explain, to the best as you can, good 11 many circumstances where it is perfectly fine for a 12 cause for not filing it earlier, and I'll consider that 12 non-attorney to represent an organization before the 13 13 at the time. 14 commission. 14 MS. THURAISINGHAM: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 Just out of curiosity, does Front and Centered 15 We'll know as soon as possible. 16 16 anticipate hiring an attorney to represent them in this JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 17 proceeding? 17 So including Microsoft's petition for 18 MS. THURAISINGHAM: We're not sure yet. 18 intervention, we have received a total of 11 petitions 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. 19 for intervention from the following organizations: The 20 So I would turn next to Microsoft for the 20 Energy Project, AWEC, Federal Executive Agencies, Nucor Steel Seattle, Walmart, the Sierra Club, Microsoft, attorney's contact information. 21 21 MR. PEPPLE: Yes, Your Honor. So my name is 22 22 CENSE -- that's Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods For 23 Tyler Pepple, T-Y-L-E-R. Last name is P-E-P-L-E. 23 Sensible Energy if I have that correctly -- NWEC, King 24 Also Corinne Milinovich, C-O-R-I-N-N-E, 24 County, and the Puyallup Tribe. 25 M-I-L-I-N-O-V-I-C-H. 25 And I have received and reviewed PSE's written Page 14 Page 16 1 And you need the address? Is that what you're 1 objections to both CENSE and the Puyallup Tribe's 2 petitions for intervention, and we will discuss those in 2 looking for? 3 3 JUDGE HOWARD: That would be great. a moment and give each side of that dispute a chance to MR. PEPPLE: Address is 1750 Southwest 4 4 present argument. 5 5 Harbor Way, Suite 450, Portland, Oregon 97201. But first, are there any verbal objections to 6 And we did file an intervention this morning, 6 any of the petitions for intervention today? 7 so all that information should be in there once it makes 7 MR. STEELE: Your Honor, this is David 8 it through the process. 8 Steele with Perkins Coie for PSE. For Sierra Club, we do not object to their 9 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. 9 10 Are there any other organizations that I have 10 intervention, but we do have concerns about the scope. not addressed yet that wish to make a verbal notice of 11 And so I'm happy to address that at the appropriate 11 12 12 time. I just wanted to note that now. appearance? 13 13 All right. Hearing none, let's turn to the JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Let me just make issue of the petitions for intervention. 14 14 sure I add that to my notes here. 15 So, Mr. Pepple, it does sound that Microsoft 15 All right. Before we turn to CENSE and the has filed the petition for intervention this morning. 16 Puyallup Tribe --16 17 So it has not popped up in my e-mail yet, so I have not 17 MR. COLEMAN: Judge, may I briefly -- sorry, had a chance to review it. And we will address that in I was waiting for you to check your notes. I apologize. 18 18 19 a moment. 19 Brent Coleman on behalf of AWEC. And just 20 Are there any other petitions for intervention 20 briefly, AWEC would join the Company's objection to 21 that any organization would like to make other than what 21 CENSE -- to their intervention. Just briefly, we agree 22 we have received in writing so far? 22 that we have some concerns with respect to relitigating 23 23 some of the issues that they have previously discussed Okay. Hearing none.

and potentially expanding the scope of the proceeding.

And we also agree that Public Counsel is

24

25

24

25

From Front and Centered, does Front and

Centered plan to petition for intervention in this case?

Page 17

certainly sophisticated and competent enough to represent the residential small commercial customers that are the membership of CENSE. So we think there's some duplication there.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I will allow AWEC an opportunity to comment when we get to that point later on in a few minutes here.

MS. GAFKEN: If I may also as well, Public Counsel does not object to any of the petitions for interventions, but we do have some opinions regarding the objections that have been raised. When the time is appropriate, we'd like to speak as well.

JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.

MS. GAFKEN: Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: And I would appreciate hearing Public Counsel's position on those.

So before we turn to CENSE and Puyallup Tribe, I did want to address the representative for Microsoft.

So it does appear that Microsoft has filed a written petition intervention, but it was this morning. As I mentioned earlier, the Commission can consider late-filed petition for intervention if there's good cause.

Mr. Pepple, I don't want to rule on your petition for intervention without reading it. Does that

the week, and therefore, we simply didn't file it until this morning.

Page 19

But, again, I think my understanding of the rule is that late-filed petition occurs after the prehearing conference. But I do apologize for not getting it in within the preferred three-day window.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Maybe our rules are a little ambiguous on that point. I'm going to take Microsoft's petition into consideration because I do want to read it before I have a ruling on it.

But for the purposes of today, I would like Microsoft to participate in any scheduling discussions.

MR. PEPPLE: Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.

So let's turn to the two disputed petitions for intervention, CENSE and Puyallup Tribe. And I want to start with CENSE. Let me make sure I have something in my notes here first.

So I want to ask a few questions of CENSE, and then I'll give CENSE an opportunity to just provide a more general argument on this issue. You know, a brief, brief argument. But I do want to ask a few questions of the organization first, and then I would turn to PSE and AWEC for their responses.

So I did see that PSE filed a motion to strike

Page 18

petition address the good cause standard?

MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, it does not.

My understanding is that a late-filed petition is actually a petition that's filed after the prehearing conference. I do understand that the Commission prefers written interventions three days before, but my understanding is that the actual late-filed petition would only occur if it was filed after the prehearing conference.

However, I was out of the office all week last week, and so that's essentially why we got it in today.

JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Pepple, I'm just refreshing my memory here looking at our rules.

WAC 480-07-355 and Paragraph 1A does say written petitions to intervene should be filed at least three business days before the initial hearing date or prehearing conference date, whichever occurs first. So that is what I was referring to.

I don't want to pry into your personal business by any measure, but is there -- you referred to being out of the office and that led to the petition being filed late. Can you tell me more about that.

MR. PEPPLE: Certainly, Your Honor. It was simply that -- yeah, I mean, I was out of the office and did not have access to Internet last week for much of

Page 20

1 CENSE's reply in support of its petition to intervene, 2 and I did have a chance to read that.

Does CENSE have any response to that motion?

MR. ARAMBURU: I have not seen that motion or that response. I don't know when it was filed.

JUDGE HOWARD: It was quite recently. I have it going through at 8:49 a.m. this morning. But there's frequently a bit of a delay between when something is filed and when it's actually processed and when I see it.

MR. STEELE: Your Honor, that time is accurate. We filed it first thing this morning as soon as we could.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. So, Mr. Aramburu -- am I saying your last name correctly?

MR. ARAMBURU: You are. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: So with the caveat that this is all happening right before the prehearing conference, you might not have had a chance to read this motion, and that's understandable. I mean, PSE has moved to strike the reply because CENSE did not ask for leave to file the reply in support of its petition.

Do you have any response to that argument?

MR. ARAMBURU: We were in a hurry on Friday to respond to this so it could be submitted in time for

Page 21

the prehearing conference. And so we apparently erred in not seeking leave to file, but we do seek that leave this morning, please.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I would take it you're formally seeking leave to file your reply now?

MR. ARAMBURU: Correct.

2.0

JUDGE HOWARD: All right.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, this is Jennifer Cameron-Rulkowski. May I interject something? JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I just noticed that I received a copy of the PSE motion to strike that was courtesy -- by courtesy, I received a courtesy copy this morning -- and it came into my e-mail at 9:34. So I could see if counsel first hasn't seen it yet.

And I just wanted to make sure that the record had the benefit of that information. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I mean, this is all occurring within short order, so I understand that.

All right. For the moment, I'm going to

consider this particular issue as a motion to strike.

But, of course, I think that -- I have reviewed PSE's motion to strike, and the Company is generally correct that the moving task to seek leave of the Commission to file reply and the parties -- all parties and everything

objection some curriculum vitae of a sample of witnesses. Those witnesses are focused on economic, reliability, and need issues. They are not focused on environmental issues.

Page 23

Page 24

I think the scope of Commission's responsibilities here -- you engaged the public interest. But we're not intending to spend much time, if any, on the environmental issues.

JUDGE HOWARD: Has CENSE considered limiting the scope of its participation to only the issue of the prudency of the Energize Eastside project? Or would CENSE consider addressing other issues in its testimony?

MR. ARAMBURU: We haven't made a final decision on that. We just became aware of this matter a couple of weeks ago, and we were involved in some other proceedings. So we've not reached a final decision on that matter. But we do intend to focus before the Commission on the prudency issues.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And then my last question I had for you before I give you a chance to offer some brief comments, if you wish, would be does CENSE maintain that it represents vulnerable or highly impacted communities as defined by the Clean Energy Transformation Act?

MR. ARAMBURU: I don't know -- I've not

Page 22

should certainly be aware of that. But I will consider that for a few minutes here.

So to move on to some other questions I had for CENSE, what specifically would be CENSE's position with respect to the prudency of the Energize Eastside project?

MR. ARAMBURU: We believe the project -- as indicated in our motion to intervene and our reply to PSE's objections, we would be questioning the need for the project and its particular fashion, its response to reliability, other such needs.

Perhaps, Mr. Examiner, your concern is that we would attempt to bring in environmental and land use issues into these proceedings. We have raised those issues in other forums. But our emphasis here would be on the prudency of the project for its inclusion and the rate base.

JUDGE HOWARD: That leads very naturally into the next question I had for you and my answer. But I'm going to ask it anyway and be a little bit obtuse.

Does CENSE anticipate that its arguments will broaden the scope of the issues before the Commission beyond the prudency determination on Energize Eastside?

MR. ARAMBURU: No, we have no intention to do that. We've supplied in our response to the PSE

looked into that matter at this point. We've indicated our intention to file request for funding. We haven't done that yet, so we've not gotten into those issues at this point. We do represent a large number of persons in the five eastern King County cities that are impacted by these fines.

So I'm not prepared at this point to respond to those matters. It may be that CENSE does not meet those requirements, but that is under consideration. And we will be filing our case certification request here based upon -- if we're permitted to intervene, we will be filing our materials on the case funding certification by the deadline indicated in your prehearing argument.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So those are the main questions I had to ask CENSE today.

Would you like to offer any general response to PSE's objections to your petition?

MR. ARAMBURU: Your Honor, we have filed our response with you which includes some appendices.

CENSE has been involved with the issue of this Eastside transmission line for seven years. We have consistently raised both land use and environmental objections, but also importantly for Commission work, we have raised the question of the need and reliability for this project.

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

Page 25

We have witnesses, three of which are identified in our responses, that are prepared to address those questions and whether or not the Energize Eastside project is one that's necessary. We have cited to previous Commission guidance to PSE concerning some of the issues regarding Energize Eastside. We certainly will be following up on some of those comments made for the 2017 IRP. So we will be doing that as well.

So CENSE is well-positioned to provide useful and appropriate information to address the question of prudency as in these hearings. And I think the Commission and the public would benefit by our engagement in these proceedings.

So I have nothing further.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. So I will turn to some other organizations now for their responses. I turn first to PSE and

Mr. Steele.

MS. BALDWIN: I'm so sorry to interject
here, Judge Howard. This is Vicki Baldwin on behalf of
Walmart. I have another hearing in another jurisdiction

that is starting in two minutes.

We timely filed our intervention, and there

were no objections this morning. We understand there are two proposed schedules circulating. We've seen both

permitting issues.

So even in the reply, the belated reply following Friday, they have already demonstrated that they're broadening the issues in this case and referencing permitting issues, and I think that should be a real concern of the Commission.

Page 27

I wanted to turn briefly to the points we made in our response brief and just highlight a few additional concerns and comments.

First, as we noted previously, CENSE does not meet the substantial interest standard for intervention. As residential and small business customers, their interests are already represented by Public Counsel by statute. Their interest as customers are no different than any other residential or small business customer.

All customers are impacted by rate changes, and thousands of customers could be impacted by one of PSE's many ongoing construction projects going on across its service territory. While CENSE members may feel strongly about this project, their interests are no different from other customers.

The Commission recently confirmed that Public Counsel adequately represents the interests of residential and small business customers in its 2019 order in Dockets UE-190334, UG-190335, where it denied

Page 26

of them, and we can make either of them work. So we don't have a preference for either one.

And I was just hoping that I could be excused for the rest of prehearing conference so I could attend this other hearing.

JUDGE HOWARD: That's fair. I was intending to grant Walmart's petition. You may consider it granted, and you will see that in the prehearing conference order.

MS. BALDWIN: Thank you so much.

JUDGE HOWARD: And you may be -- yeah, you don't have to attend the rest of this.

MS. BALDWIN: Okay. Thank you very much, and I'm very sorry about that.

JUDGE HOWARD: No, it's perfectly fine. Thank you.

All right. So, Mr. Steele, would you like to respond?

MR. STEELE: Yes, thank you, your Honor.

I first wanted to briefly address

Mr. Aramburu's comment a minute ago where he represented that CENSE did not intend to broaden the issues in this

case, and I think that the reply brief really calls it

24 into question. The reply brief expressly talks about

permitting issues, and since -- his concern is about

Page 28

on interlocutory review a petition for intervention by
an organization remarkably similar to CENSE. In sum,
CENSE does not have a substantial interest in this
proceeding that is not already adequately represented by
the other parties.

Secondly, nor would CENSE's intervention benefit the public interest. CENSE was formed in 2014 by a group of property owners in the Newcastle area. They formed CENSE for the express purpose of opposing Energize Eastside. Since that time, CENSE has unsuccessfully challenged the project in nearly every possible legal forum including FERC proceedings, land use proceedings before King County Superior Court, and conditional use permit proceedings.

In those cases, CENSE frequently relies on recycled arguments and theories that have been rejected by virtually every forum and called into question the reliability of their so-called experts.

For example, from a recent order from the City of Bellevue Hearing Examiner regarding CENSE's challenge to PSE's conditional use permit -- which we attached portions to our motion to strike -- found that arguments in evidence presented by Mr. Robert Nicola, who since referenced in his petition, quote, failed to account for several considerations required by industry practice in

Page 29

applicable federal electrical system planning mandates which would lead to, quote, erroneous results.

The Examiner also rejected arguments made by Mr. Lockhart -- who since also referenced and may participate in this case -- which he had previously made to FERC, which FERC also rejected.

Since his arguments and so-called experts have been repeatedly discredited, it's found again by the Bellevue Hearing Examiner, who said, quote, CENSE's representatives voiced concerns, but did not offer sufficient, relevant, authoritative, or credible evidence. PSE firmly established that several key aspects of opposition reports, like CENSE's, were defective and simply not credible because they failed to follow industry practice, close quote.

Having now been involved in numerous proceedings and seeing firsthand CENSE's constant audience shopping, PSE is justifiably concerned that CENSE intends to use this case as yet another forum to advance its positions and push discredited theories and opinions from individuals that are not actual experts. It is not in the public interest to provide CENSE yet another forum to litigate Energize Eastside, but would abuse the general rate case process.

Moreover, there's really a question as to

construction before a prudency determination reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of ratemaking, and it's just wrong. Prudency determinations are typically made after a project or portions of a project are completed, not before.

Page 31

CENSE seems to be looking at the Commission for permitting denials to stop the project, rather than recognizing the Commission's role for determining appropriate cost recovery. CENSE has had ample opportunities to address its concerns from a permitting standpoint and can continue to pursue those interests in different forums.

In its reply, CENSE also misrepresents facts about permitting, suggesting PSE has not obtained permits, when in actuality, PSE has obtained dozens of permits for the project. CENSE also misrepresented facts about the need for the project quoting information about winter peak need, but failed to mention that PSE has already suppressed summer peak need.

CENSE also questions in its reply without evidence that Public Counsel does not have the resources to adequately address Energize Eastside prudence, and then states that it, on the other hand, has the resources to comprehensively address the prudency questions.

Page 30

whether CENSE's interests benefit the public at all. CENSE is primarily comprised of private homeowners who are firmly entrenched and fundamentally opposed to the project and would not be providing an objective analysis as Public Counsel or Commission staff would. CENSE members simply don't want their private interest to be affected by the project. In other words, CENSE is advancing private, not objectively public, interest which does not meet the public interest standard.

Third, RCW 34.05.443 allows intervention only if, quote, the intervention sought is in the interest of justice. It will not impair the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding. Not only would CENSE disrupt the proceeding by using it as a collateral forum to relitigate past issues, but CENSE's reply brief demonstrates that CENSE already has not met that standard.

First, CENSE failed to follow the Commission's procedural rules, filing a reply when no reply is authorized. Second, CENSE's reply demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of the Commission's role in large projects such as this, and also demonstrates that it is willing to play fast and loose with the facts.

For example, CENSE's suggestion in its reply that PSE is improperly proceeding with Energize Eastside

Page 32

But in that same sentence included a footnote stating that CENSE may require additional funding to fully present the issues it intends to pursue in the case.

Which is it? Notably, Public Counsel regularly addresses the prudency of major projects in general rate cases.

Lastly, Your Honor, there is already a process in place for customers to participate in rate cases. As the Commission stated in the docket I previously quoted, which is an Avista order, the written and oral comment process, quote, provide individual customers or groups of customers like CENSE ample opportunity to share their concerns and general rate proceedings.

As CENSE points out, it has in the past participated in Commission proceedings by providing comments. Like all residential and small business customers, if CENSE members wish to participate in this proceeding, they're free to provide both written and oral comment. They're also free to coordinate with Public Counsel.

Finally, while as I note today, PSE strongly opposes CENSE's intervention. If the Commission decides otherwise, PSE submits that CENSE's participation should be limited as follows: First, it should be narrowly

Page 33

tailored to only address the prudency issues surrounding Energize Eastside at issue in this case. CENSE should not be permitted to use prior arguments, opinions, or theories that have already been rejected, dismissed, or discredited in other forums. And for efficiency, it should be required to coordinate with Public Counsel so as to avoid duplicating efforts in this case.

And, Your Honor, I'm happy to answer any follow-up questions you might have about those points.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Steele.

Mr. Coleman, I believe you said that AWEC joined in this objection. Would you like to comment?

MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I wouldn't have much more to say other than what the Company said. I guess I would just reiterate two specific points.

One, we are of the opinion that Public Counsel certainly has the strength and competency to represent the residential and small commercial interests of the members of CENSE.

And two, with respect to the scope of the hearing, you know, just in the discussion today, I guess a concern has been highlighted for us and for me individually of the nuance between -- and I recognize it as a nuanced distinction, but I think it exists -- between the questioning of the need of the project and

representations about Public Counsel's resources and potential focus. Energize Eastside is among the issues Public Counsel will address in our evaluation of this case. I'm not implying that we would have the same focus or conclusion, but I do want the record to be clear that Public Counsel has not discussed our strategy or witness lineup with CENSE or any other party.

Page 35

CENSE's interest as residential and small commercial customers are within those that Public Counsel represents before the Commission. Public Counsel does not represent individuals or specific groups of individuals, but customers as a whole. Public Counsel does not oppose the request by CENSE to intervene.

If the Commission determines that their participation is valuable, we have no objection. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Would CENSE like to offer a brief response to any of those comments from the other parties?

MR. ARAMBURU: Yes, I would.

There was an initial objection by counsel for PSE that we weren't going to get into permitting issues, but then he promptly launches onto citations from permitting proceedings and other such matters, and urges

Page 34

the prudency of the costs that are being asked to be recovered. I think that there is a distinction between those two issues, and one I think is certainly within the scope and one is not.

And just the discussion today I think has shone some light on our concern with respect to whether or not the issue of the need versus the prudency of the cost really is the proper issue to be discussed before the Commission.

And with that, I have nothing further to add. I appreciate your time.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.

Would Public Counsel like to comment on this particular petition?

MS. GAFKEN: Yes, thank you, Judge Howard.

This is the first time that Puget has sought a prudence determination and cost recovery for the Energize Eastside transmission project. So the issue is now ripe for participation by those interested in the project.

The question for the Commission is whether CENSE meets the requirements for intervention and whether, in the Commission's view, CENSE's participation would be valuable.

CENSE does make some unsubstantiated

Page 36

the Commission to not allow questions that have been previously decided in permitting proceedings.

As you probably know, Mr. Examiner, permitting proceedings are land use proceedings. They have wholly different sets of criteria than the Commission does. The application for inclusion of the Energize Eastside project into the transmission base is a large one of a large component. There are no other identified parties in these proceedings other than Public Counsel and perhaps Staff counsel that are prepared to address these particularly in the detail that CENSE is prepared to discuss.

We will be addressing the issues that are before the Commission regarding prudency. We represent a large number of persons on the Eastside, and they may have land use interest and environmental interest in this project. It does not exclude them from coming before the Commission to make objections and provide testimony and exhibits that relate to the rate issues.

All of the CENSE members are ratepayers and will have to pay the rates if the Energize Eastside is included in the rate base. So there aren't other people prepared to address this very important and substantive issue in the manner that CENSE is. We stand alone in that regard.

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 37

I apologize to Public Counsel that I may have overstated the situation, but I think we have the resources to proceed to address the prudency and public interest issues, and so the petition for intervention should be granted.

Thank you, Mr. Examiner, unless you have further questions.

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

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE HOWARD: Well, one question I would have would be, what is your response to PSE's in-the-alternative recommendation that CENSE coordinates the presentation of its case with Public Counsel?

MR. ARAMBURU: Well, we don't have any objection to that at all. And we don't know, at these early stages of proceedings, just how much resources Public Counsel intends to put into the Energize Eastside project as opposed to the multiple other issues and the multiple other matters that are being raised by various parties.

I will note that you've granted interventions to other parties with minimal indication of what the public interest they represent is. And I think we are being much more defined about our interest and the matters that we intend to address and particularly the disclosure of our witnesses.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.

relatively broad instruction, would Public Counsel think that's workable?

Page 39

MS. GAFKEN: I think so. If it's the sort of condition that we've seen in prior cases, that's fine. That has been workable. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.

7 MR. STEELE: Your Honor, if I may just very 8

briefly.

JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.

MR. STEELE: I think this discussion highlights sort of why the Commission has a process for customers and groups of customers that want to comment in a rate case -- to do it through the written and oral comment process. They have many opportunities to submit reports if they want. They can provide information to Public Counsel.

But that's why there's that separation between Public Counsel's role to represent their interest, and then if other customers or groups have comments to add to that, they can certainly do that through the mechanisms the Commission has provided, and CENSE has used in the past, and parties like CENSE have used in the past.

So I think that's why it's coordinated like that. And obviously they can certainly provide

Page 38

I think I have enough information to come to a decision on this particular petition. This is just my brief verbal ruling that will be explained in more detail in the prehearing conference order.

MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, may I intervene for just a moment.

I wanted to address the idea of coordinating with Public Counsel, and I wanted to ensure that that wasn't an additional requirement beyond what we normally do, right? So we often communicate with parties in a proceeding that have similar interests or are addressing similar issues, but I don't know that we necessarily plan our case out based on what other parties are doing.

So I just wanted to ensure that there wasn't an additional restriction there that was being contemplated.

JUDGE HOWARD: Well, it is a condition that the Commission has used in the past in some of these cases with multiple petitions for intervention. And frankly, it's not the most precise condition. I mean -but it does get to the idea of -- to some degree coordinating the presentation of evidence. I mean, that does involve careful judgment calls of the parties about when they want to do that.

I mean, considering the fact that it's a

Page 40

2 Company does have real concern about duplication here 3 and efficiency in the proceeding and what support -- you

know, an order where they're allowed to provide their

information to Public Counsel as well. But I think the

written and oral comments, but let Public Counsel address the issues in the case as a party.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your comments.

I do think I have enough information and argument at this point to issue my brief verbal ruling that I'll explain more in the order.

So I will be granting CENSE's petition for intervention subject to conditions on that organization's participation in the case. I will also grant PSE's motion to strike CENSE's reply. So as I explain -- we'll explain more in the prehearing conference order.

CENSE's participation will be limited to the transmission issues, specifically the Energize Eastside project. If CENSE, later in the case, wishes to address other issues, it can raise that in the form of a motion to amend the prehearing conference order or something along those lines and seek leave. CENSE will also be instructed to coordinate the presentation of its case with Public Counsel.

I also want to give CENSE and all the other

Page 41

parties a clear heads-up that the Commission is focused on the prudency of these investments. This is a specific legal issue. The Commission is not a permitting agency, a citing agency, or a safety regulator in this context.

Furthermore, CENSE and the other parties must be sure to adhere to any Commission deadlines and rules. I hope that my ruling on the motion to strike gives an example of some -- in a sense, the astringency that we're looking for in following these rules to make this proceeding workable for all the parties and stakeholders.

This is not a regular civil trial that can be extended indefinitely. The Commission has statutory authority to suspend the operation of a tariff for a certain number of months. So a discovery or a dispute should be brought to me as a presiding ALJ and resolved.

But it should be clear to all the parties that we are on a specific schedule that cannot be extended indefinitely. Contentious behavior or disregard of Commission rules may lead to the Commission dismissing an intervenor from the case.

So that would address CENSE's petition for intervention granted subject to conditions.

So I'd like to move next to the Puyallup Tribe.

So we will make a full evaluation. It would be irresponsible of me to say we have an answer one way or another because that's very new to us. So we will evaluate that and get back to the Commission as soon as possible if that is appropriate.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Well, I would ask a follow-up, then.

The Clean Energy Transformation Act -- the definition of a highly impacted community in the Act does incorporate the definition of Indian country found in Federal Law 18 USC 1151.

Does the Puyallup Tribe fall within that definition and the sum of its land?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes, absolutely, they do. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. So I think what I might do is -- I might just offer you the opportunity to respond in the way you see fit to PSE's objections to the petition to intervene, and then I may have some follow-up questions.

But why don't you go ahead and respond if you like.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay, thank you.
I'll start with basically whether or not the
Tribe has either substantial interest or their
participation would be in the public's interest in this

Page 42

And I'd like to follow roughly the same order, although I believe that AWEC does not join in this particular objection. I want to ask a couple of questions first of Puyallup Tribe's counsel, give Puyallup Tribe's counsel an opportunity to respond generally to the objections, and then we will turn to PSE and ask for input from Public Counsel.

So I do have a couple of questions for Puyallup Tribe. So as Puyallup Tribe's attorneys may be aware, we have a recently enacted statute that sets up a new intervenor funding program before the Commission, and this prioritizes vulnerable and highly impacted communities. And the statute doesn't apply in these terms, but they are defined in the Clean Energy Transformation Act.

Are you aware of the definitions of these terms? And would you submit that the Puyallup Tribe falls under one of these categories or both?

MS. ANDERSON: We are aware that there is a funding mechanism available. We have not done a full analysis as to whether or not it applies to the tribe. We would seek to do that as soon as possible. But I would say in some instances, our intervention isn't necessarily hinging on the availability of those types of funds because of the issues that are involved.

Page 44

Page 43

proceeding. And I would submit that both situations exist on behalf of the Tribe.

First, the Tribe has a substantial interest, and I will say that is not going to be adequately represented, with all due respect to Ms. Gafken, by Public Counsel because the Puyallup Tribe is itself a sovereign nation. We are not a member of the Washington public. We are not a small commercial business or residential customer. We are a sovereign nation somewhat akin to maybe the group of federal agencies that have also filed a petition to intervene.

And we have interest in this case because as a sovereign nation, we are a ratepayer to Puget Sound Energy, but we also have citizens and members who pay rates -- who pay utility bills to Puget Sound Energy, some of whom from time to time also utilize our government's assistance programs to pay for those if they're in dire financial need.

So we are a ratepayer. We have citizens who are ratepayers who are not represented by the general public interest. And we provide assistance to our member citizens as a service provider for financial hardship.

So in that regard, we have a substantial interest in how the rates will be impacted in

Page 45

particular, and we are limiting our participation to the Tacoma LNG project and its prudency in being included in the rate base.

2.4

PSE has raised objections, of course, as to our appeals of environmental permitting in the past. Yes, those have occurred. We are fully aware that this proceeding is only limited to whether or not the Tacoma LNG project is being appropriately factored into the rate base for natural gas customers.

And to that degree, we hold a significant amount of information because we have been evaluating this project through every step of its development, from the earliest permits and environmental reviews, all the way up to its most recent permits. And we have been doing this for admittedly seven years.

During that process, however, we have a very deep understanding as to how the project has evolved from one that was deemed to be a substantial peak shaving facility to one now to meet its environmental permitting requirements, which admittedly are not at issue here, but play a role as to how much of that facility will actually go to peak shaving now that it is through several rounds of different environmental permits.

And that facility design has changed. Its

proceedings and what the scope of these proceedings are. We are not looking to relitigate any environmental permitting dispute. At this time, we are simply looking at how this facility -- and whether or not it's prudent to include it in the rate base and to what degree.

They also have made allegations that we would broaden the scope of this proceeding. We are not looking to do that outside of the prudency determination. We do not anticipate a heavy amount of discovery, if any discovery.

PSE has raised a question as to whether or not we have abused discovery in the past. Should that be relevant to your decision today, I would be happy to go through the disputes that we have had and discuss the orders that have come down, actually in the Tribe's favor, just to allow that discovery to occur because every step of the way we have encountered fights regarding discovery.

But I'm not sure that that's relevant here, only because we really don't anticipate a heavy amount of discovery. If there were a discovery dispute as to scope, I would assume that that issue could be solved expeditiously by yourself as part of the ALJ process. But I don't really anticipate that to be the case.

And I think -- you know, I also -- with regard

Page 46

capacity allocations have changed from peak shaving to marine shipping and terminal fuels and other sources of fuels, that when we look at how it might be included in the natural gas rate base, it is going to differ from what was originally proposed for this project significantly.

So our interest is how much of that rate should -- is appropriate to go to the ratepayers for the actual services that that facility will provide to the ratepayers, and whether the expenses in constructing that were prudent in order to be included in that rate base. Though we have that substantial interest individually, but because of the depth of our knowledge, we also believe it's in the public interest to allow us to present the evidence as we have seen it evolve from 2015, 2016 until today with regard to the prudency of that facility.

So that goes to the two prongs of interest that PSE was objecting, that we, one, did not have a substantial interest as an entity, but also that we weren't in the public interest. And we believe that they are wrong.

Puget Sound Energy has also made some other allegations in its reply, and I want to just be clear that, again, the Tribe is fully aware of these

Page 48

Page 47

to confidentiality, they have made allegations that we would use information obtained in this proceeding to go back and address things outside of this proceeding, and they seek to limit our ability on any sort of information that is obtained.

We understand, and we've participated in one other type of a proceeding where we've had to sign confidentiality agreements in WUTC proceedings. We understand that process. We are ethical attorneys who will live by the confidentiality agreements that we sign.

To the extent that any nonconfidential information is in this proceeding, that is public information. To limit the Tribe and to treat the Tribe differently than any other party to this proceeding just seems unnecessary, and we would ask that we not be given special treatment to limit our use of information that would be generally available to the public anyway because it's not confidential.

But I want to assure you that we understand the confidential nature of the proceedings to the extent that things are under the confidentiality of order, and we fully intend to abide by that as attorneys.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And just a brief follow-up question.

Page 49

In your comments today, you referred to the Tribe limiting its participation to the Tacoma LNG plant. Does the tribe also want to address low-income issues because those were briefly referred to in your petition?

MS. ANDERSON: To the degree that it's part of the Tacoma LNG rate base and issues, that would be the extent. We really aren't used to proceeding in these proceedings in a more broader spectrum. If other issues were to come up -- I think in the last -- also consideration, the last petition -- if something became evident that was heavily impacting tribal members, as attorneys inside the Tribe's law office, we would need to raise that with the Tribal Council.

But I would expect that and hope that maybe we could be given the same leave to seek to amend a prehearing order if you were going to limit us here to the scope of the participation of the Tacoma LNG.

I just don't want to commit -- as their attorney, it's my obligation to bring an issue -- if I were to see it -- that might impact tribal members so heavily that I should bring it to them. I would need to bring it to them to address that.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. So I would look to PSE if it would like to. I, of course, have reviewed PSE's

consistent with their conduct in other cases. And so PSE would be concerned with similar behavior in using this case as, again, a collateral forum to relitigate past issues.

Page 51

So I think that would be PSE's primary concern with the Tribe's intervention. And so, like CENSE, if they were granted intervention, we would ask that they be limited to -- narrowly tailored to only address the issues not already addressed by another party. They should not be permitted to use prior arguments or opinions or theories that have already been rejected in other forums, and that they also be required to coordinate with other parties to avoid duplicating efforts amongst parties.

And so if the Commission decides to grant intervention, we would ask that those types of limitations be in place so to ensure this proceeding is not used to relitigate past issues. Thank you, your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. A brief question for you, Mr. Steele.

I did see in PSE's written objections, in part of the alternative relief requested, that there's recommendation the Commission instruct the Tribe that it cannot take information gained in this proceeding and

Page 50

written objections.

But, Mr. Steele, would you like to give any brief comments in response to what we've heard today?

MR. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor.

Just very briefly, as you noted, we covered both the interest prongs in our opposition and won't rehash them here. We do have some concerns about really how different the Tribe is from any other residential or effectively small business customer with the amount of gas and electricity that they purchase from PSE. And we do believe that those interests are already going to be represented in this case if they have concerns about those types of issues.

Our primary concern with the Tribe, and what we explain in our opposition, is just disruption of the process. And PSE's experience for several years in litigating issues surrounding LNG with the Tribe is that, for years, the Tribe has done everything it can from a litigation perspective to try and stop the project, including repeated appeals and extensive discovery, and while these actions have delayed the projects, the project has not been successful.

And so I hear counsel's representation that they don't intend to do that in this case. PSE is just concerned from past experience that that's not been

Page 52

use it for purposes outside of the current proceeding.
And I did hear Ms. Anderson's comments today
making the distinction between what's covered by the
confidentiality agreement, the protective order, and
what is not confidential. So I'm reading PSE's
recommendation as being broader and being a broader
instruction.

So are you aware of cases where the Commission has done that? Or are you aware of a provision of law that would give us that type of authority?

MR. STEELE: I think our concern there was just simply their motives for intervening in the case.

And, I agree, public information that's filed in the case, it's public. It's out there in the Commission website and anyone can download it. We understand that.

I think our concern is, again, just more focused on why are they intervening and what's their motives given sort of past experience. And, certainly, information that's confidential or sensitive should obviously not be shared outside the construct of the case.

So I think that was our only point there, is just our concern about motives and about why they're intervening.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.

Page 53

Would Public Counsel like to comment at all on this petition?

MS. GAFKEN: Yes, I would. Thank you.
One of the issues in this case is whether the
LNG project is prudent to whether it should be included
in customer rates, and the Tribe is also a customer, a
customer who has done a deep dive into this facility.

I would like to address the argument that there is no nexus between evidence regarding the LNG facility and the Tribe's status as a customer and its members who qualify for need-based assistance. Rates must be fair, just, and reasonable, and to meet the standard, the LNG facility must be prudent to be included in rate.

The Tribe has a vested interest as a customer and in ensuring that need-based members not draw increased assistance due to inclusion of a plant that may not be prudent, and that is ultimately the issue in this case. Prudency has not been determined yet.

Because of the Tribe's interest in the LNG facility, it has relevant information. The point is not to relitigate the issues that have been litigated, but to ensure the Commission has a full view of the facts as they impact the prudence question.

I also want to address the argument regarding whether the Tribe represents an interest that is not

Subsection 23 and RCW 80.28.430.

This general rate case represents the first time that Puget has sought a prudence determination and cost recovery for the complete LNG facility, though the issue has never been ripe for the Tribe's participation. I do acknowledge that one small portion having to do with a pipe was prevented in a prior case related to --well, it was a prior general rate case. The pipe was related to LNG. But this is the first time we're looking at full prudence for the facility.

Page 55

Tribal members have participated in numerous public comment hearings to date to address LNG, so not only does the Tribe have a long-standing interest in the facility, they also possess the unique voice that is lacking among the other parties.

The Commission now has the opportunity to hear from the Tribe, not only through public comment hearings, but directly as a party. Public Counsel believes that the Tribe will present relevant information to the Commission regarding the LNG facility and that it has a substantial interest in the case.

Thus, Public Counsel supports the Puyallup Tribe's request for intervention. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I think I have enough information to give my

Page 54

already represented. Public Counsel represents Puget's residential and small business customers. We are a statutory party to these proceedings. As I mentioned earlier, we do not represent individuals or specific groups of individuals, but customers as a whole. Our representation would include, I believe, tribal members who are also Puget customers.

Even so, even though we don't represent specific individuals or groups of individuals, certain interests do sometimes play more prominently in our advocacy. Low income is a prime example of that. While we are not a low-income advocate specifically, we do engage in low-income issues. It's a very important space, and one that we have a lot to contribute to.

But despite that, the Commission has long recognized, and appropriately so, that dedicated low-income advocates like The Energy Project are valuable participants in this proceeding. Here, the Tribe presents a unique voice among ratepayers that is valuable. The Tribe is exactly the type of new participant that the recently approved participant funding is designed to draw into Commission proceeding.

Under CETA and the new participation funding statute, the Tribe fall squarely within the definition of a highly impacted community, see RCW 19.405.020

Page 56

brief verbal ruling, and I will give this in more detail
in the prehearing conference order.

So I will grant Puyallup Tribe's petition for intervention subject to conditions. As I'll explain more in the prehearing conference order, the Tribe's participation will be limited to the Tacoma LNG or Liquid Natural Gas plant and low-income issues. The Tribe will coordinate with The Energy Project on the presentation of its case with regards to low-income issues specifically. The Tribe's discovery will be limited to these same two issues.

The Tribe will be bound by the protective order, Order 02 in this docket. If the Tribe wishes to expand the number of issues, it is addressing this proceeding and may petition to amend this prehearing conference order that I will be issuing.

The Tribe and all the other parties and intervenors must bear in mind that the Commission is, again, not a permitting agency and not charged with regulating safety in this particular context. We are only focused on the prudency of the Tacoma LNG expenses, and a portion of that should be allocated to ratepayers.

I would also echo what I said earlier when ruling on CENSE's petition. This proceeding is on a very specific schedule. We have limited statutory

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

Page 57

authority to have a calendar for this proceeding and extend the effective date of tariffs.

And I am also extremely mindful of the fact that we have a large number of parties in this proceeding. So failure to follow Commission rules or unreasonable behavior on the part of any intervenor may result in that intervenor being dismissed from the case.

All right. So we have addressed the disputed petitions to intervene. I'd like to just check in with -- on a couple of the other issues that were raised earlier in this call. Before I do that, I want to check in with the attorneys for King County.

So I am aware of King County's comments in PSE's power costs only rate case docket regarding the calculation of the Green Direct Energy Credit. I'm curious, does the County intend to address any other issues than the Green Direct Program?

MR. MAYER: Thank you, Your Honor.

No, the County plans to limit its intervention solely to the Green Direct, and in particular, the Green Direct Energy Charge Credit.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.

One thing that we've included in prior prehearing conference orders in these cases would be having the parties identify the topic of discovery

be in support of that.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.

And the next issue we would have would be --Mr. Steele, I believe you raised a concern about the scope of Sierra Club's participation.

Page 59

MR. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead.

MR. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor.

As I noted just briefly, previously, PSE does not opposite Sierra Club's intervention but is concerned based on Sierra Club's petition that Sierra Club may intend to expand the scope of this case, in which case Sierra Club's intervention -- I just want to highlight a few portions of their petition that concern the company.

Firstly, in its petition, Sierra Club notes that it is, quote, an environmental and conservation organization dedicated to the protection of public health and the environment, but it appears to seek to address issues that are beyond that.

And, for example, in paragraph six, Sierra Club states that, quote, Sierra Club seeks to intervene in this proceeding to test PSE's three-year rate plans, which would significantly increase both electric and gas base rates for all customers. Sierra Club will evaluate whether such large increases are in the best interest of

Page 58

request at the top of them so it helps parties identify what's relevant to them.

Would you support that requirement? MR. MAYER: Yes, Your Honor.

You mean in the sense of saying that the County's sole interest in this proceeding is the Green Direct Energy Charge as well as the discovery would be limited to that?

JUDGE HOWARD: I'm not necessarily -- I'm going to take the issue of whether we want to place conditions on King County's intervention under consideration. Because there aren't any objections, and you've indicated that King County is focused on the Green Direct Credit and doesn't have any intentions to expand beyond that, I may not want to go into the issue of placing any conditions on the County at this time.

But I am trying to think of -- in King County's comments in that earlier docket, there was a concern about needing to intervene and the unfamiliarity with these proceedings when the County was really focused with this one particular issue. So I was wondering -- that's why I was wondering if the County would support that sort of requirement for data request just to make it easier for parties to identify.

MR. MAYER: Yes, Your Honor, the County will

Page 60

ratepayers and whether more reliable, cost-effective,and equitable alternatives are available to PSE.

Based on our reading of their petition, they have not provided any basis nor do they have the expertise to address such a broad issue, ratemaking generally, and there are other parties -- many other parties that are already addressing and playing that role in the case.

Secondly, Sierra Club also appears to broaden the issues in the case. They state that, quote, they'll evaluate PSE's compliance with Washington's Clean Energy and Transformation Act and Senate Bill 5295 because continued gas expansion runs a real risk of PSE not meeting Washington's ambitious climate goals and stranding its customers without loaded carbon-intensive resources. That's also in paragraph six.

Sierra Club appears to be conflating a few issues there. Neither of these laws are relevant to the discussion of gas expansion or gas infrastructure. CETA specifically applies only to electric generation and the sources of that electricity. CETA is silent on the use of natural gas for purposes other than electric generation.

And so PSE is concerned that Sierra Club intends to use this proceeding to address policy issues

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

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

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

20

23

24

25

on?

Page 61

tied to gas infrastructure generally, and PSE would be concerned about that expansion.

In paragraph seven of their petition, they also talk about wanting to advance various campaigns and initiatives that they believe promote Sierra Club's interests, and we would just emphasize that this proceeding is not an open platform for Sierra Club to advance issues that are beyond those issues that are before the Commission in this case.

In past interventions in PSE cases, Sierra Club's role and scope has been limited to issues specifically involving the environment and issues that are actually before the Commission in the case. And we believe that Sierra Club's intervention should be similarly limited, and PSE respectfully requests that the Commission do so.

We would also request that Sierra Club work with other organizations to avoid duplication of efforts. Specifically, there appears to be overlapping interests between the Northwest Energy Coalition and Sierra Club with respect to environmental and conservation issues, and we'd ask that those organizations in particular be required to coordinate their reference to avoid duplication. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Would Sierra Club like to

JUDGE HOWARD: What are your thoughts on Mr. Steele's recommendation that Sierra Club coordinate with NWEC?

Page 63

Page 64

MS. SMITH: We'd have to check with NWEC. I think we'd be amiable to that. We have had conversations with them. We've worked well numerous times in the past.

You know, again, because these papers were just filed at the end of the January, it's hard to get through all the testimony. But I think I've been pretty clear about what we're interested in. But I'd hate to see our involvement limited at this time given our track record of being on point in the past and participating beneficially to all parties in other rate cases.

So I'm happy to hear what NWEC has to say about that.

JUDGE HOWARD: Would NWEC like to give a brief response since this conversation is bringing up your organization?

MS. PAREKH: Thank you, Your Honor.

Northwest Energy Council doesn't have concerns with coordinating with the Sierra Club on issues, and of course we wouldn't want that to limit our participation in the forum in any way. But we are happy to coordinate with the Sierra Club.

Page 62

respond?

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

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor. Sierra Club is undoubtedly an environmental organization, but we don't participate as an environmental organization in the numerous rate cases we've litigated throughout the country and even before

the UTC. We are very interested in the significant rate increases as they bear on our 25,000 members who are also Puget ratepayers.

And, you know, this is -- this rate case is moving pretty quickly so far. We just filed our interventions. I've had a short amount of time to review the applications. But we do intend to hire experts to look at the gas distribution planning and also demand forecasting.

I probably should have used the word "were" instead of "are" when I said we are interested to see that -- whether or not there were cost-effective alternatives to the decisions PSE made at the time, and that is the way you prove prudency, right? If there were more cost-effective alternatives available to the company, that would have been in the best interest of the ratepayers. So that was bad language on my part.

And I'm just going to leave it there now, unless you have any additional questions.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.

2 Mr. Steele, I'm going to take your arguments 3 under consideration. I'm aware that both Sierra Club

4 and NWEC have appeared before the Commission on numerous

5 occasions. So I'm going to be granting their petitions 6 to intervene, but I will take your arguments into

consideration about the scope, and I will address those

in the order.

MR. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: And I just want to check in

with Mr. Pepple again -- just to continually bother Mr. Pepple during this call -- because a question

occurred to me. 14 What issues does Microsoft intend to intervene 15

16 MS. MILINOVICH: Good morning, Your Honor.

17 This is Corinne Milinovich from the law firm Davison Van

18 Cleve on behalf of Microsoft. 19

Mr. Pepple had to drop off the call, but I am more than happy to answer your question regarding

21 Microsoft's interest; is that correct? 22

JUDGE HOWARD: That's right.

What issues in the case would Microsoft intend to intervene on?

MS. MILINOVICH: So Microsoft is interested

Page 65

in PSE's request for relief, which includes a proposal for how to allocate decommissioning and remediation cost from the Colstrip generating station to Microsoft. So that cost allocation is an issue that Microsoft is specifically interested in.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Would that be your primary concern? Is that fair to say?

MS. MILINOVICH: Yes.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. All right. That's the only question I had at this time. It just occurred to me to ask that.

All right. So I believe we've heard from everyone on the petitions to intervene in the case. As I have indicated, CENSE and Puyallup Tribe's petitions are granted subject to conditions. The remaining petitions to intervene are granted to the extent that PSE has raised concerns about the scope of Sierra Club's participation in the case and whether to coordinate with NWEC. I will address that in the prehearing conference order.

So let's move on to the issue of the procedural schedule. Before our call today, I e-mailed the parties with the possible dates for the hearing. I indicated the Commission could hold the hearing over two days, preferably on September 27th and September 28th.

Page 67

Ms. Thuraisingham was able to see that. And that link will navigate to the other procedural rules as well.

And thank you for entertaining me, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah, and I agree with your comments.

And I would say further, I mean, that the scope and number of issues and the nature of this being a multi-rate plan and the first one of these types of cases under the new statute with all these intervenors, it's going to require coordination and a lot of effort from everyone involved.

MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, this is Simon ffitch. May I just be heard briefly on this point?

JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.

MR. FFITCH: I wholeheartedly agree with the general observation about the administration and the number of parties.

I do want to also just remind the Commission that another thing that we're trying to do here in the regulatory world is to open proceedings up to more participants, some of whom aren't historically very active in front of the Commission, but would like to get active on behalf of vulnerable populations particularly in highly impacted communities. And the Commission is making a real effort and initiative to try to make that

Page 66

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt, but I did have a point about the interventions. If I could raise that now before we move on, I'd appreciate it.

JUDGE HOWARD: Sure, go ahead.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you.

So I didn't -- I wasn't given an opportunity to say anything about the most recent interventions, and I did want to bring up a point. There are a lot of parties in this case, and I just want it to -- I want all of the parties to be aware of that, and the case administration in this particular case is going to be significant with the number of parties that we have.

And I want -- especially newer parties, for example, Front and Centered, to be aware that there are -- that the Commission has procedural rules. And they may be engaging an attorney, but especially if they aren't, I just want them to be aware that there are procedural rules, and we all need to follow them or the case administration in this case is going to get very unwieldy.

And I just wanted to bring up that point and make sure that, especially the new intervenors, are aware of the rules. And I did put a link to the intervention rule in the chat, and I hope that

Page 68

pathway more accessible to people.

So, you know, that can apply to some parties in this docket as well, and that's part of the picture as well. I just wanted to add that to the discussion. Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.

So I'm talking about the issue of the procedural schedule. I mentioned that I proposed some hearing dates, and I believe Ms. Baldwin earlier referred to there being some proposed schedules circulating.

So let's start discussing that. And would PSE or Staff or would another party like to say where the parties are at in these positions?

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, this is Jennifer Cameron-Rulkowski for Commission Staff, and I'd be happy to describe where we're at.

So Staff has prepared a schedule, and I'm happy to share that with you, and so has PSE. And we have -- I would say we're pretty close on a number of the dates, and the primary difference that we have is at the end of the case. And I can go ahead with my remarks on that now, but I think it might be helpful for you to have both schedules in front of you before we provide those remarks.

Page 69

And I have a proposal, which is that both Ms. Carson and I e-mail you our schedules. And the parties, except for the newest intervenors or potential intervenors, have seen those schedules in large part. I'll clean mine up a little bit. And then I would just propose we e-mail those, and perhaps we could take a very short break.

JUDGE HOWARD: I think that's a good idea. Yeah, if you could e-mail those to me. I think it would be a good time to take a break as well.

And I'll just let everyone know that one thing I've been considering for the schedule in this case -- I mean, there's a number of moving pieces -- but I am considering the idea of setting -- putting a couple of dates in the schedule for discovery conferences if they are needed, just because we have so many parties and things that we need to coordinate, and we do have a history of contentiousness around some of these issues.

So I think if we have these dates for discovery conferences, if disputes arise, that that could be helpful. So why don't you please send those to me.

Let's take a break.

MS. CARSON: Your Honor, may I speak just for a moment on behalf of the Company?

JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.

Page 71

JUDGE HOWARD: Thanks. So -MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I'll reserve argument until after the break.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. We're about to take a break, but I do want to get both of your thoughts.

Are you sort of at an impasse right now? Or would it be helpful to take a longer break so the parties can discuss this with me off of the call? Or are we just at the point where we have two competing schedules and we need to just resolve it?

Staff, you may go first.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Sorry, Your Honor. I was having trouble with clicking. There we go.

I think we're at an impasse. I think we need a decision on what the Commission would like to do.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.

Ms. Carson, would you agree with that?
MS. CARSON: I think that's probably true.
We have tried. There's been a lot of back-and-forth on this, and I think those two issues are very critical to PSE. So I think we're at an impasse.

With the exception -- you know, if there's a way to have the later hearing date with the reply brief, you know, we could do that. But that, you know, starts impinging on the Commission's time for deliberation.

Page 70

MS. CARSON: I agree with

Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski that, really, our schedules are not that far apart in most respects. She highlighted one difference, and I want to highlight one other difference that's very important to PSE.

The end of the case, as you'll see, we -- PSE accepted the first dates that you offered in September. Staff accepted the October dates. Staff does not allow for a reply brief, which is -- reply briefs are critical to PSE, and we have always, in past GRCs, had reply briefs, so that's very important. So I would consider that one difference.

The second difference is the amount of time between response testimony and rebuttal testimony. Staff's is shorter. It's five weeks, which we think is unacceptable. We've followed closely the 2019 GRC schedule and other recent schedules, and we have six weeks, which we think is just a bare minimum because there's also a settlement conference in there that will pull away time and resources from preparing rebuttal testimony.

So those are our two major concerns, is the time between response and rebuttal testimony, and the hearing date being pushed back late by Staff so that there is not reply brief opportunity. Thank you.

Page 72

JUDGE HOWARD: Well, is Staff unable to work with the -- let me see.

So Staff is going with the later of the two hearing dates I suggested? Is Staff unable to make September 27th and 28th work? Or is it because of other factors in your schedule?

Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski?

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Sorry, Your Honor. I was trying to send the schedule. I haven't done it yet.

So there are a number of things in play here.
So I guess we're having the discussion now. So what is going on right now is we have something that I have never experienced at the Commission, and I've been here -- I've been with the UTC division for many years at this point.

We have filings from two major utilities that are ten days apart. And we have cases that are basically two major general rate cases that are running in parallel track. And we also have to work around some times when Staff is going to be out, and that means -- and since the dates around July 4th are very difficult for us, and we need a little more space moving forward.

And so Ms. Carson has talked about the compression of the time between the response testimony

Page 73

and the rebuttal, but that's what's going on there. We have people out, and we have major decision-makers on the case out. And we can't simply turn around and then file testimony right after that. So that's one issue.

But back to the main issue. We have these two cases in parallel. And this is -- this means that it's all of the same attorneys who are working on both cases, and in many cases, it's some of the same decision-makers or regulatory services staff. And then also there's other stakeholders, and I don't want to leave out the policy staff and the decision-makers as well. This is a real challenge.

And the way that the Company's schedule has arranged things at the end is that we would have -- and I have some of the Avista dates courtesy of Public Counsel in the staff draft schedule. The way that this would work is that we have a hearing in the Avista general rate case. Then, we have, the following week, a hearing in the PSE general rate case. This is PSE's schedule. And then we're briefing both at once. We need a little bit of time in between those.

I will note that PSE's schedule -- I don't think it has the full six weeks that you asked for in your e-mail between rebuttal and the hearing. We've got that in there. We've gone with the later hearing date

brief

And so I would ask the Commission to consider asking the Company to extend out that date. Otherwise, we can do without a reply brief, and PSE can do without a reply brief as well.

JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, would you like to --

MS. CARSON: Yes.

Your Honor, there's a statutory deadline suspension. PSE is not willing to waive that. And it's not something that the Commission can require the Company to do. So we are not willing to waive that.

For the past two decades in its general rate cases, PSE has had reply briefs. Also, in looking at every industrial utility except Avista in their recent general rate cases, they all have reply briefs: Cascade, Northwest Natural, PacifiCorp, and of course PSE.

I also went back and looked at the 2019 GRC order, and the Commission reply briefs are critical to the Commission sorting through these complex issues and sorting through the initial briefs and reaching fair, just, reasonable, and sufficient rates.

And the Commission cited reply briefs over 20 times on important issues like prudence of Get to Zero,

Page 74

that you suggested in October.

And the question that we have is -- this is for the Commission, too. I think the Commission -- the decision-makers are going to get quite compressed at the end. And I do want the Commission to consider -- I hope they're thinking about making these two big decisions at the same time. And if they're considering asking the Company to extend the schedule at all, I would encourage the Commission to do it now so that it benefits the stakeholders.

Extending the effective date, the rate-effective date, would be a way to easily work in a reply brief. And that's what PSE wants, is they want a reply brief. I'll point out that the Commission's procedural rules do not guarantee a reply brief. Reply briefs aren't in there. So in the Avista general rate case, there is no reply brief. I know that PSE typically has a reply brief, and it has not been an issue in the past.

Like I said, I have not experienced this, that we have major rate cases so close together. And this is within the control of the utilities. And we, as the stakeholders, are simply -- we have to simply react. But it is within the Company's ability to extend out the rate-effective date if they really want that reply

Page 76

Page 75

on prudence of the Data Center, and in the period rate base, and Colstrip decommissioning and remediation, and on and on and on. So this is obviously something that is not just important to PSE, but it's important to all parties. And it was not just PSE's reply brief, it's citing to all different parties' reply briefs on those important issues.

So we think it's critical -- if there's a way that it can be done with the hearing date pushed back, that's fine. But we do not want to forego the right for a reply brief. And we do feel that at least six weeks is needed between response and rebuttal.

I would say that I e-mailed back and forth with Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, and she expressed what her concerns were with PSE's original schedule and where it was too tight, and we stretched it out on each of those areas that she identified as being too tight and too constrained. So we have made efforts to deal with the real pressure points for Staff and other parties.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Let's hear briefly from Ms. Gafken. I see your hand is raised. And then we'll take a brief recess.

MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Judge. I didn't get my hand up quick enough. We may have been better to do this before Puget's response, so my apologies there.

Page 77

Public Counsel does agree with Staff's proposed schedule. In terms of the dates that you'll see when they're e-mailed to both of you, we can make all of them work except for the June 14th settlement date in PSE's schedule. We do have a conflict on that date, and so we would need to work with the parties to find an acceptable date for that particular event.

2.0

But we do strongly support holding the hearing in this case on October 3rd and 4th instead of September 27th and 28th. There is a real issue with two major rate cases being sandwiched on top of each other.

Avista and PSE have both presented substantial major cases that are pending before the Commission on virtually the same timeline. Public Counsel has witnesses who will appear in both proceedings. I am sure that other parties may face that issue, too. Although I have not specifically confirmed that with Counsel, but I imagine that to be the case.

Staff schedule provides the space between the events that is necessary to do a good job in both cases, and ultimately, the goal -- I think we have a shared goal among the parties -- of providing the Commission with the best record possible on which to make its decision.

Unfortunately, as we've been discussing,

decision on the schedule and the prehearing conference order and look at everything very carefully because I think that there are a lot of competing interests and valid concerns and interests on both sides of this.

So let's take a recess and go off the record and return at 11:25.

(A break was taken from 11:13 a.m. to 11:25 a.m.)

JUDGE HOWARD: It is 11:25. We're coming back after a brief recess here.

I've received Staff's proposed procedural schedule in an e-mail, and I've also received the Company's proposed schedule. I'm going to carefully evaluate both of them after our prehearing conference today and issue a decision in the prehearing conference order as I was indicating.

One question I had after looking at them just briefly was -- it did look like the Company's proposal for updating its power costs was about a month later than Staff's. I was wondering if that was -- was that a material disagreement? Or is that an incidental issue?

Ms. Carson, would you care to comment?

MS. CARSON: Well, in PSE's schedule, there
is an update of power costs at the time of rebuttal.

And then there's also the potential for a power cost

Page 78

Staff's schedule eliminates the time for a reply brief. And the issue for Public Counsel is not opposition to the idea of a reply brief. It's certainly been used, and I am very aware of Puget's preference for a reply

But the issue truly is time. With the final briefing needed by the Commission by October 31st, there simply is not time to include reply briefs without a slight extension to the suspension date, and of course only Puget has the power to extend that suspension date.

I will note that reply briefs have not been uniformly used in rate cases before the Commission, and that the pending -- you know, as I said before -- the pending Avista rate case does not have reply briefs. While Puget would like reply briefs, they are not necessary or required under the Commission's rules.

Thank you for the opportunity to address this. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.

So let's take a 15-minute recess and come back at 11 -- let's just say 11:25.

I think our plan is going to be basically to just finish some of the formalities at the end of the prehearing conference, and then I want to -- because the parties are at an impasse, I want to really consider this issue carefully over this afternoon and issue a

Page 80

Page 79

update 60 days before the rate-effective date, which I
believe that parties are willing to agree to provided
that -- as I understand it, there's a PacifiCorp,
P-Corp, that has this issue before it now. And so I
think the parties are willing to see how the Commission
deals with that in the PacifiCorp, P-Corp.

That 60-day update to power costs was actually something that staff had originally put in its schedule. PSE has updated power costs oftentimes at the compliance filing, which we're happy to do that as well. But that's something that Staff originally had in, and I know there was some concerns, and I believe the parties decided to see how it was treated in the PacifiCorp case.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski?

 $\label{eq:MS.CAMERON-RULKOWSKI:} Ms.\ CAMERON-RULKOWSKI:\ Thank\ you,\ Your\ Honor.$ 

Yes, I concur with what Ms. Carson said. I took out the 60-day update -- I took that out of my schedule because there was not agreement among the parties to that. But there was agreement to put it back in, as I understand it, depending on the decision in the P-Corp case.

The other thing that I wanted to bring to

Page 81

should keep in mind?

MR. FFITCH: I'm not -
JUDGE HOWARD: Is t

everyone's attention is that in the schedule that I sent you, I included language on the content of the power cost update, and this is something that the parties are discussing. And I had circulated that language on Friday and hadn't had an opportunity to hear back from everyone. I believe it's acceptable to PSE. We had had some preliminary conversation on it, but I did want to

JUDGE HOWARD: Is there a time of day that would be problematic? I'm not familiar with it.

MR FFITCH: As Lunderstand it Your Honor.

Page 83

bring that to your attention.

So everyone -- well, everyone with the exception of Front and Centered, I believe, and

MR. FFITCH: As I understand it, Your Honor, the most important concern is the Yom Kippur holiday, and others may be able to speak to this.

exception of Front and Centered, I believe, and
Ms. Milinovich -- has seen that language.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. It did appear that the

But I believe if the hearing ends -- the October dates proposed are October 3rd and 4th, I believe. I believe if the hearing ends at 5:00 on the 4th, there's not an issue. But if it continues on into the evening, that could be an issue. So it would have to be -- as I'm informed -- that beginning again the next day might be all right, but there might have to be a hard stop at 5:00 at the end of the October dates.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. It did appear that the scope of the update was the same between the two proposed schedules; is that right?

The first day of the hearing in September -- I think is Monday, September 26th if I'm not mistaken -- is the second day of Rosh Hashanah. And, Your Honor, I can't speak to the observance issues there.

MS. CARSON: That's correct.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Yes it is.

I just wanted to bring this to the Commission's attention without recommending a change, but other parties or witnesses may, you know, want to raise that at some point. So I want to put it on your radar.

And it's supposed to be at the rebuttal stage, and then as Ms. Carson represented, potentially at the -- well, the 60 days before the rate-effective day.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. All right.

JUDGE HOWARD: No, I appreciate that. And I was not aware of those issues, so I always like to hear

Well, like I indicated, I'll take those both under consideration. And I may respond to each of your e-mails cc-ing all of the attorneys of record just to err on the safe side of disclosing all communications I've received to all the parties of record.

Page 82

Page 84

Mr. ffitch?

2.0

them.MR. FFITCH:

MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to make a couple of points.

MR. FFITCH: Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: I should ask -- Mr. ffitch,
do you have something else?

First of all, I wanted to say for the record on behalf of The Energy Project, that we do support the Staff recommended schedule for the reasons that were, I think, well articulated by both Staff and Public Counsel and tied to the schedule congestion with the Avista case. We are a party also to the Avista case.

Okay. I'm sorry. I wasn't sure if I was cutting you off.

The second thing I wanted to just bring up for consideration -- and I don't think this necessarily requires a change to the hearing dates -- but just to ask the Commission to keep in mind that the first recommended hearing date in September falls close to the Rosh Hashanah holiday, and that the hearing date in October is very close -- I think just immediately before -- Yom Kippur.

Does any other party wish to give any comments before we move onto the remaining issues today?

MR. MAYER: Yes, Your Honor. This is Ben Mayer for King County.

So there may need to be some consideration about -- you know, as the Commission is getting closer to those certain dates -- about accommodating those two holidays if that's necessary for counsel or witnesses.

I just wanted to thank PSE and Staff for putting those together. And I think you'll notice in both, there's a Green Direct settlement conference, an early one, and I just wanted to say that the County has specific dates in that window that -- if possible, it would like to see a specific date in the order, and it has available April 11th to the 15th, April 18th, and April 20th.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I definitely want to be accommodating of people's freedom to exercise their religion.

And I just wanted to put that out there for other parties to respond if there's anything now. If not, those are the dates that the County has available for that particular settlement conference.

Would there be a specific accommodation that we

for that particular settlement conference.

JUDGE HOWARD: Could you run those dates by me, again? April 11th through the 15th?

MR. MAYER: Correct.

their use of discovery. As we've observed, this is a large case with a large number of parties on a

MR. MAYER: Yes, April 18th and April 20th.

2 large case with a large number of parties on a
3 constrained timeframe. Discovery may not be use

Any other party wish to comment before we move 4 fishing on? 5 they sh

JUDGE HOWARD: And what were the other ones?

All right. Hearing none.

2.0

So I will just touch on a few more issues, and I believe we are through the main substance of the prehearing conference already.

So I do want to touch on the new issue of intervenor funding. As you may be aware, the Commission recently improved the interim agreement for intervenor funding in Docket U-210595 with certain amendments.

I e-mailed the parties before our conference to let them know that any request for case certification and notices of intent to seek funding do not need to be filed by the time of today's prehearing conference.

These documents should instead be filed with the Commission on or before March 14th, 2022, so this would be in 14 days from today. And this will be a deadline for written submissions only.

And then following -- the terms of the interim agreement with the deadline for proposed budgets would then be 30 days later on April 13th, 2022, and I saw that both of the proposed schedules incorporated that.

large case with a large number of parties on a constrained timeframe. Discovery may not be used as a fishing expedition. If parties have discovery disputes, they should attempt to work those out in good faith. But if they cannot, they should bring any motions to the Commission for resolution.

Page 87

When I'm considering the proposed procedural schedules this afternoon, I may include a discovery conference in the schedule that I adopt, as it may reflect a specific date, or I may just have it as a to-be-determined date because that could be helpful if we need that later on.

I also want to address a few specific issues regarding discovery. One point would be having a requirement in the prehearing conference order that the parties identify each data request by subject in the cover letter in the distribution e-mail and in the data request itself, and then data requests would then be grouped by subject when they are propounded.

Does anyone have any concerns or objections to my including such a requirement?

All right. Hearing none, I will continue.

I did not see if the proposed schedules shortened the time for discovery responses. Oh, it

Page 86

Do any of the parties or intervenors or -- I know Front and Centered hasn't moved to intervene yet, but does anyone have any questions or concerns that they would like to raise now about intervenor funding?

 $\label{eq:MR.FFITCH: Your Honor, this is Simon flitch.} MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, this is Simon flitch.$ 

JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, go ahead.

MR. FFITCH: I just wanted to provide information to the Bench and to the parties about the status of the final modified agreement.

My office has in hand signatures to the agreement that's been modified according to the Commission's order that was issued last week. And we expect to file that within the next hour or so with the Commission in the docket established for consideration of intervenor funding. So that's just information for Your Honor and for the other parties.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I will be sure to check that.

Does anyone else have any questions or comments or concerns at this time for this issue?

All right. Hearing none.

I'll next move on to the issue of discovery and data requests. So on the issue of discovery generally, I want to caution the parties to speak judicious in

Page 88 looks like this is addressed in Staff's -- just give me one moment here -- I see -- and the Company's schedules.

Okay. So I will move on from that. I see that the parties have addressed that.

And, finally, I'm aware that the parties author a request that any data request and responses are shared with every other party. It will make this easier on the parties by including such a requirement in the prehearing conference order. This would be subject to a limitation that we have a couple of intervenors now who have conditions placed on their participation in the case.

So is there any objection to my including such a requirement for sharing requests and responses with the other parties in the prehearing conference order?

Mr. ffitch, do you have a concern?

MR. FFITCH: I do not have a concern. I have a belatedly raised hand with a question about an earlier matter, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead.

MR. FFITCH: But no objection to your last statement about exchanging information.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.

MR. FFITCH: I just wanted to understand what the Bench was contemplating for the discovery

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

2.0

Page 89

conferences. Would that be a time to bring disputes to the Bench? Or would it be a time for parties to discuss discovery matters informally, which we, you know, often do in any event?

2.0

But I just wondered what your thinking there was on the function of the discovery conferences.

JUDGE HOWARD: It would be -- it's not something that we do in every case as you know, but it would be an opportunity for the parties to meet with me. And if there are disputes about discovery that has been propounded already, those could be addressed in the conference and then possibly solutions worked out. And this is, you know, recognizing the number of intervenors in the case and that there have been concerns raised by PSE regarding past discovery.

I'm not saying that I'm agreeing with those on the merits I haven't evaluated that. That hasn't come up yet in this case. But I think it could be helpful to have such a meeting on the calendar to resolve disputes and to look for a path forward if there is a disagreement.

But if it's not needed by the time we come to that point in my calendar, then we don't have to have it

MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor. I

JUDGE HOWARD: And I would say that that could be an option on the table in the future if it's required.

It looks like CENSE's attorney might want to respond.

MR. ARAMBURU: I'd like to understand the nature of the discovery conference. If discovery is submitted and then there becomes an issue, we don't wait until a date, a specific date, to discuss that with counsel. It would be my understanding that if there's a dispute that comes up, it should be attempted to be resolved as in CR-37 between the parties, and I don't think we would have to wait.

I guess the question would be, if counsel got together to discuss this, would we need your participation in the conference?

JUDGE HOWARD: No, that's a good question.

And the parties should follow the normal rules of attempting to work out disputes between each other without the Commission's intervention. So the discovery conference is the fallback of if there are disputes remaining that the parties cannot work out, and they're still there, and they haven't already been addressed by ruling on a motion to compel or something of that nature, then that could be an opportunity to sit down

Page 90

appreciate the clarification.

JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson?

MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor. I don't believe we have any objection to having that kind of discovery conference on the calendar. I guess we are concerned about the amount of discovery. We sometimes in the past have seen parties, you know, just kind of blanketly send out discovery from their experts that --maybe before they've read the case -- and so they're asking questions that are already there.

So I guess I would just, you know -- ask everybody to please, you know, read first and then send your discovery so that we're not repeating things that are easy to find.

The other thing is sometimes parties don't look at what the other parties have sent, and so we get these same repetitive questions from three or four different parties.

So I guess, you know -- I know the Commission has the ability to limit discovery requests, and, you know, we're not asking for that at this time. But I guess if there's a discovery conference and we're just inundated with discovery that's repetitive, you know, we would want to reserve our right to ask for discovery to be limited at some point in time.

Page 92

Page 91

and have a brief discussion to find a solution and move forward.

It's not something the Commission does in every case. I think it could be helpful in this particular one. Hopefully that answers your guestion.

MR. ARAMBURU: Thank you for the clarification.

MS. CARSON: I would just make one other point, is that PSE has worked very closely with other parties in these proceedings. We very, very rarely get to the point where there's a motion to compel or we're at a complete impasse. So our hope would be that we can continue to work with the parties on discovery issues.

JUDGE HOWARD: Great.

Did any other party have any questions about discovery before we continue on to a few more housekeeping matters?

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I do, Your Honor. This is Jennifer Cameron-Rulkowski. Thank you.

I concur with Ms. Carson. We are generally able to resolve discovery issues among the parties. And we do have a lot of dates in the schedule already, so I'm not sure it would be helpful to set a date. These issues tend to arise organically, and if there's an

issue we can't resolve, I certainly wouldn't wait around

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

Page 93

until a discovery conference. I would be taking some

So they can be incredibly helpful, these informal gatherings, but we've managed thus far to organize them on our own among the parties. And so I know we have a lot of parties and it's hard to get dates, but because we don't really know when an issue might arise, I'm not sure how useful it is to have a date that we then have to notify the judge that we're changing or skipping.

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

sort of action.

So I guess I appreciate the concept because it can be so helpful, but I'm not sure when it would be.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Maybe that will just be something to keep in mind -- for me to keep in mind, really. And if we need it, we need it. And if we don't, then we won't include a specific day.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: And can I bring up one other issue, Your Honor?

JUDGE HOWARD: Sure.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Regarding discovery, we've had this come up a couple of cases now, and I want to get on top of it.

Under the Commission's procedural rules at WAC 480-07-405, parties are required to serve copies of data requests on other parties. So we're required to

signature page using that form page that's included with order two?

MR. ARAMBURU: We'll do so today, yes.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Thank you. It's a little, you know, detail-focused of me to bring that up, but that's my job.

So a couple more housekeeping matters. On electronic filing and electronic service, the Commission requires electronic filing of documents for formal filing. We are continuing to suspend the requirements for paper copies of filed documents in lieu of the COVID-19 pandemic, which will be memorialized in the prehearing conference order.

Also, the Commission's rules provide for electronic service of documents. The Commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically.

If any party has not yet designated a lead representative for service, please do so via e-mail to me as soon as possible. My e-mail is michael.howard@utc.law.gov.

Also, if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff, we should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding. Please e-mail

Page 94

provide all of the parties a copy of what -- the data requests that we've served on the Company or anybody else.

So I think that what we would need in the prehearing conference would be a statement that all of the parties want to receive copies of the response to the discovery.

JUDGE HOWARD: No, I believe you're correct on that. And that's what that language would be getting at. I mean, it's more concerned with the response.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: Any other questions or concerns on discovery before we move on?

All right. Hearing none.

I wanted to touch on the issue of the protective order. I will remind the parties that the Commission has already entered a protective order in this docket with provisions for the protection of highly confidential information.

I did see that on February 22nd, last week, CENSE had filed a signed page for the confidentiality agreement, but it did not use the normal signature page which is attached as an exhibit to the protective order.

Mr. Aramburu, would you mind refiling that

Page 96

Page 95

that to us as well. I saw that AWEC sent such an e-mail this morning, and so we will take a look at that.

Let me check on the issue of errata sheets. Okay. It does appear that both schedules are addressing the issue of errata sheets. It is approximately one week before the hearing.

Does anyone have any concerns with either of the schedules' way of addressing errata sheets?

MS. CARSON: PSE has no objection.

I did have a question about the electronic filing only. We were required to file five copies, paper copies, of testimony and exhibits. Is that only for testimony and exhibits? Is that for any filing with the Commission in this case?

JUDGE HOWARD: No, the paper copy requirement you're referring to -- I haven't looked this up recently, but I believe it pertains to the Company's filing of its initial testimony. And that requirement for paper copies is something that is in statute, and we don't believe that we can waive that. But we can waive the requirement for paper copies as the case goes on. That's what I'm recalling right now.

MS. CARSON: So for rebuttal testimony and response testimony, will paper copies be needed? JUDGE HOWARD: No, no .

Page 97 Page 99 MS. CARSON: Okay. Thank you. 1 1 important to include those courtesy copies to the ALJ to 2 2 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. make sure that your motion or your filing isn't lost to 3 Is there anything else that we should address 3 the ether or something like that. today before we go off the record? 4 4 Is there anything else -- any other concerns or 5 5 MS. GAFKEN: Judge Howard, I have one questions we should address before we adjourn? 6 additional thing that I believe is a housekeeping item. 6 MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, this is Brent 7 It's about timely service, and I want to clarify when 7 Coleman on the telephone for AWEC. I apologize, my 8 timely service is made so parties can establish a shared 8 computer died. 9 9 understanding and expectations. I do have just one point of clarification if 10 Under WAC 480-07-365, Subsection 2C, that 10 that's okay. requires, quote, all electronic documents submitted to 11 JUDGE HOWARD: Sure. 11 the Commission through the web portal or by e-mail on a 12 12 MR. COLEMAN: The reason -- the basis for my 13 filing date deadline must be delivered to all parties 13 clarification is, in the simultaneous matter ongoing, 14 and the presiding administrative law judge by e-mail at 14 Judge O'Connell has asked for an electronic copy -- or 15 the same time the documents are submitted to the 15 excuse me, a paper copy -- of unredacted testimony, 16 Commission or immediately thereafter, end quote. 16 which I think was a little bit -- was not consistent 17 The reason I raise this is that we often see 17 with what you just mentioned with respect to 18 materials near the end of the day. And I understand 18 electronics. 19 that receipt prior to 5:00 p.m. is technically on time, 19 So I want to make sure I understand -- if 20 however, we have also received materials after 5:00 p.m. 20 there's a differences in the two cases, I can manage For example, Puget served this rate case on 21 21 that. I just wanted to make sure I understood what you 22 Public Counsel after 5:00 p.m. on January 31st, 2022, 22 were asking or identifying. 23 even though the Record Center received the filing at 23 So is electronic submission acceptable? Or do 24 1:28 p.m. We received Puget's cover letter at 24 we still need to provide -- or does the Commission want 25 5:06 p.m., nonconfidential materials at 5:20 p.m., and 25 three paper copies for internal distribution of Page 98 Page 100 1 unredacted testimony? 1 confidential materials at 5:26 p.m. 2 2 I do have other examples of filing provided JUDGE HOWARD: You know, it's been my 3 after 5:00 p.m. if that detail is helpful. But the 3 understanding that we have been waiving paper copies for 4 reason I'm raising this issue here is that this is not 4 filings after the Company's initial testimony. But I am 5 an isolated event. Service after 5:00 p.m. is not 5 going to take a look at the Avista docket and just make 6 consistent with the requirements of simultaneously serve 6 sure that I am understanding this issue correctly and 7 or serve immediately after filing. 7 that I'm not overlooking the point. 8 So I'm going to -- that's a good question, and 8 And to that end, I would like affirmation that 9 service after 5:00 p.m. is not timely. Thank you. 9 I will have to just double-check myself and address that 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. I 10 in the prehearing conference order. MR. COLEMAN: Okay. Again, I'll do what you 11 think that is a valid concern. 11 I haven't reviewed, you know, the dates and 12 want, obviously. I just wanted to make sure that if 12 13 13 timestamps of exactly what you're referring to, but I they're different, that I put my team on notice. 14 take your general point that it should be 14 JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah, it's a fair question. 15 contemporaneous, and it shouldn't be after the filing 15 Any other concerns or questions? 16 deadline at issue. 16 All right. I will issue an order in the near 17 And I was going to address this in the 17 future containing the procedural schedule and other 18 prehearing conference order, but I would mention it now. 18 guidelines for the disposition of this case. 19 Two, is that the courtesy copy to the ALJ on the case is 19 We are adjourned. Thank you all for attending. 20 extremely helpful and important, and that should be 20 (Hearing adjourned at 11:56 a.m.) 21 contemporaneous as well. 21 22 There are times where it takes the Commission 22 23 Record Center staff a few hours to several hours 23 24 24 sometimes to process something, and there are even times

25

25

where things slip through the cracks. So it's very

,	Page 101	
	Page 101	
1	CERTIFICATE	
2		
3	STATE OF WASHINGTON	
4	COUNTY OF KING	
5		
6	I, Rose Detloff, a Certified Court Reporter in	
7	and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that	
8	the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the	
9	best of my knowledge, skill and ability.	
10	ADTCA .	
11 12		
13	inity rane Dellay	
14	ROSE DETLOFF, RPR, CCR #21036100	
15	ROSE DETEOFF, RFR, GCR #21030100	
16	My commission expires:	
17	DECEMBER 6, 2022	
18	DEGENOLIVO, 2022	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

A	49:3,23 51:8 53:8	80:2	Anderson's 52:2	appropriately 45:8
<b>a.m</b> 8:2 20:7 79:7,8	53:24 55:12 57:16	agreeing 89:16	Ann 3:4 9:17	54:16
100:20	59:19 60:5,25	agreement 52:4	ann.paisner@atg	approved 54:21
abide 48:23	64:7 65:19 78:17	80:21,22 85:12,23	3:8	approximately
ability 48:4 74:24	87:14 97:3 98:17	86:10,12 94:23	answer 22:19 33:8	96:5
90:20 101:9	99:5 100:9	agreements 48:8,10	43:2 64:20	<b>April</b> 84:17,17,18
able 67:1 83:7	addressed 14:11	ahead 43:20 59:7	answers 92:5	84:24 85:2,2,24
92:21	51:9 57:8 88:1,4	66:5 68:22 86:7	anticipate 13:16	<b>Aramburu</b> 6:20,20
absolutely 43:14	89:11 91:23	88:20	22:21 47:9,20,24	12:12,13,16 20:4
abuse 29:24	addresses 32:6	<b>akin</b> 44:10	anybody 94:2	20:14,16,24 21:6
abused 47:12	95:23	<b>Alec</b> 6:4 12:1	anyway 22:20	22:7,24 23:13,25
acceptable 77:7	addressing 23:12	alec.wrolson@pu	48:18	24:18 35:21 37:12
81:6 99:23	36:13 38:11 56:14	6:7	<b>apart</b> 70:3 72:18	91:6 92:6 94:25
accepted 70:7,8	60:7 96:4,8	<b>ALJ</b> 41:17 47:23	apologies 76:25	95:3
access 18:25	adequately 27:23	98:19 99:1	apologize 12:15	Aramburu's 26:21
accessible 68:1	28:4 31:22 44:4	allegations 46:24	16:18 19:5 37:1	aramburulaw@g
accommodating	adhere 41:7	47:6 48:1	99:7	6:23
82:20,23	adjourn 99:5	<b>Alliance</b> 3:10 9:22	<b>app</b> 13:2	area 28:8
accommodation	adjourned 100:19	allocate 65:2	apparently 21:1	areas 76:17
82:25	100:20	allocated 56:22	<b>appeals</b> 45:5 50:20	argument 16:4
account 28:24	administration	allocation 65:4	<b>appear</b> 17:19 77:15	19:21,22 20:23
accurate 20:12	66:12,20 67:16	allocations 46:1	81:12 96:4	24:13 40:9 53:8
101:8	administrative	<b>allow</b> 17:5 36:1	appearance 9:2,4	53:24 71:3
acknowledge 55:6	1:12 2:2 8:13	46:14 47:16 70:8	9:12,19,24 10:6,9	arguments 22:21
Act 23:24 42:15	97:14	allowed 40:4	10:23 11:7,14,20	28:16,22 29:3,7
43:8,9 60:12	admittedly 45:15	allows 30:10	12:8,25 14:12	33:3 51:10 64:2,6
action 93:2	45:20	alongside 11:11	appearances 8:18	arranged 73:14
actions 50:21	adopt 87:10	alternative 51:23	appeared 1:18 64:4	articulated 82:7
active 67:22,23	<b>advance</b> 29:20 61:4 61:8	alternatives 60:2	appearing 8:23 9:2	<b>asked</b> 34:1 73:23 99:14
actual 18:7 29:21	advancing 30:8	62:19,21	9:7,15,16 10:2,4 10:18,19 11:10,23	
46:9	advancing 50.8 advocacy 54:11	ambiguous 19:8 ambitious 60:14	appears 59:18 60:9	<b>asking</b> 74:7 75:3 90:10,21 99:22
actuality 31:15	advocate 54:12	amend 40:21 49:16	60:17 61:19	aspects 29:13
add 16:14 34:10	advocates 54:17	56:15	appendices 24:19	aspects 29.13 assistance 44:17,21
39:19 68:4 95:22	affirmation 98:8	amendments 85:13	applicable 29:1	53:11,16
addition 10:4 additional 27:9	afternoon 78:25	amiable 63:5	application 36:6	<b>Assistant</b> 2:10 3:4
	87:9	amount 45:11 47:9	applications 62:13	9:6,8,14,17
32:2 38:9,15	agencies 4:2 10:10	47:20 50:9 62:12	applies 42:21 60:20	assume 47:22
62:25 97:6	10:13 15:20 44:10	70:13 90:6	apply 42:13 68:2	assure 48:20
address 14:1,4,18 16:11 17:18 18:1	agency 41:4,4	ample 31:9 32:13	appreciate 17:15	astringency 41:9
25:3,10 26:20	56:19	analysis 30:4 42:21	34:11 66:4 83:24	attached 28:21
31:10,22,24 33:1	ago 23:15 26:21	<b>Anderson</b> 2:18 6:3	90:1 93:11	94:24
35:3 36:10,23	agree 16:21,25	9:1 11:22,23	appropriate 16:11	attempt 22:13 87:5
37:3,23 38:7 40:6	52:13 67:4,15	42:19 43:14,22	17:12 25:10 31:9	attempted 91:11
40:19 41:23 48:3	70:1 71:17 77:1	49:6	43:5 46:8	attempting 91:19
70.17 71.23 70.3				
	<u> </u>	I	<u> </u>	I

1				
attend 26:4,12	<b>back</b> 43:4 48:3	<b>Ben</b> 5:3 11:9 84:9	<b>briefs</b> 70:9,11	21:11 66:1,6
attending 100:19	70:24 73:5 75:19	ben.mayer@klga	74:16 75:14,16,20	68:15,16 70:2
attention 81:1,8	76:9,13 78:19	5:6	75:22,24 76:6	71:2,12 72:7,8
83:21	79:10 80:22 81:5	<b>Bench</b> 86:9 88:25	78:8,11,14,15	76:14 80:16,17
<b>attorney</b> 2:10 3:5	back-and-forth	89:2	<b>bring</b> 22:13 49:20	81:16 92:18,19
3:17 4:4 9:7,14,17	71:19	beneficially 63:14	49:22,23 66:9,22	93:17,20 94:11
11:24 12:2 13:4	<b>bad</b> 62:23	<b>benefit</b> 21:17 25:12	80:25 81:8 82:10	campaigns 61:4
13:16 49:20 66:17	Bainbridge 3:18	28:7 30:1	83:20 87:6 89:1	capacity 46:1
91:4	<b>Baker</b> 4:9 10:20	benefits 74:9	93:17 95:5	captioned 8:8
attorney's 13:21	<b>Baldwin</b> 4:16 10:24	best 15:11 59:25	bringing 63:18	carbon-intensive
<b>attorneys</b> 2:10 3:4	10:25 25:19,20	62:22 77:23 101:9	<b>broad</b> 39:1 60:5	60:15
9:9 11:11 12:23	26:10,13 68:9	<b>better</b> 76:24	broaden 22:22	care 79:22
42:9 48:9,23	<b>bare</b> 70:18	<b>beyond</b> 22:23 38:9	26:22 47:7 60:9	careful 38:23
49:13 57:12 73:7	base 22:17 36:7,22	58:15 59:19 61:8	broadening 27:4	carefully 78:25
81:23	45:3,9 46:4,12	<b>big</b> 74:6	<b>broader</b> 49:9 52:6	79:2,13
Attys 5:8	47:5 49:7 59:24	<b>Bill</b> 60:12	52:6	<b>Carson</b> 2:17 8:20
audience 29:18	76:2	<b>bills</b> 44:15	<b>Bromley</b> 5:7 11:12	8:21 69:2,23 70:1
author 88:5	<b>based</b> 24:10 38:13	<b>bit</b> 20:8 22:20 69:5	brought 41:17	71:17,18 72:24
authoritative 29:11	59:11 60:3	73:21 99:16	budgets 85:23	75:6,8 79:22,23
authority 41:15	basically 43:23	blanketly 90:8	<b>business</b> 15:6 18:16	80:19 81:15,18
52:10 57:1	72:19 78:21	blc@dvclaw.com	18:19 27:12,15,24	90:2,3 92:8,20
authorized 30:20	<b>basis</b> 60:4 99:12	3:14	32:17 44:8 50:9	96:9,23 97:1
availability 42:24	<b>bear</b> 56:18 62:8	<b>bother</b> 64:11	54:2	Cascade 75:17
available 42:20	beginning 8:18	<b>bound</b> 56:12	<b>Byron</b> 2:19 9:1	case 8:8,10 9:8,16
48:18 60:2 62:21	83:13	Box 2:11	byronstarkey@p	10:5,7,19 14:25
84:17,21	<b>behalf</b> 9:7,15,22	<b>break</b> 69:7,10,22	2:23	24:10,12 26:23
				,
<b>Avenue</b> 3:6 4:4 5:4	11:1 12:19 16:19	71:3,5,7 79:7		27:4 29:5,19,24
5:9,15 6:5,9,21	11:1 12:19 16:19 25:20 44:2 64:18	71:3,5,7 79:7 <b>Brent</b> 3:11 9:21	C	ŕ
		<b>Brent</b> 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	27:4 29:5,19,24
5:9,15 6:5,9,21	25:20 44:2 64:18	<b>Brent</b> 3:11 9:21	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5	<b>Brent</b> 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15 73:17 74:16 75:15	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 <b>behavior</b> 41:20	<b>Brent</b> 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 <b>Brew</b> 4:10 10:18,21	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15 73:17 74:16 75:15 77:12 78:14 82:8	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 <b>behavior</b> 41:20 51:2 57:6	<b>Brent</b> 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 <b>Brew</b> 4:10 10:18,21 <b>brief</b> 19:21,22	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15 73:17 74:16 75:15 77:12 78:14 82:8 82:9 100:5	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 <b>behavior</b> 41:20 51:2 57:6 <b>Behle</b> 4:16 10:25	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15 73:17 74:16 75:15 77:12 78:14 82:8 82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15 73:17 74:16 75:15 77:12 78:14 82:8 82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13 61:18,24	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15 73:17 74:16 75:15 77:12 78:14 82:8 82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13 61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15 73:17 74:16 75:15 77:12 78:14 82:8 82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13 61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14 42:9,16,19 45:6	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11 42:2 46:14,21	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1 63:18 70:9,25	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5 4:23	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14 59:12,12 60:8,10
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15  73:17 74:16 75:15  77:12 78:14 82:8  82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13  61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14  42:9,16,19 45:6  46:25 52:8,9	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11 42:2 46:14,21 50:11 54:6 59:4	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1 63:18 70:9,25 71:23 74:13,14,15	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5 4:23 call 12:7 57:11	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14 59:12,12 60:8,10 61:9,13 62:10
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15  73:17 74:16 75:15  77:12 78:14 82:8  82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13  61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14  42:9,16,19 45:6  46:25 52:8,9  57:13 64:3 66:11	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11 42:2 46:14,21 50:11 54:6 59:4 61:5,14 65:12	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1 63:18 70:9,25 71:23 74:13,14,15 74:17,18 75:1,4,5	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5 4:23 call 12:7 57:11 64:12,19 65:22	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14 59:12,12 60:8,10 61:9,13 62:10 64:23 65:13,18
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15  73:17 74:16 75:15  77:12 78:14 82:8  82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13  61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14  42:9,16,19 45:6  46:25 52:8,9  57:13 64:3 66:11  66:15,18,24 78:4	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11 42:2 46:14,21 50:11 54:6 59:4 61:5,14 65:12 68:9 80:2,12 81:6	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1 63:18 70:9,25 71:23 74:13,14,15 74:17,18 75:1,4,5 76:5,11,22 78:1,3	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5 4:23 call 12:7 57:11 64:12,19 65:22 71:8	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14 59:12,12 60:8,10 61:9,13 62:10 64:23 65:13,18 66:10,11,12,20,20
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15  73:17 74:16 75:15  77:12 78:14 82:8  82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13  61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14  42:9,16,19 45:6  46:25 52:8,9  57:13 64:3 66:11  66:15,18,24 78:4  83:25 85:11 88:5	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11 42:2 46:14,21 50:11 54:6 59:4 61:5,14 65:12 68:9 80:2,12 81:6 81:10 83:8,10,10	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1 63:18 70:9,25 71:23 74:13,14,15 74:17,18 75:1,4,5 76:5,11,22 78:1,3 78:5 79:10 92:1	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5 4:23 call 12:7 57:11 64:12,19 65:22 71:8 Callaghan 2:8 9:9	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14 59:12,12 60:8,10 61:9,13 62:10 64:23 65:13,18 66:10,11,12,20,20 68:22 69:12 70:6
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15  73:17 74:16 75:15  77:12 78:14 82:8  82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13  61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14  42:9,16,19 45:6  46:25 52:8,9  57:13 64:3 66:11  66:15,18,24 78:4  83:25 85:11 88:5 <b>AWEC</b> 9:19 15:20	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11 42:2 46:14,21 50:11 54:6 59:4 61:5,14 65:12 68:9 80:2,12 81:6 81:10 83:8,10,10 85:8 90:4 94:8	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1 63:18 70:9,25 71:23 74:13,14,15 74:17,18 75:1,4,5 76:5,11,22 78:1,3 78:5 79:10 92:1 briefing 73:20 78:7	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5 4:23 call 12:7 57:11 64:12,19 65:22 71:8 Callaghan 2:8 9:9 called 28:17	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14 59:12,12 60:8,10 61:9,13 62:10 64:23 65:13,18 66:10,11,12,20,20 68:22 69:12 70:6 73:3,18,19 74:17
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15  73:17 74:16 75:15  77:12 78:14 82:8  82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13  61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14  42:9,16,19 45:6  46:25 52:8,9  57:13 64:3 66:11  66:15,18,24 78:4  83:25 85:11 88:5 <b>AWEC</b> 9:19 15:20  16:19,20 17:5	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11 42:2 46:14,21 50:11 54:6 59:4 61:5,14 65:12 68:9 80:2,12 81:6 81:10 83:8,10,10 85:8 90:4 94:8 96:17,20 97:6 believes 55:19 Bellevue 2:21 28:20	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1 63:18 70:9,25 71:23 74:13,14,15 74:17,18 75:1,4,5 76:5,11,22 78:1,3 78:5 79:10 92:1 briefing 73:20 78:7 briefly 16:17,20,21 26:20 27:7 39:8 49:4 50:5 59:9	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5 4:23 call 12:7 57:11 64:12,19 65:22 71:8 Callaghan 2:8 9:9 called 28:17 calls 26:23 38:23	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14 59:12,12 60:8,10 61:9,13 62:10 64:23 65:13,18 66:10,11,12,20,20 68:22 69:12 70:6 73:3,18,19 74:17 77:9,18 78:14
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15  73:17 74:16 75:15  77:12 78:14 82:8  82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13  61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14  42:9,16,19 45:6  46:25 52:8,9  57:13 64:3 66:11  66:15,18,24 78:4  83:25 85:11 88:5 <b>AWEC</b> 9:19 15:20  16:19,20 17:5  19:24 33:11 42:2  96:1 99:7	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11 42:2 46:14,21 50:11 54:6 59:4 61:5,14 65:12 68:9 80:2,12 81:6 81:10 83:8,10,10 85:8 90:4 94:8 96:17,20 97:6 believes 55:19	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1 63:18 70:9,25 71:23 74:13,14,15 74:17,18 75:1,4,5 76:5,11,22 78:1,3 78:5 79:10 92:1 briefing 73:20 78:7 briefly 16:17,20,21 26:20 27:7 39:8	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5 4:23 call 12:7 57:11 64:12,19 65:22 71:8 Callaghan 2:8 9:9 called 28:17 calls 26:23 38:23 Cameron-Rulko	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14 59:12,12 60:8,10 61:9,13 62:10 64:23 65:13,18 66:10,11,12,20,20 68:22 69:12 70:6 73:3,18,19 74:17 77:9,18 78:14 80:14,24 82:9,9
5:9,15 6:5,9,21 <b>Avista</b> 32:11 73:15  73:17 74:16 75:15  77:12 78:14 82:8  82:9 100:5 <b>avoid</b> 33:7 51:13  61:18,24 <b>aware</b> 22:1 23:14  42:9,16,19 45:6  46:25 52:8,9  57:13 64:3 66:11  66:15,18,24 78:4  83:25 85:11 88:5 <b>AWEC</b> 9:19 15:20  16:19,20 17:5  19:24 33:11 42:2	25:20 44:2 64:18 67:23 69:24 82:5 behavior 41:20 51:2 57:6 Behle 4:16 10:25 belated 27:2 belatedly 88:18 believe 22:7 33:11 42:2 46:14,21 50:11 54:6 59:4 61:5,14 65:12 68:9 80:2,12 81:6 81:10 83:8,10,10 85:8 90:4 94:8 96:17,20 97:6 believes 55:19 Bellevue 2:21 28:20	Brent 3:11 9:21 16:19 99:6 Brew 4:10 10:18,21 brief 19:21,22 23:21 26:23,24 27:8 30:15 35:19 38:3 40:9 48:24 50:3 51:20 56:1 63:18 70:9,25 71:23 74:13,14,15 74:17,18 75:1,4,5 76:5,11,22 78:1,3 78:5 79:10 92:1 briefing 73:20 78:7 briefly 16:17,20,21 26:20 27:7 39:8 49:4 50:5 59:9	C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1 101:1 C-O-R-I-N-N-E 13:24 calculation 57:15 calendar 57:1 89:19,23 90:5 California 3:22 4:5 4:23 call 12:7 57:11 64:12,19 65:22 71:8 Callaghan 2:8 9:9 called 28:17 calls 26:23 38:23	27:4 29:5,19,24 32:4 33:2,7 35:4 37:11 38:13 39:13 40:6,13,19,23 41:22 44:12 47:24 50:12,24 51:3 52:12,14,21 53:4 53:18 55:2,7,8,21 56:9 57:7,14 59:12,12 60:8,10 61:9,13 62:10 64:23 65:13,18 66:10,11,12,20,20 68:22 69:12 70:6 73:3,18,19 74:17 77:9,18 78:14 80:14,24 82:9,9 85:15 87:2 88:12

				1 agc 10+
92:4 96:14,21	98:23	44:22	89:22 93:21	Commission's 23:5
97:21 98:19	<b>Centered</b> 6:13,14	City 4:18 28:19	comes 91:11	30:18,21 31:8
100:18	12:10,22 13:15	civil 41:13	coming 36:17 79:9	34:23 71:25 74:14
case's 13:1	14:24,25 66:15	clarification 90:1	comment 17:6	78:16 83:20 86:13
cases 28:15 32:7,9	81:10 86:2	92:7 99:9,13	26:21 32:11,20	91:20 93:23 95:14
38:19 39:4 51:1	certain 41:16 54:9	clarify 97:7	33:12 34:13 39:12	Commissioners
52:8 57:24 61:10	82:20 85:13	clean 13:9 23:23	39:14 53:1 55:12	8:15,15
62:5 63:14 67:9	certainly 16:13	42:14 43:8 60:11	55:17 79:22 85:4	commit 49:19
72:18,19 73:6,7,8	17:1,13 18:23	69:5	comments 23:21	communicate
74:21 75:14,16	21:10,18 22:1	clear 35:6 41:1,18	25:7 27:9 32:17	38:10
77:11,13,20 78:12	25:6 33:17 34:3	46:24 63:11	35:19 39:19 40:5	communications
93:21 99:20	39:20,25 52:18	Cleve 3:12 7:4 9:21	40:7 49:1 50:3	81:24
categories 42:18	67:14 68:6 78:3	12:19 64:18	52:2 57:13 58:18	communities 23:23
cause 15:8,12 17:23	92:25	clicking 71:13	67:5 84:7 86:20	42:13 67:24
18:1	certification 24:10	climate 60:14	commercial 17:2	community 43:9
caution 86:25	24:12 85:15	close 29:15 68:20	33:18 35:9 44:8	54:25
caveat 20:17	<b>Certified</b> 101:6	74:21 82:14,16	commission 1:2,4	company 21:23
cc-ing 81:23	certify 101:7	closely 70:16 92:9	1:15 2:6 8:9,14	33:14 40:2 59:14
CCR 1:25 101:14	<b>CETA</b> 54:23 60:19	closer 82:19	13:14 17:21 18:5	62:22 69:24 74:8
CENSE 12:13,15	60:21	Club 4:20,22 11:3,5	21:24 22:22 23:18	75:3,12 94:2
15:22 16:1,15,21	challenge 28:20	15:21 16:9 59:11	24:23 25:5,12	Company's 16:20
17:3,17 19:16,17	73:12	59:15,20,21,24	27:6,22 30:5 31:6	73:13 74:24 79:13
19:19,20 20:3,21	challenged 28:11	60:9,17,24 61:7	32:10,16,23 34:9	79:18 88:2 96:17
22:4,21 23:9,12	chance 14:18 16:3	61:17,21,25 62:3	34:21 35:10,15	100:4
23:22 24:8,15,20	20:2,19 23:20	63:2,22,25 64:3	36:1,5,14,18	compel 91:24 92:11
25:9 26:22 27:10	change 82:12 83:21	Club's 59:5,10,11	38:18 39:11,21	competency 33:17
27:19 28:2,3,7,9	<b>change</b> 45:25 46:1	59:13 61:5,11,14	41:1,3,7,14,21,21	competency 33.17
28:10,15 29:19,22	changes 27:16	65:17	42:11 43:4 51:15	competing 71:9
30:2,5,7,13,16,18	changing 93:10	co-presiding 8:14	51:24 52:8,14	79:3
31:6,9,13,16,20	<b>Charge</b> 57:21 58:7	Coalition 6:18	53:22 54:15,22	Complainant 1:5
32:2,13,15,18	<b>charged</b> 56:19	15:22 61:20	55:16,20 56:18	complete 55:4
33:2,19 34:22,25	chat 66:25	Coie 2:19 8:21,24	57:5 61:9,13,16	92:12
35:7,13,18 36:11	check 16:18 57:9	16:8	64:4 65:24 66:16	completed 31:4
36:20,24 37:10	57:11 63:4 64:10	<b>Coleman</b> 3:11 9:20	67:18,22,24 68:16	complex 75:21
39:21,22 40:19,22	86:19 96:3	9:21 16:17,19	71:15 72:14 74:3	compliance 60:11
40:25 41:6 51:6	circulated 81:4	33:11,13 99:6,7	74:3,5,9 75:2,11	80:9
65:14 94:22	circulating 25:25	99:12 100:11	75:20,21,24 77:13	component 36:8
CENSE's 20:1 22:4	68:11	collateral 30:14	77:22 78:7,12	component 30.8
28:6,20 29:9,13	circumstances	51:3	80:5 82:13,19	31:24
29:17 30:1,15,20	13:12	colleague 11:16	85:11,19 86:15	compressed 74:4
30:24 32:23,24	citations 35:24	Colstrip 65:3 76:2	87:7 90:19 92:3	compression 72:25
34:23 35:8 40:11	cited 25:4 75:24	com@dvclaw.com	94:18 95:8,15	compression 72:23
40:14,17 41:23	cities 24:5	7:7	96:14 97:12,16	computer 99:8
56:24 91:4	citing 41:4 76:6	come 38:1 47:15	98:22 99:24	concept 93:11
Center 76:1 97:23	citizens 44:14,19	49:10 78:19 89:17	101:16	concern 22:12
0.1 71.23	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	12.10 10.12 02.11	101.10	- CONCOLIN 22.12
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>

26:25 27:6 33:22	confidential 48:19	38:16	20:15 100:6	98:19 99:1
34:6 40:2 50:14	48:21 52:5,19	contemplating	<b>cost</b> 31:9 34:7,17	cover 87:18 97:24
51:5 52:11,16,23	94:20 98:1	88:25	55:4 65:2,4 79:25	<b>covered</b> 50:5 52:3
58:18 59:4,14	confidentiality	contemporaneous	81:3	<b>COVID-19</b> 95:12
65:7 83:6 88:16	48:1,8,10,22 52:4	98:15,21	cost-effective 60:1	<b>CR-37</b> 91:12
88:17 98:11	94:22	content 81:2	62:18,21	cracks 98:25
concerned 29:18	confirmed 27:22	Contentious 41:20	costs 34:1 57:14	<b>credible</b> 29:11,14
50:25 51:2 59:10	77:17	contentiousness	79:19,24 80:7,9	Credit 57:15,21
60:24 61:2 90:6	conflating 60:17	69:18	Council 49:14	58:14
94:10	conflict 77:5	<b>context</b> 41:5 56:20	63:21	criteria 36:5
concerning 25:5	congestion 82:8	continually 64:11	<b>counsel</b> 3:2,5 9:12	<b>critical</b> 70:9 71:20
<b>concerns</b> 16:10,22	conservation 59:16	continue 31:11	9:15 10:2 16:25	75:20 76:8
27:9 29:10 31:10	61:22	87:23 92:13,16	17:9 21:15 27:13	curiosity 13:15
32:14 50:7,12	<b>consider</b> 15:7,12	continued 60:13	27:23 30:5 31:21	curious 57:16
63:21 65:17 70:22	17:21 21:21 22:1	continues 83:11	32:5,21 33:6,16	current 52:1
76:15 79:4 80:12	23:12 26:7 70:11	continuing 95:10	34:13 35:3,6,10	curriculum 23:1
86:3,21 87:21	74:5 75:2 78:24	contribute 54:14	35:11,13,22 36:9	customer 27:15
89:14 94:14 96:7	consideration 19:9	control 74:22	36:10 37:1,11,15	44:9 50:9 53:6,6,7
99:4 100:15	24:9 49:11 58:12	conversation 63:18	38:8 39:1,16 40:1	53:10,14
conclusion 35:5	64:3,7 81:22	81:7	40:5,24 42:4,4,7	customers 17:2
<b>concur</b> 80:19 92:20	82:11,18 86:15	conversations 63:6	44:6 53:1 54:1	27:12,14,16,17,21
<b>condition</b> 38:17,20	considerations	coordinate 32:20	55:18,22 73:16	27:24 32:9,12,13
39:4	28:25	33:6 40:23 51:13	77:1,14,18 78:2	32:18 35:9,12
conditional 28:14	considered 23:9	56:8 61:23 63:2	82:7,21 91:10,14	39:12,12,19 45:9
28:21	considering 38:25	63:24 65:18 69:17	97:22	54:2,5,7 59:24
conditions 40:12	69:12,14 74:7	coordinated 39:24	counsel's 17:16	60:15
41:24 56:4 58:11	87:8	coordinates 37:10	35:1 39:18 50:23	cutting 84:6
58:16 65:15 88:11	consistent 51:1	coordinating 38:7	country 43:10 62:6	
conduct 30:13 51:1	98:6 99:16	38:22 63:22	County 5:2,8 11:7	$\overline{\mathbf{D} 8:4}$
<b>conference</b> 1:9 8:7	consistently 24:22	coordination 67:10	11:9,12 15:24	<b>Dallas</b> 2:9 9:10
8:17 15:7 18:5,9	Consolidated 1:4	copies 93:24 94:6	24:5 28:13 57:12	
18:17 19:5 20:18	constant 29:17	95:11,24 96:11,12	57:16,19 58:13,16	dan.teimouri@ut
21:1 26:4,9 38:4	constrained 76:18	96:19,21,24 99:1	58:20,22,25 84:10	2:15
40:16,21 56:2,5	87:3	99:25 100:3	84:14,21 101:4	<b>Daniel</b> 2:9 9:10
56:16 57:24 65:19	construct 52:20	copy 21:12,13 94:1	County's 57:13	data 58:23 76:1
70:19 78:23 79:1 79:14,15 84:13,22	constructing 46:10 construction 27:18	96:15 98:19 99:14 99:15	58:6,11,17	86:24 87:17,18,19
85:9,14,17 87:10	31:1	99:15 Corinne 7:4 12:18	<b>couple</b> 23:15 42:3,8 57:10 69:14 82:3	88:6 93:25 94:1
87:16 88:9,15	Consumers 3:10	13:24 64:17	88:10 93:21 95:7	date 1:24 18:16,17
89:12 90:5,22	9:22	Corporation 7:2	course 21:22 45:4	55:12 57:2 70:24
91:7,16,21 93:1	Cont 3:1 4:1 5:1	12:20	49:25 63:23 75:17	71:23 73:25 74:11
94:5 95:13 98:18	6:1 7:1	correct 15:4 21:6	78:9	74:12,25 75:3
100:10	contact 12:24 13:21	21:23 64:21 81:15	Court 28:13 101:6	76:9 77:4,5,7 78:9
conferences 69:15	containing 100:17	84:25 94:8	courtesy 21:13,13	78:10 80:1 82:14
69:20 89:1,6	contemplated	correctly 15:23	21:13 73:15 95:24	82:15 84:16 87:11
07.20 07.1,0	Johnson		21.13 /3.13 /3.24	87:12 91:9,9
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				.
92:23 93:9 97:13	defined 23:23	70:4,5,12,13	<b>dispute</b> 16:3 41:16	<b>e-mail</b> 14:17 21:14
dates 65:23 68:9,20	37:22 42:14	differences 99:20	47:3,21 91:11	69:2,6,9 73:24
69:15,19 70:7,8	definitely 82:22	<b>different</b> 27:14,21	disputed 19:15	79:12 87:18 95:19
72:4,22 73:15	definition 43:9,10	31:12 36:5 45:23	57:8	95:20,23,25 96:1
77:2 82:12,20	43:13 54:24	50:8 76:6 90:17	disputes 47:14	97:12,14
83:9,15 84:15,21	definitions 42:16	100:13	69:20 87:4 89:1	<b>e-mailed</b> 65:22
84:23 92:22 93:7	<b>degree</b> 38:21 45:10	differently 48:15	89:10,19 91:19,21	76:13 77:3 85:14
98:12	47:5 49:6	difficult 72:22	disregard 41:20	<b>e-mails</b> 81:23
<b>David</b> 2:18 8:23	<b>delay</b> 20:8	dire 44:18	disrupt 30:13	earlier 15:12 17:21
16:7	delayed 50:21	<b>Direct</b> 57:15,17,20	disruption 50:15	54:4 56:23 57:11
<b>Davison</b> 3:12 7:4	deliberation 71:25	57:21 58:7,14	distinction 33:24	58:18 68:9 88:19
9:21 12:19 64:17	delivered 97:13	84:13	34:2 52:3	earliest 45:13
day 81:19 83:3,14	<b>demand</b> 62:15	directly 55:18	distribution 62:14	early 37:14 84:14
83:16,18 93:16	demonstrated 27:3	disagreement	87:18 99:25	Earthjustice 5:15
97:18	demonstrates	79:21 89:21	dive 53:7	11:16
days 15:6 18:6,16	30:16,20,22	disclosing 81:24	division 72:15	easier 58:24 88:7
65:24 72:18 80:1	denials 31:7	disclosure 37:24	<b>docket</b> 13:1 32:10	easily 74:12
81:19 85:20,24	denied 27:25	discovery 41:16	56:13 57:14 58:18	East 6:5,15
<b>DC</b> 4:11	depending 80:23	47:10,10,12,16,18	68:3 85:13 86:15	eastern 24:5
<b>deadline</b> 24:13 75:9	<b>depth</b> 46:13	47:21,21 50:21	94:19 100:5	<b>Eastside</b> 6:18 15:22
85:20,23 97:13	<b>Deputy</b> 11:11	56:10 57:25 58:7	<b>Dockets</b> 1:3 8:7	22:5,23 23:11
98:16	describe 68:17	69:15,19 86:23,24	27:25	24:21 25:4,6
deadlines 41:7	design 45:25	87:1,3,4,9,15,25	documents 85:18	28:10 29:23 30:25
<b>deal</b> 76:18	designated 95:18	88:25 89:3,6,10	95:9,11,15,25	31:22 33:2 34:18
<b>deals</b> 80:6	designed 54:22	89:15 90:5,6,8,13	97:11,15	35:2 36:6,15,21
decades 75:13	despite 54:15	90:20,22,23,24	<b>doing</b> 25:8 38:13	37:15 40:18
DECEMBER	<b>detail</b> 36:11 38:4	91:7,7,20 92:13	45:15	easy 90:14
101:17	56:1 98:3	92:16,21 93:1,20	double-check	echo 56:23
<b>decided</b> 36:2 80:13	detail-focused 95:5	94:7,14	100:9	economic 23:2
<b>decides</b> 32:23 51:15	determination 15:2	discredited 29:8,20	download 52:15	<b>effective</b> 57:2 74:11
<b>decision</b> 23:14,16	22:23 31:1 34:17	33:5	dozens 31:15	effectively 50:9
38:2 47:13 71:15	47:9 55:3	<b>discuss</b> 16:2 36:12	<b>draft</b> 73:16	<b>efficiency</b> 33:5 40:3
77:24 79:1,15	determinations	47:14 71:8 89:2	draw 53:15 54:22	effort 67:10,25
80:23	31:3	91:9,15	<b>drop</b> 64:19	efforts 33:7 51:14
decision-makers	determined 53:18	discussed 15:3	dsteele@perkins	61:19 76:18
73:2,8,11 74:4	determines 35:15	16:23 34:8 35:6	2:22	either 26:1,2 43:24
decisions 62:19	determining 31:8	discussing 68:12	due 44:5 53:16	96:7
74:6	<b>Detloff</b> 1:25 101:6	77:25 81:4	duplicating 33:7	electric 59:23 60:20
decommissioning	101:14	discussion 33:21	51:13	60:22
65:2 76:2	development 45:12	34:5 39:10 60:19	duplication 17:4	electrical 29:1
dedicated 54:16	dex@smxblaw.c	68:4 72:12 92:1	40:2 61:18,24	electricity 50:10
59:17	4:12	discussions 19:12		60:21
deemed 45:18	died 99:8	dismissed 33:4 57:7	E 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1,1	<b>electronic</b> 95:8,8,9
deep 45:17 53:7	differ 46:4	dismissing 41:21	5:1,1 6:1,1 7:1,1	95:15,24 96:10
defective 29:14	difference 68:21	disposition 100:18	8:4,4 101:1,1	97:11 99:14,23
			0.4,4 101.1,1	

	1	l		11161761710
electronically	equitable 60:2	Executive 4:2	<b>F</b> 101:1	14:16 15:6 17:19
95:16,17	err 81:24	10:10,12 15:20	face 77:16	18:4,8,15,22
electronics 99:18	errata 96:3,5,8	exercise 82:23	facility 45:19,22,25	19:25 20:5,9,12
eliminates 78:1	erred 21:1	exhibit 94:24	46:9,17 47:4 53:7	24:18 25:23 44:11
emphasis 22:15	erroneous 29:2	exhibits 36:19	53:9,13,20 55:4	52:13 62:11 63:9
emphasize 61:6	especially 66:14,17	96:12,13	55:10,14,20	85:17,18 94:22
enacted 42:10	66:23	exist 44:2	fact 38:25 57:3	95:11,25
encountered 47:17	essentially 18:11	exists 33:24	factored 45:8	<b>filing</b> 13:1 15:12
encourage 74:8	establish 97:8	<b>expand</b> 56:14 58:15	<b>factors</b> 72:6	24:10,12 30:19
ends 83:8,10	established 29:12	59:12	facts 30:23 31:13	80:10 95:8,9,10
<b>Energize</b> 22:5,23	86:15	expanding 16:24	31:17 53:22	96:11,13,18 97:13
23:11 25:3,6	ether 99:3	<b>expansion</b> 60:13,19	failed 28:24 29:14	97:23 98:2,7,15
28:10 29:23 30:25	ethical 48:9	61:2	30:18 31:18	99:2
31:22 33:2 34:18	evaluate 43:4 59:24	expect 49:15 86:14	<b>failure</b> 57:5	filings 72:17 100:4
35:2 36:6,21	60:11 79:14	expectations 97:9	fair 26:6 53:11 65:7	<b>final</b> 23:13,16 78:6
37:15 40:18	evaluated 89:17	expedition 87:4	75:22 100:14	86:10
Energy 1:7 2:16	evaluating 45:11	expeditiously 47:23	faith 87:5	finally 32:22 88:5
3:10,16 5:13 6:19	evaluation 35:3	expenses 46:10	fall 43:12 54:24	financial 44:18,22
8:10,11,22 9:22	43:1	56:21	<b>fallback</b> 91:21	<b>find</b> 77:6 90:14
9:24 10:2,5 11:18	evening 83:12	experience 50:16	falls 42:18 82:14	92:1
13:9 15:20,23	event 77:7 89:4	50:25 52:18	familiar 83:4	fine 13:12 26:15
23:23 42:14 43:8	98:5	experienced 72:14	far 14:22 62:11	39:5 76:10
44:14,15 46:23	events 77:20	74:20	70:3 93:4	fines 24:6
54:17 56:8 57:15	everybody 90:12	expertise 60:5	fashion 22:10	finish 78:22
57:21 58:7 60:11	everyone's 81:1	experts 28:18 29:7	<b>fast</b> 30:23	<b>firm</b> 9:21 10:25
61:20 63:21 82:5	evidence 28:23	29:21 62:14 90:8	<b>favor</b> 47:16	64:17
engage 54:13	29:12 31:21 38:22	<b>expires</b> 101:16	<b>February</b> 1:24 8:1	firmly 29:12 30:3
engaged 23:6	46:15 53:9	<b>explain</b> 15:11 40:10	94:21	first 12:22 16:5
engagement 25:13	evident 49:12	40:15,15 50:15	federal 4:2 10:9,12	18:17 19:18,23
engaging 66:17	evolve 46:15	56:4	15:20 29:1 43:11	20:12 21:15 25:17
ensure 38:8,14	evolved 45:17	explained 38:3	44:10	26:20 27:10 30:18
51:17 53:22	exactly 54:20 98:13	express 28:9	feel 27:19 76:11	32:25 34:16 42:3
ensuring 53:15	<b>Examiner</b> 22:12	expressed 76:14	FERC 28:12 29:6,6	44:3 55:2,9 67:8
entered 94:18	28:20 29:3,9 36:3	expressly 26:24	<b>ffitch</b> 3:17 10:1,2	70:7 71:11 82:4
entertaining 67:3	37:6	extend 57:2 74:8,24	67:12,13,15 82:1	82:13 83:16 90:12
entity 46:20	example 28:19	75:3 78:10	82:2 83:2,5 84:2,3	firsthand 29:17
entrenched 30:3	30:24 41:9 54:11	<b>extended</b> 41:14,19	86:5,6,8 88:16,17	Firstly 59:15
environment 59:18	59:20 66:15 97:21	Extending 74:11	88:21,24 89:25	<b>fishing</b> 87:4
61:12	examples 98:2	extension 78:9	Fifth 3:6 6:9	fit 43:17
environmental	exception 71:22	extensive 50:20	fights 47:17	<b>five</b> 24:5 70:15
22:13 23:4,8	81:10	extent 48:12,21	<b>file</b> 14:6 15:9 19:1	96:11
24:22 36:16 45:5	exchanging 88:22	49:8 65:16	20:21 21:2,5,25	Floor 4:11,23
45:13,19,23 47:2	exclude 36:17	extremely 57:3	24:2 73:4 86:14	focus 23:17 35:2,5
59:16 61:21 62:3	excuse 99:15	98:20	96:11	focused 23:2,3 41:1
62:5	excused 26:3		<b>filed</b> 8:10 9:2 12:25	52:17 56:21 58:13

	1	1	1	
58:20	fuels 46:2,3	61:1 86:24 92:20	<b>grant</b> 26:7 40:14	he/him 8:12
<b>follow</b> 29:15 30:18	Fukano 2:8 9:10	generating 65:3	51:15 56:3	heads-up 41:1
42:1 57:5 66:19	<b>full</b> 42:20 43:1	generation 60:20	granted 26:8 37:5	health 59:18
91:18	53:22 55:10 73:23	60:23	37:19 41:24 51:7	hear 10:15 11:3
<b>follow-up</b> 33:9 43:7	fully 32:3 45:6	<b>getting</b> 19:6 82:19	65:15,16	50:23 52:2 55:16
43:19 48:25	46:25 48:23	94:9	granting 40:11	63:15 76:21 81:5
followed 70:16	function 89:6	give 12:7 16:3	64:5	83:25
following 15:19	fundamental 30:21	19:20 23:20 40:25	<b>GRC</b> 70:16 75:19	heard 50:3 65:12
25:7 27:3 41:10	31:2	42:4 50:2 52:10	GRCs 70:10	67:13
73:18 85:22	fundamentally	55:25 56:1 63:17	great 14:3 92:14	hearing 14:13,23
<b>follows</b> 32:25	30:3	84:7 88:1	Green 57:15,17,20	17:16 18:16 25:21
footnote 32:1	<b>funding</b> 24:2,12	given 48:16 49:16	57:20 58:6,14	26:5 28:20 29:9
forecasting 62:15	32:2 42:11,20	52:18 63:12 66:7	84:13	33:21 65:23,24
<b>forego</b> 76:10	54:22,23 85:11,13	gives 41:8	<b>group</b> 28:8 44:10	68:9 70:24 71:23
foregoing 101:8	85:16 86:4,16	<b>giving</b> 12:23,24	grouped 87:20	72:4 73:17,19,24
form 40:20 95:1	funds 42:25	<b>Gloria</b> 4:21 11:5	groups 32:12 35:12	73:25 76:9 77:8
formal 95:9	<b>further</b> 25:14 34:10	gloria.smith@sie	39:12,19 54:5,9	82:12,14,15 83:8
formalities 78:22	37:7 67:6	4:24	guarantee 74:15	83:10,16 85:6
formally 21:5	Furthermore 41:6	<b>go</b> 43:20 45:22 46:8	guess 33:15,21	86:22 87:23 94:15
<b>formed</b> 28:7,9	<b>future</b> 91:2 100:17	47:13 48:2 58:15	72:12 90:5,11,19	96:6 100:20
<b>forth</b> 76:13		59:7 66:5 68:22	90:22 91:14 93:11	hearings 25:11
<b>forum</b> 28:12,17	G	71:11,13 79:5	guidance 25:5	55:12,18
29:19,23 30:14	<b>G</b> 8:4	86:7 88:20 97:4	guidelines 100:18	heavily 49:12,22
51:3 63:24	<b>Gafken</b> 3:3 9:13,14	goal 77:21,22		heavy 47:9,20
forums 22:15 31:12	17:8,14 34:15	<b>goals</b> 60:14	H	<b>Hello</b> 12:9
33:5 51:12	38:5 39:3 44:5	goes 46:18 96:21	hand 31:23 76:22	helpful 68:23 69:21
forward 72:23	53:3 76:21,23	<b>going</b> 19:8 20:7	76:24 86:11 88:18	71:7 87:12 89:18
89:20 92:2	97:5 98:10	21:20 22:20 27:18	happening 20:18	92:4,23 93:3,12
<b>found</b> 28:22 29:8	gained 51:25	35:23 44:4 46:4	<b>happy</b> 16:11 33:8	98:3,20
43:10	gas 45:9 46:4 50:10	49:17 50:11 58:10	47:13 63:15,24	<b>helps</b> 58:1
<b>four</b> 90:17	56:7 59:23 60:13	62:24 64:2,5	64:20 68:17,18	<b>High</b> 3:18
Fourth 2:20 5:4	60:19,19,22 61:1	66:12,20 67:10	80:10	highlight 27:8
<b>Francisco</b> 3:22 4:5	62:14	72:3,13,21 73:1	<b>Harbor</b> 3:12 7:5	59:13 70:4
4:23	<b>Gates</b> 5:4 11:9,10	74:4 78:21 79:13	14:5	highlighted 33:22
frankly 38:20	gatherings 93:4	98:17 100:5,8	<b>hard</b> 63:9 83:15	70:3
free 32:19,20	<b>general</b> 2:10,10 3:4	<b>good</b> 8:6,20 9:5,13	93:6	highlights 39:11
freedom 82:23	8:10 9:7,9,14,17	9:20 10:1,11,16	hardship 44:23	highly 23:22 42:12
frequently 20:8	19:21 24:16 29:24	10:24 11:8,15,22	<b>Harry</b> 2:8 9:9	43:9 54:25 67:24
28:15	32:6,14 44:20	12:17 15:8,11	harry.fukano@u	94:19
Friday 20:24 27:3	55:2,8 67:16	17:22 18:1 64:16	2:14	hinging 42:24
81:5	72:19 73:18,19	69:8,10 77:20	Hashanah 82:15	hire 62:13
<b>front</b> 6:13,14 12:10	74:16 75:13,16	87:5 91:17 100:8	83:18	hiring 13:16
12:22 13:15 14:24	98:14	gotten 24:3	Hasselman 5:14	historically 67:21
14:24 66:15 67:22	General's 3:5	government's	11:17	history 69:18
68:24 81:10 86:2	generally 21:23	44:17	<b>hate</b> 63:11	<b>hold</b> 45:10 65:24
	42:5 48:18 60:6		<b>Hayes</b> 3:21	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

holding 77:0	25,10 27.0 25	important 26:22	25.11 12 54.4 5 0	20.22 20.6 9 0 11
holding 77:8	35:18 37:8,25	important 36:23	35:11,12 54:4,5,9	29:22 30:6,8,9,11
holiday 82:15 83:6	38:5,17 39:6,9	54:13 70:5,11	54:9	35:8 36:16,16
holidays 82:21	40:7 43:6,15	75:25 76:4,4,7	industrial 75:15	37:4,21,22 39:18
homeowners 30:2	48:24 49:24 51:20	83:6 98:20 99:1	industry 28:25	43:24,25 44:3,12
<b>Honor</b> 8:20 9:6,20	52:25 55:24 57:22	importantly 24:23	29:15	44:21,25 46:7,12
10:1,11,16,24	58:9 59:2,7 61:25	improperly 30:25	info@frontandce	46:14,18,20,21
11:4,8,15,22	63:1,17 64:1,10	improved 85:12	6:17	50:6 53:14,19,25
12:12,17 13:22	64:22 65:6,9 66:5	in-house 11:24	informal 93:4	55:13,21 58:6
15:14 16:7 18:2	67:4,14 68:6 69:8	in-the-alternative	informally 89:3	59:25 62:22 64:21
18:23 19:13 20:11	69:25 71:1,4,16	37:10	information 10:6	interested 34:19
21:8 24:18 26:19	72:1 75:6 76:20	incidental 79:21	12:24 13:21 14:7	62:7,17 63:11
32:8 33:8,13 39:7	78:18 79:9 80:15	<b>include</b> 47:5 54:6	21:17 25:10 31:17	64:25 65:5
50:4 51:19 57:18	81:12,20 82:22	78:8 87:9 93:16	38:1 39:15 40:1,8	<b>interests</b> 27:13,20
58:4,25 59:6,8	83:3,24 84:3,23	99:1	45:11 48:2,5,13	27:23 30:1 31:11
62:2 63:20 64:9	85:1,3 86:7,18	included 32:1	48:14,17 51:25	33:18 38:11 50:11
64:16 66:1 67:3	88:20,23 89:7	36:22 45:2 46:3	52:13,19 53:20	54:10 61:6,20
67:12 68:5,15	90:2 91:1,17	46:11 53:5,13	55:20,25 86:9,16	79:3,4
69:23 71:2,12	92:14 93:13,19	57:23 81:2 95:1	88:22 94:20	interim 85:12,22
72:8 75:9 80:18	94:8,13 95:4	includes 24:19 65:1	informed 83:13	interject 21:9 25:19
82:2 83:5,18 84:9	96:15,25 97:2,5	including 15:17	infrastructure	interlocutory 28:1
86:5,17 88:19	98:10 99:11 100:2	28:12 50:20 87:22	60:19 61:1	internal 99:25
89:25 90:3 92:18	100:14	88:8,13	initial 18:16 35:22	Internet 18:25
93:18 94:12 99:6	hurry 20:24	inclusion 22:16	75:22 96:18 100:4	interrupt 66:2
hope 41:8 49:15	nuity 20.24	36:6 53:16	initiative 67:25	<b>interrupt</b> 66.2 <b>intervene</b> 8:25 10:7
66:25 74:5 92:12	I	income 54:11	initiatives 61:5	18:15 20:1 22:8
Hopefully 92:5	idea 38:7,21 69:8	income 34.11 incorporate 43:10	input 42:6	24:11 35:14 38:5
hoping 26:3	69:14 78:3	incorporated 85:25	inside 49:13	43:18 44:11 57:9
hour 86:14	<b>identified</b> 25:2 36:8	increase 59:23	instances 42:23	58:19 59:21 64:6
hours 98:23,23	76:17	increased 53:16	instruct 51:24	64:14,24 65:13,16
*	identify 57:25 58:1	increases 59:25	instructed 40:23	86:2
<b>housekeeping</b> 92:17 95:7 97:6	58:24 87:17	62:8		
	identifying 99:22		<b>instruction</b> 39:1 52:7	intervening 10:4
Howard 1:12 2:3	imagine 77:18	incredibly 93:3		52:12,17,24
8:6,12 9:3,11,13	immediately 82:16	indefinitely 41:14	intend 23:17 26:22	intervenor 41:22
9:18,23 10:8,14	97:16 98:7	41:20	37:23 48:23 50:24	42:11 57:6,7
10:22 11:2,6,13	impact 49:21 53:23	Indian 43:10	57:16 59:12 62:13	85:11,12 86:4,16
11:19 12:5,14,21	impact 49.21 33.23	Indians 6:5	64:14,23	intervenors 56:18
13:7,11,19 14:3,9	-	<b>indicated</b> 22:8 24:1	<b>intending</b> 23:7 26:6	66:23 67:9 69:3,4
15:5,16 16:13	24:5 27:16,17	24:13 58:13 65:14	intends 29:19 32:3	86:1 88:10 89:13
17:5,13,15 18:12	42:12 43:9 44:25	65:23 81:21	37:15 60:25	intervention 14:6
19:7,14 20:6,14	54:25 67:24	indicating 79:16	<b>intent</b> 85:16	14:14,16,20,25
20:17 21:4,7,10	impacting 49:12	indication 37:20	intention 22:24	15:8,10,18,19
21:18 22:18 23:9	impair 30:12	individual 32:12	24:2	16:2,6,10,21
23:19 24:14 25:15	impasse 71:6,14,21	individually 33:23	intentions 58:14	17:20,22,25 19:16
25:20 26:6,11,15	78:24 92:12	46:13	<b>interest</b> 23:7 27:11	25:23 27:11 28:1
33:10 34:12,15	impinging 71:25	individuals 29:21	27:14 28:3,7	28:6 30:10,11
	implying 35:4			
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I	I

	1	1	1	
32:23 34:22 37:4	35:2,23 36:13,19	11:2,6,13,19 12:5	<b>kind</b> 90:4,7	law@smxblaw.c
38:19 40:12 41:24	37:4,16 38:12	12:14,21 13:7,11	<b>King</b> 5:2,8 11:7,9	4:13
42:23 51:6,7,16	40:6,18,20 42:25	13:19 14:3,9 15:5	11:12 15:23 24:5	laws 60:18
55:23 56:4 57:19	49:4,7,10 50:13	15:16 16:13,17	28:13 57:12,13	lead 13:10 29:2
58:11 59:10,13	50:17 51:4,9,18	17:5,13,15 18:12	58:11,13,17 84:10	41:21 95:18
61:14 66:25 91:20	53:4,21 54:13	19:7,14 20:6,14	101:4	leads 22:18
interventions 17:10	56:7,10,11,14	20:17 21:4,7,10	<b>Kippur</b> 82:17 83:6	leave 20:21 21:2,2
18:6 37:19 61:10	57:10,17 59:19	21:18 22:18 23:9	<b>know</b> 15:4,15 19:21	21:5,24 40:22
62:12 66:3,8	60:10,18,25 61:8	23:19 24:14 25:15	20:5 23:25 33:21	49:16 62:24 73:10
inundated 90:23	61:8,11,12,22	25:20 26:6,11,15	36:3 37:13 38:12	led 18:21
investments 41:2	63:22 64:14,23	33:10 34:12,15	40:4 47:25 62:10	<b>legal</b> 28:12 41:3
involve 38:23	67:7 69:18 71:20	35:18 37:8,25	63:8 68:2 69:11	<b>let's</b> 8:18 14:13
involved 23:15	75:21,25 76:7	38:5,17 39:6,9	71:22,24,24 74:17	19:15 65:21 68:12
24:20 29:16 42:25	83:19,25 84:8	40:7 43:6,15	78:13 80:12 82:19	69:22 76:21 78:19
67:11	85:7 87:14 92:13	48:24 49:24 51:20	83:22 85:15 86:2	78:20 79:5
involvement 63:12	92:21,24	52:25 55:24 57:22	89:3,8,13 90:7,11	<b>letter</b> 87:18 97:24
involving 61:12	issuing 56:16	58:9 59:2,7 61:25	90:12,19,19,21,23	lieu 95:11
IRP 25:8	<b>item</b> 97:6	63:1,17 64:1,10	93:6,7 95:5 98:12	<b>light</b> 34:6
irresponsible 43:2		64:22 65:6,9 66:5	100:2	<b>limit</b> 48:4,14,17
Island 3:18	J	67:4,14 68:6 69:8	knowledge 46:13	49:17 57:19 63:23
isolated 98:5	<b>J</b> 2:9 6:20,20	69:25 71:1,4,16	101:9	90:20
<b>issue</b> 14:14 19:21	<b>Jaimini</b> 5:14 11:16	72:1 75:6 76:20		limitation 88:10
21:21 23:10 24:20	Jan 5:14 11:16	76:23 78:18 79:9	<u>L</u>	limitations 51:17
33:2 34:7,8,18	<b>January</b> 63:9 97:22	80:15 81:12,20	Lacey 1:16 8:1	<b>limited</b> 32:25 40:17
36:24 40:9 41:3	<b>Jeff</b> 2:7 9:9	82:22 83:3,24	lacking 55:15	45:7 51:8 56:6,11
45:21 47:22 49:20	jeff.roberson@ut	84:3,23 85:1,3	Lake 4:18	56:25 58:8 61:11
53:17 55:5 58:10	2:13	86:7,18 88:20,23	land 22:13 24:22	61:15 63:12 90:25
58:15,21 59:3	Jefferson 4:10	89:7 90:2 91:1,17	28:12 36:4,16	<b>limiting</b> 23:9 45:1
60:5 65:4,21 68:7	<b>Jennifer</b> 2:7 9:6	92:14 93:9,13,19	43:13	49:2
73:4,5 74:19	21:9 68:16 92:19	94:8,13 95:4	language 62:23	line 11:17 24:21
77:10,16 78:2,6	jennifer.cameron	96:15,25 97:2,5	81:2,4,11 94:9	lines 40:22
78:25,25 79:15,21	2:12	97:14 98:10 99:11	large 24:4 30:22	lineup 35:7
80:4 83:11,12	jhasselman@ear	99:14 100:2,14	36:7,8,15 57:4	link 66:24 67:1
85:10 86:21,23,24	5:18	judgment 38:23	59:25 69:4 87:2,2	<b>Liotta</b> 4:3 10:11,12
91:8 92:25 93:7	<b>job</b> 77:20 95:6	judicious 86:25	Lastly 32:8	Liquid 56:7
93:18 94:16 96:3	Joe 2:9 9:10	<b>July</b> 72:22	late 18:22 70:24	<b>Lisa</b> 3:3 6:3 9:14
96:5 98:4,16	joe.dallas@utc.w	<b>June</b> 77:4	late-filed 15:7	11:23
100:6,16	2:14	jurisdiction 25:21	17:22 18:3,7 19:4	lisa.anderson@p
<b>issued</b> 86:13	join 16:20 42:2	justice 30:12	<b>Latimer</b> 4:16 11:1	6:7
issues 16:23 22:14	<b>joined</b> 33:12	justifiably 29:18	launches 35:24	lisa.gafken@atg
22:15,22 23:3,4,8	joining 8:16		Laura 4:9 10:20	3:8
23:12,18 24:3	jparekh@earthj	<u>K</u>	law 1:12 2:2 3:17	litigate 29:23
25:6 26:22,25	5:17	<b>K&amp;L</b> 5:4 11:9,10	4:4 6:4,20 8:13	<b>litigated</b> 53:21 62:6
27:1,4,5 30:15	judge 1:12 2:2 8:6	keep 82:13 83:1	9:21 10:25 11:24	litigating 50:17
32:3 33:1 34:3	8:13 9:3,11,13,18	93:14,14	12:2 43:11 49:13	litigation 50:19
	9:23 10:8,14,22	<b>key</b> 29:12	52:9 64:17 97:14	

li44lo 10.9 22.20	major 22.6 70.22	26.20 44.14 40.12	migundovsta di	Nagh 2.9 0.0
little 19:8 22:20	<b>major</b> 32:6 70:22 72:17,19 73:2	36:20 44:14 49:12	misunderstanding	Nash 2:8 9:9
69:5 72:23 73:21		49:21 53:10,15	30:21 31:2	nash.callaghan@
95:5 99:16 <b>live</b> 48:10	74:21 77:10,13	54:6 55:11 62:8	modified 86:10,12	2:13
	making 52:3 67:25	membership 17:3	Mohler 4:9 10:20	nation 44:7,9,13
LLP 2:19 3:21	74:6	memorialized	moment 14:19 16:3	natural 45:9 46:4
LNG 45:2,8 49:2,7	manage 99:20	95:12	21:20 38:6 69:24	56:7 60:22 75:17
49:18 50:17 53:5	managed 93:4	memory 18:13	88:2	naturally 22:18
53:9,12,19 55:4,9	mandates 29:1	mention 31:18	Monday 83:17	nature 48:21 67:7
55:12,20 56:6,21	manner 36:24	98:18	month 79:19	91:7,25
loaded 60:15	March 85:19	mentioned 17:21	months 41:16	navigate 67:2
Lockhart 29:4	<b>Mariel</b> 6:14 12:9	54:3 68:8 99:17	morning 8:6,20 9:5	near 97:18 100:16
long 54:15	13:4	merits 89:17	9:13,20 10:1,11	nearly 28:11
long-standing	marine 46:2	met 30:16	10:16,24 11:8,15	necessarily 38:12
55:13	Martinez 5:8 11:12	<b>Michael</b> 1:12 2:3	11:22 12:17 14:6	42:24 58:9 82:11
longer 71:7	material 79:21	8:12	14:16 17:20 19:2	necessary 25:4
look 46:3 49:24	materials 24:12	michael.howard	20:7,12 21:3,14	77:20 78:16 82:21
62:14 79:2,18	97:18,20,25 98:1	95:21	25:24 64:16 96:2	need 14:1 15:4 22:9
89:20 90:15 96:2	matter 8:14 23:14	Microsoft 7:2	<b>motion</b> 19:25 20:3	23:3 24:24 31:17
100:5	23:17 24:1 88:19	12:19,23 13:20	20:4,19 21:12,21	31:18,19 33:25
looked 24:1 75:19	99:13	14:15 15:21 17:18	21:23 22:8 28:22	34:7 44:18 49:13
96:16	matters 24:8 35:25	17:19 19:12 64:14	40:14,20 41:8	49:22 66:19 69:17
<b>looking</b> 14:2 18:13	37:17,23 89:3	64:18,23,25 65:3	91:24 92:11 99:2	71:10,14 72:23
31:6 41:10 47:2,3	92:17 95:7	65:4	motions 87:6	73:21 77:6 82:18
47:8 55:10 75:14	Mattheis 4:10	Microsoft's 15:17	<b>motives</b> 52:12,18	85:16 87:13 91:15
79:17	10:17,20	19:9 64:21	52:23	93:15,15 94:4
looks 88:1 91:4	<b>Mayer</b> 5:3 11:8,9	Mihaly 3:21	move 22:3 41:25	99:24
<b>Loop</b> 1:15	57:18 58:4,25	Milinovich 7:4	65:21 66:3 84:8	need-based 53:11
loose 30:23	84:9,10,25 85:2	12:18 13:24 64:16	85:4 86:23 88:3	53:15
<b>lost</b> 99:2	mean 18:24 20:20	64:17,25 65:8	92:1 94:14	needed 69:16 76:12
<b>lot</b> 54:14 66:9	21:18 38:20,22,25	81:11	moved 20:20 86:2	78:7 89:22 96:24
67:10 71:19 79:3	58:5 67:6 69:13	mind 12:23 56:18	moving 21:24	needing 58:19
92:22 93:6	94:10	82:13 83:1 93:14	62:11 69:13 72:23	needs 22:11
<b>Low</b> 54:11	means 72:21 73:6	93:15 94:25	multi-rate 67:8	Neighborhoods
low-income 49:3	measure 18:20	mindful 57:3	<b>multiple</b> 37:16,17	6:18 15:22
54:12,13,17 56:7	mechanism 42:20	<b>mine</b> 69:5	38:19	Neither 60:18
56:9	mechanisms 39:21	minimal 37:20	<b>Murphy</b> 6:9 12:3	never 55:5 72:14
ъ	meet 24:8 27:11	<b>minimum</b> 70:18		new 42:10 43:3
M M	30:9 45:19 53:12	<b>minute</b> 26:21	N	54:20,23 66:23
M 2:9	89:9	minutes 17:7 22:2	N 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	67:9 85:10
M-A-R-I-E-L 13:5	meeting 60:14	25:22	6:1 7:1 8:4	Newcastle 28:8
M-I-L-I-N-O-V-I	89:19	misrepresented	name 8:12 9:14	newer 66:14
13:25	meets 34:22	31:16	12:9 13:22,23	newest 69:3
Madison 6:15	member 44:7,22	misrepresents	20:15	<b>nexus</b> 53:9
main 4:17 24:15	members 27:19	31:13	names 12:24 95:22	<b>Nicholas</b> 6:8 12:3
73:5 85:8	30:6 32:18 33:19	mistaken 83:17	narrowly 32:25	Nicola 28:23
maintain 23:22			51:8	
	1	1	I	1

non attornov 12.12	<b>object</b> 16:9 17:9	20:14 26:13 39:6	95:2,13 98:18	nondomio 05:12
non-attorney 13:13	<b>U</b>		100:10,16	pandemic 95:12
nonconfidential	objecting 46:19	43:6,15,22 49:24	*	paper 95:11 96:12
48:12 97:25	<b>objection</b> 16:20	65:6,9 71:4,16	orderly 30:12	96:15,19,21,24
normal 91:18 94:23	23:1 33:12 35:16	80:15 81:12,20	orders 47:15 57:24	99:15,25 100:3
normally 38:9	35:22 37:13 42:3	82:22 84:5 85:3,3	<b>Oregon</b> 3:13 7:6	papers 63:8
Northeast 2:20	88:13,21 90:4	88:3,23 96:4 97:1	14:5	paragraph 18:14
3:18	96:9	99:10 100:11	organically 92:24	59:20 60:16 61:3
Northwest 5:13	objections 16:1,5	Olympia 2:11	organization 13:5,8	<b>parallel</b> 72:20 73:6
11:18 61:20 63:21	17:11 22:9 24:17	once 14:7 73:20	13:13 14:21 15:9	Parekh 5:14 11:15
75:17	24:23 25:24 36:18	ones 85:1	19:23 28:2 59:17	11:16 63:20
Notably 32:5	42:5 43:17 45:4	ongoing 27:18	62:4,5 63:19	<b>Parsons</b> 4:16 10:25
<b>note</b> 16:12 32:22	50:1 51:22 58:12	99:13	organization's	part 47:23 49:6
37:19 73:22 78:11	87:21	online 13:1	40:13	51:22 57:6 62:23
<b>noted</b> 27:10 50:5	objective 30:4	<b>open</b> 61:7 67:20	organizations 12:6	68:3 69:4
59:9	objectively 30:8	operation 41:15	14:10 15:19 25:16	participant 54:21
notes 12:15 16:14	obligation 49:20	opinion 33:16	61:18,23	54:21
16:18 19:18 59:15	observance 83:19	opinions 17:10	organize 93:5	participants 1:18
<b>notice</b> 9:2 10:6 12:7	observation 67:16	29:21 33:3 51:11	original 76:15	54:18 67:21
12:25 14:11 84:12	observed 87:1	opportunities	<b>originally</b> 46:5 80:8	participate 19:12
100:13	<b>obtained</b> 31:14,15	31:10 39:14	80:11	29:5 32:9,18 62:4
noticed 21:11	48:2,5	opportunity 17:6	outside 47:8 48:3	participated 32:16
notices 85:16	<b>obtuse</b> 22:20	19:20 32:13 42:5	52:1,20	48:6 55:11
notify 93:9	obviously 39:25	43:16 55:16 66:7	overlapping 61:19	participating 63:13
nthomas@omwl	52:20 76:3 100:12	70:25 78:17 81:5	overlook 12:14	participation 23:10
6:11	occasions 64:5	89:9 91:25	overlooking 100:7	32:24 34:19,23
<b>nuance</b> 33:23	occur 18:8 47:16	<b>oppose</b> 35:13	overstated 37:2	35:16 40:13,17
nuanced 33:24	occurred 45:6	<b>opposed</b> 30:3 37:16	owners 28:8	43:25 45:1 49:2
<b>Nucor</b> 4:7 10:15,18	64:13 65:10	opposes 32:23		49:18 54:23 55:5
15:20	occurring 21:19	opposing 28:9	P	56:6 59:5 63:23
number 24:4 36:15	occurs 18:17 19:4	opposite 59:10	<b>P</b> 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1,1	65:18 88:11 91:16
41:16 56:14 57:4	<b>October</b> 70:8 74:1	opposition 29:13	5:1,1 6:1,1 7:1,1	particular 8:16
66:13 67:7,17	77:9 78:7 82:16	50:6,15 78:2	8:4	21:21 22:10 34:14
68:20 69:13 72:11	83:9,9,15	<b>option</b> 91:2	<b>P-Corp</b> 80:4,6,24	38:2 42:2 45:1
87:2 89:13	offer 23:21 24:16	oral 32:11,20 39:13	<b>P-E-P-P-L-E</b> 13:23	56:20 57:20 58:21
numerous 29:16	29:10 35:18 43:16	40:5	<b>p.m</b> 97:19,20,22,24	61:23 66:12 77:7
55:11 62:5 63:6	offered 70:7	order 21:19 26:9	97:25,25 98:1,3,5	84:22 92:4
64:4	office 2:10 3:5 5:8	27:25 28:19 32:11	98:9	particularly 36:11
<b>NW</b> 4:10	6:4 11:24 12:2	38:4 40:4,10,16	<b>P.O</b> 2:11	37:23 67:23
NWEC 11:14 15:23	18:10,21,24 49:13	40:21 42:1 46:11	PacifiCorp 75:17	parties 21:25,25
63:3,4,15,17 64:4	86:11	48:22 49:17 52:4	80:3,6,13	28:5 35:20 36:8
65:19	<b>Offices</b> 6:20	56:2,5,13,13,16	page 94:22,23 95:1	37:18,20 38:10,13
	oftentimes 80:9	64:8 65:20 75:20	95:1	38:23 39:22 41:1
0	<b>Ogden</b> 6:9 12:3	79:2,16 84:16	Pages 1:11	41:6,11,18 51:13
<b>O</b> 8:4	Oh 87:25	86:13 87:16 88:9	<b>Paisner</b> 3:4 9:17	51:14 55:15 56:17
<b>O'Connell</b> 99:14	okay 13:19 14:9,23	88:15 94:17,18,24	Palms 4:4	57:4,25 58:1,24
<b>000-</b> 8:3	onay 13.17 14.7,23	00.13 /4.17,10,24	Pam 2:18 9:1	31.7,23 30.1,24
		l		

60 67 60 14	1 1761	< <b>₹</b> 0. <b>₹</b> 0. <b>₹</b> 1	1 4 125 2 60 2	27 10 20 7 22 10
60:6,7 63:14	<b>period</b> 76:1	67:8 78:21	potential 35:2 69:3	27:10 29:5 32:10
65:22 66:10,11,13	<b>Perkins</b> 2:19 8:21	planning 29:1	79:25	36:2 59:9
66:14 67:17 68:2	8:24 16:8	62:14	potentially 16:24	primarily 30:2
68:14 69:3,16	permit 28:14,21	plans 57:19 59:22	81:18	<b>primary</b> 50:14 51:5
71:8 76:5,19 77:6	permits 31:15,16	plant 49:3 53:16	power 57:14 78:10	65:7 68:21
77:16,22 78:24	45:13,14,24	56:7	79:19,24,25 80:7	<b>prime</b> 54:11
80:2,5,12,22 81:3	permitted 24:11	platform 61:7	80:9 81:2	<b>prior</b> 33:3 39:4
81:25 83:22 84:20	33:3 51:10	<b>play</b> 30:23 45:21	practice 28:25	51:10 55:7,8
85:14 86:1,9,17	permitting 26:25	54:10 72:11	29:15	57:23 97:19
86:25 87:2,4,17	27:1,5 31:7,10,14	playing 60:7	precise 38:20	prioritizes 42:12
88:4,5,8,15 89:2,9	35:23,25 36:2,3	<b>please</b> 21:3 59:7	preferably 65:25	<b>private</b> 30:2,6,8
90:7,15,16,18	41:4 45:5,20 47:3	69:21 90:12 95:19	preference 26:2	probably 36:3
91:12,18,22 92:10	56:19	95:25	78:4	62:16 71:18
92:13,21 93:5,6	person 13:5	<b>PLLC</b> 6:9,20	preferred 19:6	problematic 83:4
93:24,25 94:1,6	personal 18:19	<b>point</b> 17:6 19:8	prefers 18:5	procedural 30:19
94:17 95:16,16	<b>persons</b> 24:4 36:15	24:1,4,7 40:9	prehearing 1:9 8:7	65:21 66:16,19
97:8,13	perspective 50:19	52:22 53:20 63:13	8:16 15:7 18:4,8	67:2 68:8 74:15
parties' 76:6	pertains 96:17	66:2,9,22 67:13	18:17 19:5 20:18	79:11 87:8 93:23
partner 11:10	<b>petition</b> 10:7 14:16	71:9 72:16 74:14	21:1 24:13 26:4,8	100:17
party 35:7 40:6	14:25 15:5,8,9,17	83:23 87:15 89:23	38:4 40:15,21	proceed 37:3
48:15 51:9 54:3	17:20,22,25 18:1	90:25 92:9,11	49:17 56:2,5,15	proceeding 13:17
55:18 68:13 82:9	18:3,4,7,21 19:4,9	98:14 99:9 100:7	57:24 65:19 78:23	16:24 28:4 30:13
84:7 85:4 88:7	20:1,22 24:17	points 27:7 32:15	79:1,14,15 85:9	30:14,25 32:19
92:15 95:18	26:7 28:1,24	33:9,15 76:19	85:17 87:16 88:9	38:11 40:3 41:11
path 89:20	34:14 37:4 38:2	82:3	88:15 94:5 95:13	44:1 45:7 47:7
pathway 68:1	40:11 41:23 43:18	<b>policy</b> 13:9 60:25	98:18 100:10	48:2,3,7,13,15
pay 36:21 44:14,15	44:11 49:5,11	73:11	preliminary 81:7	49:8 51:17,25
44:17	53:2 56:3,15,24	<b>popped</b> 14:17	<b>prepared</b> 24:7 25:2	52:1 54:18,22
<b>PC</b> 3:12 4:10 7:4	59:11,14,15 60:3	populations 67:23	36:10,11,23 68:18	56:15,24 57:1,5
pccseaef@atg.wa	61:3	<b>portal</b> 97:12	preparing 70:20	58:6 59:22 60:25
3:9	petitions 8:25	portion 55:6 56:22	<b>present</b> 16:4 32:3	61:7 95:25
peak 31:18,19	14:14,20 15:18	<b>portions</b> 28:22 31:4	46:15 55:19	proceedings 12:13
45:18,22 46:1	16:2,6 17:9 18:15	59:14	presentation 37:11	22:14 23:16 25:13
pending 77:13	19:15 38:19 57:9	<b>Portland</b> 3:13 6:5	38:22 40:23 56:9	28:12,13,14 29:17
78:13,14	64:5 65:13,14,16	7:6 14:5	presented 28:23	32:14,16 35:25
<b>people</b> 36:22 68:1	picture 68:3	<b>position</b> 13:8 17:16	77:12	36:2,4,4,9 37:14
73:2	<b>pieces</b> 69:13	22:4	presents 54:19	47:1,1 48:8,21
people's 82:23	pipe 55:7,8	positions 29:20	presiding 41:17	49:9 54:3 58:20
<b>Pepple</b> 7:3 12:17	pjanderson@per	68:14	97:14	67:20 77:15 92:10
12:18 13:22,23	2:23	possess 55:14	pressure 76:19	process 14:8 29:24
14:4,15 17:24	place 32:9 51:17	possible 15:15	pretty 62:11 63:10	32:8,12 39:11,14
18:2,12,23 19:13	58:10	28:12 42:22 43:5	68:20	45:16 47:23 48:9
64:11,12,19	placed 88:11	65:23 77:23 84:15	prevented 55:7	50:16 98:24
perfectly 13:12	placing 58:16	95:20	previous 25:5	processed 20:9
26:15	plan 14:25 38:13	possibly 89:12	previously 16:23	program 42:11
		1 <i>J</i>		
	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	<u> </u>	l	l	l
57:17	68:24 86:8 94:1	43:17 49:25 50:16	11:20,23,25 12:2	24:22,24 37:17
programs 44:17	95:14 99:24	51:5,22 52:5	15:24 16:1,16	45:4 47:11 57:10
<b>project</b> 3:16 9:25	provided 10:6	57:14 59:22 60:11	17:17 19:16 41:25	59:4 65:17 76:22
10:3,5 15:20 22:6	39:21 60:4 80:2	65:1 73:19,22	42:4,4,8,9,17	88:18 89:14
22:7,10,16 23:11	98:2	76:5,15 77:4	43:12 44:6 55:22	raising 98:4
24:25 25:4 27:20	provider 44:22	79:23	56:3 65:14	rarely 92:10
28:11 30:4,7 31:4	provides 77:19	<b>public</b> 3:2,5 9:12		rate 8:10 22:17
31:4,7,16,17	providing 30:4	9:15 16:25 17:8	Q	27:16 29:24 32:6
33:25 34:18,20	32:16 77:22	17:16 23:6 25:12	qualify 53:11	32:9,14 36:19,22
36:7,17 37:16	provision 52:9	27:13,22 28:7	question 22:19	39:13 45:3,9 46:4
40:19 45:2,8,12	provisions 94:19	29:22 30:1,5,8,9	23:20 24:24 25:10	46:7,11 47:5 49:7
45:17 46:5 50:20	prudence 31:22	31:21 32:5,21	26:24 28:17 29:25	53:13 55:2,8
50:22 53:5 54:17	34:17 53:23 55:3	33:6,16 34:13	34:21 37:8 47:11	57:14 59:22 62:5
56:8 82:5	55:10 75:25 76:1	35:1,3,6,9,10,12	48:25 51:20 53:23	62:7,10 63:14
projects 27:18	<b>prudency</b> 22:5,16	36:9 37:1,3,11,15	64:12,20 65:10	72:19 73:18,19
30:22 32:6 50:22	22:23 23:11,18	37:21 38:8 39:1	74:2 79:17 88:18	74:16,21 75:13,16
prominently 54:10	25:11 31:1,3,24	39:16,18 40:1,5	91:14,17 92:5	76:1 77:11 78:12
promote 61:5	32:6 33:1 34:1,7	40:24 42:7 44:6,8	96:10 100:8,14	78:14 97:21
<b>prompt</b> 30:12	36:14 37:3 41:2	44:21 46:14,21	questioning 22:9	rate-effective 74:12
promptly 35:24	45:2 46:16 47:8	48:13,18 52:13,14	33:25	74:25 80:1 81:19
<b>prongs</b> 46:18 50:6	53:18 56:21 62:20	53:1 54:1 55:12	<b>questions</b> 19:19,22	ratemaking 31:2
pronouns 8:13	<b>prudent</b> 46:11 47:4	55:17,18,22 59:17	22:3 24:15 25:3	60:5
proper 34:8	53:5,13,17	73:15 77:1,14	31:20,25 33:9	<b>ratepayer</b> 44:13,19
property 28:8	<b>pry</b> 18:19	78:2 82:7 97:22	36:1 37:7 42:3,8	ratepayers 36:20
<b>proposal</b> 65:1 69:1	<b>PSE</b> 8:11,19 16:8	<b>public's</b> 43:25	43:19 62:25 86:3	44:20 46:8,10
79:18	19:23,25 20:20	<b>Puget</b> 1:7 2:16 8:9	86:20 90:10,17	54:19 56:22 60:1
propose 69:6	21:12 22:25 25:5	8:11,21 34:16	92:15 94:13 99:5	62:9,23
proposed 25:25	25:17 29:12,18	44:13,15 46:23	100:15	rates 36:21 44:15
46:5 68:8,10 77:1	30:25 31:14,15,18	54:7 55:3 62:9	quick 76:24	44:25 53:6,11
79:11,13 81:14	32:22,24 35:23	78:10,15 97:21	quickly 62:11	59:24 75:23
83:9 85:23,25	42:6 45:4 46:19	<b>Puget's</b> 54:1 76:25	quite 20:6 74:4	<b>Raul</b> 5:8 11:12
87:8,24	47:11 49:24 50:10	78:4 97:24	quote 28:24 29:2,9	raul.martinez@k
propounded 87:20	50:24 51:2 59:9	<b>pull</b> 70:20	29:15 30:11 32:12	5:11
89:11	60:2,13,24 61:1	purchase 50:10	59:16,21 60:10	<b>RCW</b> 30:10 54:25
<b>Pros</b> 5:8	61:10,15 62:19	purpose 28:9	97:11,16	55:1
<b>Prosecuting</b> 11:11	65:17 68:12,19	purposes 19:11	quoted 32:10	reached 23:16
protection 59:17	70:5,6,10 71:21	52:1 60:22	quoting 31:17	reaching 75:22
94:19	73:19 74:13,17	<b>pursue</b> 31:11 32:3	R	react 74:23
protective 52:4	75:4,10,14,18	<b>push</b> 29:20		<b>read</b> 19:10 20:2,19
56:12 94:17,18,24	76:4 77:12 80:9	<b>pushed</b> 70:24 76:9	<b>R</b> 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	90:9,12
<b>prove</b> 62:20	81:6 84:11 89:15	<b>put</b> 37:15 66:24	6:1 7:1 8:4 101:1	<b>reading</b> 17:25 52:5
<b>provide</b> 19:20 25:9	92:9 96:9	80:8,22 83:23	radar 83:23	60:3
29:22 32:12,19	<b>PSE's</b> 15:25 21:22	84:19 100:13	raise 40:20 49:14	real 27:6 40:2
36:18 39:15,25	22:9 24:17 27:17	<b>putting</b> 69:14 84:12	66:3 83:22 86:4	60:13 67:25 73:12
40:4 44:21 46:9	28:21 37:9 40:14	Puyallup 6:2,4	97:17	76:19 77:10
			raised 17:11 22:14	
	•			·

really 26:23 29:25	referencing 27:5	remarkably 28:2	request 24:2,10	84:20 91:5
34:8 47:20,24	referred 18:20 49:1	remarks 68:22,25	35:13 55:23 58:1	<b>Respondent</b> 1:8
49:8 50:7 58:20	49:4 68:10	remediation 65:2	58:23 61:17 65:1	responding 8:24
70:2 74:25 78:24	referring 18:18	76:2	85:15 87:17,19	response 20:3,5,23
93:7,15	96:16 98:13	remind 67:18 94:17	88:6,6	22:10,25 24:16,19
<i>'</i>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, , ,
reason 97:17 98:4	refiling 94:25	repeated 50:20	requested 51:23	27:8 35:19 37:9
99:12	reflect 87:11	repeatedly 29:8	requests 61:15	50:3 63:18 70:14
reasonable 53:12	reflects 31:1	repeating 90:13	86:24 87:19 88:14	70:23 72:25 76:12
75:23	refreshing 18:13	repetitive 90:17,23	90:20 93:25 94:2	76:25 94:6,10
reasons 82:6	regard 36:25 44:24	reply 20:1,21,22	require 32:2 67:10	96:24
rebuttal 70:14,20	46:16 47:25	21:5,25 22:8	75:11	responses 19:24
70:23 73:1,24	regarding 17:10	26:23,24 27:2,2	required 28:25	25:2,17 87:25
76:12 79:24 81:17	25:6 28:20 36:14	30:15,19,19,20,24	33:6 51:12 61:23	88:6,14
96:23	47:18 53:9,24	31:13,20 40:14	78:16 91:3 93:24	responsibilities
recalling 96:22	55:20 57:14 64:20	46:24 70:9,9,10	93:25 96:11	23:6
receipt 97:19	87:15 89:15 93:20	70:25 71:23 74:13	requirement 38:9	rest 26:4,12
receive 94:6 95:24	regards 56:9	74:14,15,15,17,18	58:3,23 87:16,22	restriction 38:15
received 14:22	regular 41:13	74:25 75:4,5,14	88:8,14 96:16,18	result 57:7
15:18,25 21:12,13	regularly 32:5	75:16,20,24 76:5	96:21	results 29:2
79:11,12 81:25	regulating 56:20	76:6,11 78:1,3,4,8	requirements 24:9	return 79:6
97:20,23,24	regulator 41:5	78:11,14,15	34:22 45:20 95:10	review 14:18 28:1
recess 76:22 78:19	regulatory 67:20	REPORTED 1:25	98:6	62:13
79:5,10	73:9	Reporter 101:6	requires 82:12 95:9	reviewed 15:25
recognize 33:23	rehash 50:7	reports 29:13 39:15	97:11	21:22 49:25 98:12
recognized 54:16	reiterate 33:15	represent 13:13,16	reserve 71:3 90:24	reviews 45:13
recognizing 31:8	<b>rejected</b> 28:16 29:3	17:2 24:4 33:17	residential 17:2	<b>Richard</b> 6:20,20
89:13	29:6 33:4 51:11	35:11 36:14 37:21	27:12,15,24 32:17	12:12
recommendation	<b>relate</b> 36:19	39:18 54:4,8	33:18 35:8 44:9	<b>right</b> 10:14 12:21
37:10 51:24 52:6	related 55:7,9	representation	50:8 54:2	14:13 15:4 16:15
63:2	relatively 39:1	50:23 54:6	resolution 87:7	19:7 20:18 21:4,7
recommended 82:6	relevant 29:11	representations	<b>resolve</b> 71:10 89:19	21:20 23:19 24:14
82:14	47:13,19 53:20	35:1	92:21,25	25:15 26:17 37:25
recommending	55:19 58:2 60:18	representative	resolved 41:17	38:10 52:25 55:24
83:21	reliability 22:11	17:18 95:19	91:12	57:8 62:20 64:1
record 21:16 35:5	23:3 24:24 28:18	representatives	resources 31:21,24	64:22 65:9,12
63:13 77:23 79:5	reliable 60:1	29:10 95:23	35:1 37:3,14	71:6 72:13 73:4
81:23,25 82:4	relief 51:23 65:1	represented 26:21	60:16 70:20	76:10,20 81:14,20
97:4,23 98:23	relies 28:15	27:13 28:4 44:5	respect 16:22 22:5	83:14 85:6 86:22
recovered 34:2	religion 82:24	44:20 50:12 54:1	33:20 34:6 44:5	87:23 90:24 93:13
recovery 31:9	relitigate 30:15	81:18	61:21 99:17	94:15 96:22 97:2
34:17 55:4	47:2 51:3,18	representing 8:21	respectfully 61:15	100:16
recycled 28:16	53:21	10:12 11:17 12:13	respects 70:3	<b>ripe</b> 34:19 55:5
reference 61:24	relitigating 16:22	represents 23:22	respond 20:25 24:7	risk 60:13
referenced 28:24	remaining 65:15	27:23 35:10 53:25	26:18 42:5 43:17	<b>Rita</b> 4:3 10:12
29:4	84:8 91:22	54:1 55:2	43:20 62:1 81:22	rita.liotta@navy
	I	l	I	I

4:6	73:13,16,20,22	69:4 81:11 90:7	shorter 70:15	small 17:2 27:12,15
<b>Road</b> 3:18	74:8 76:15 77:2,5	Senate 60:12	<b>Shute</b> 3:21	27:24 32:17 33:18
<b>Roberson</b> 2:7 9:9	77:19 78:1 79:1	send 69:21 72:9	side 16:3 81:24	35:8 44:8 50:9
<b>Robert</b> 28:23	79:12,13,23 80:8	90:8,12	<b>sides</b> 79:4	54:2 55:6
<b>role</b> 30:21 31:8	80:21 81:1 82:6,8	Senior 11:11	Sierra 4:20,22 11:3	<b>Smith</b> 4:21 11:4,5
39:18 45:21 60:8	87:10 92:22	sense 41:9 58:5	11:5 15:21 16:9	62:2 63:4
61:11	100:17	<b>Sensible</b> 6:18 15:23	59:5,10,11,11,13	smohler@smxbl
<b>Room</b> 4:5	schedules 25:25	sensitive 52:19	59:15,20,21,24	4:13
<b>Rose</b> 1:25 101:6,14	68:10,24 69:2,4	sent 81:1 90:16	60:9,17,24 61:5,7	so-called 28:18
Rosh 82:15 83:18	70:2,17 71:10	96:1	61:10,14,17,21,25	29:7
roughly 42:1	81:14 85:25 87:9	sentence 32:1	62:3 63:2,22,25	<b>sole</b> 58:6
rounds 45:23	87:24 88:2 96:4	separation 39:17	64:3 65:17	<b>solely</b> 57:20
<b>RPR</b> 1:25 101:14	schedules' 96:8	September 65:25	<b>sign</b> 48:7,11	solution 92:1
rule 17:24 19:4	scheduling 19:12	65:25 70:7 72:5	signature 94:23	solutions 89:12
66:25	School 3:18	77:9 82:14 83:16	95:1	solved 47:22
rules 15:5 18:13	scope 16:10,24	83:17	signatures 86:11	somewhat 44:10
19:7 30:19 41:7	22:22 23:5,10	serve 93:24 95:16	<b>signed</b> 94:22	soon 15:1,15 20:12
41:10,21 57:5	33:20 34:4 47:1,7	95:17 98:6,7	significant 45:10	42:22 43:4 95:20
66:16,19,24 67:2	47:22 49:18 59:5	served 94:2 97:21	62:7 66:13	<b>sooner</b> 15:10
74:15 78:16 91:18	59:12 61:11 64:7	service 27:19 44:22	significantly 46:6	sophisticated 17:1
93:23 95:14	65:17 67:6 81:13	95:8,15,19 97:7,8	59:23	<b>sorry</b> 12:14 16:17
<b>ruling</b> 19:10 38:3	<b>Seattle</b> 3:7 4:7 5:5	98:5,9	<b>silent</b> 60:21	25:19 26:14 66:2
40:9 41:8 56:1,24	5:10,16 6:10,16	services 46:9 73:9	similar 28:2 38:11	71:12 72:8 84:5
91:24	6:22 10:15,18	set 92:23	38:12 51:2	<b>sort</b> 39:3,11 48:4
run 84:23	15:21	sets 36:5 42:10	similarly 61:15	52:18 58:23 71:6
running 72:19	<b>second</b> 4:22,23 5:9	setting 69:14	<b>Simon</b> 3:17 10:2	93:2
runs 60:13	6:21 30:20 70:13	settlement 70:19	67:12 86:5	<b>sorting</b> 75:21,22
	82:10 83:18	77:4 84:13,22	simon@ffitchlaw	<b>sought</b> 30:11 34:16
S	<b>Secondly</b> 28:6 60:9	seven 24:21 45:15	3:19	55:3
<b>S</b> 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	see 19:25 20:10	61:3	<b>simply</b> 18:24 19:1	<b>sound</b> 1:7 2:16 8:10
6:1 7:1 8:4	21:15 26:8 43:17	<b>share</b> 32:13 68:19	29:14 30:6 47:3	8:11,22 14:15
safe 81:24	49:21 51:22 54:25	<b>shared</b> 52:20 77:21	52:12 73:3 74:23	44:13,15 46:23
safety 41:4 56:20	62:17 63:12 67:1	88:6 97:8	74:23 78:8	sources 46:2 60:21
<b>Salt</b> 4:18	70:6 72:2 76:21	sharing 88:14	simultaneous 99:13	<b>South</b> 4:17
sample 23:1	77:2 80:5,13	<b>Shaun</b> 4:9 10:19	simultaneously	Southeast 1:15
San 3:22 4:5,23	84:16 87:24 88:2	<b>shaving</b> 45:19,22	98:6	<b>Southwest</b> 3:12 7:5
sandwiched 77:11	88:3 94:21 97:17	46:1	sit 91:25	14:4
saw 85:24 96:1	seeing 29:17	sheets 96:3,5,8	situation 37:2	<b>sovereign</b> 44:7,9,13
saying 20:15 58:5	seek 21:2,24 40:22	<b>Sheree</b> 2:17 8:21	situations 44:1	<b>space</b> 54:14 72:23
89:16	42:22 48:4 49:16	shipping 46:2	six 59:20 60:16	77:19
scarson@perkin	59:18 85:16	shone 34:5	70:17 73:23 76:11	speak 17:12 69:23
2:22	seeking 21:2,5	shopping 29:18	<b>skill</b> 101:9	83:7,19 86:25
schedule 41:19	seeks 59:21	<b>short</b> 21:19 62:12	skipping 93:10	special 48:17
56:25 65:22 68:8	seen 20:4 21:15	69:7	slight 78:9	specific 33:15
68:18 69:12,15	25:25 39:4 46:15	shortened 87:25	<b>slip</b> 98:25	35:11 41:3,19
70:17 72:6,9				

54:4,9 56:25	station 65:3	97:10	T-H-U-R-A-I-S-I	12:5,15,21 13:7
82:25 84:15,16	status 53:10 86:10	substance 85:8	13:6	13:11 15:14,16
87:11,14 91:9	statute 27:14 42:10	substantial 27:11	T-Y-L-E-R 13:23	17:5,14 19:13,14
93:16	42:13 54:24 67:9	28:3 43:24 44:3	table 91:2	20:16 21:17 25:15
specifically 22:4	96:19	44:24 45:18 46:12	<b>Tacoma</b> 6:6 45:2,7	26:10,13,16,19
40:18 54:12 56:10	statutory 41:14	46:20 55:21 77:12	49:2,7,18 56:6,21	33:10 34:12,15
60:20 61:12,19	54:3 56:25 75:9	substantive 36:23	tailored 33:1 51:8	35:16 37:6,25
65:5 77:17	Steel 4:7 10:15,18	successful 50:22	take 19:8 21:4	39:5 40:7 43:22
spectrum 49:9	15:21	sufficient 29:11	51:25 58:10 64:2	48:24 50:4 51:18
spelling 12:23	Steele 2:18 8:23,24	75:23	64:6 69:6,10,22	51:20 52:25 53:3
spend 23:7	16:7,8 20:11	suggest 15:10	71:4,7 76:22	55:23,24 57:18,22
Square 1:15	25:18 26:17,19	<b>suggested</b> 72:4 74:1	78:19 79:5 81:21	59:2,8 61:24 62:2
squarely 54:24	33:10 39:7,10	suggesting 31:14	96:2 98:14 100:5	63:20 64:1,9 66:6
staff 2:6 9:4,7 12:2	50:2,4 51:21	suggestion 30:24	taken 1:24 79:7	67:3 68:5 70:25
13:5 30:5 36:10	52:11 59:4,6,8	<b>Suite</b> 2:20 3:6,13	takes 98:22	76:20,23 78:17,18
68:13,16,18 70:8	64:2,9	4:5,17 5:5,9,16	talk 61:4	80:17 82:2 84:2
70:8,24 71:11	Steele's 63:2	6:10,15,21 7:5	talked 72:24	84:11 86:18 89:25
72:1,3,4,21 73:9	step 45:12 47:17	14:5	talking 68:7	92:6,19 94:11
73:11,16 76:19	<b>Stone</b> 4:10 10:17	sum 28:2 43:13	talks 26:24	95:4,4 97:1 98:9
77:19 80:8,11	10:20	<b>summer</b> 31:19	<b>tariff</b> 41:15	98:10 100:19
82:6,7 84:11	<b>stop</b> 31:7 50:19	Superior 28:13	tariffs 57:2	Thanks 71:1
95:24 98:23	83:15	supervisors 15:3	task 21:24	theories 28:16
<b>Staff's</b> 70:15 77:1	stranding 60:15	supplied 22:25	tcp@dvclaw.com	29:20 33:4 51:11
78:1 79:11,20	strategy 35:6	<b>support</b> 20:1,22	7:7	thing 20:12 57:23
88:1	<b>Street</b> 2:20 3:21	40:3 58:3,22 59:1	team 100:13	67:19 69:11 80:25
<b>stage</b> 81:17	4:10,17,22 6:15	77:8 82:5 95:23	technically 97:19	82:10 90:15 97:6
<b>stages</b> 37:14	strength 33:17	supports 55:22	<b>Teimouri</b> 2:9 9:10	things 48:3,22
stakeholders 41:12	stretched 76:16	supposed 81:17	telephone 99:7	69:17 72:11 73:14
73:10 74:10,23	strike 19:25 20:20	suppressed 31:19	tell 18:22	90:13 98:25
stand 36:24	21:12,21,23 28:22	sure 13:18 16:14	ten 72:18	think 15:3 17:3
standard 18:1	40:14 41:8	19:17 21:16 41:7	tend 92:24	19:3 21:22 23:5
27:11 30:9,17	<b>Strom</b> 2:17 8:21	47:19 66:5,23	terminal 46:2	25:11 26:23 27:5
53:12	strongly 27:20	77:16 84:5 86:18	terms 42:14,17	33:24 34:2,3,5
standpoint 31:11	32:22 77:8	92:23 93:8,12,19	77:2 85:22	37:2,21 38:1 39:1
<b>Starkey</b> 2:19 9:1	<b>subject</b> 40:12 41:24	99:2,11,19,21	territory 27:19	39:3,10,24 40:1,8
start 8:18 13:3	56:4 65:15 87:17	100:6,12	test 59:22	43:15 47:25 49:10
19:17 43:23 68:12	87:20 88:9	surrounding 33:1	testimony 23:12	51:5 52:11,16,22
starting 25:22	submission 99:23	50:17	36:19 63:10 70:14	55:25 58:17 63:5
starts 71:24	submissions 85:21	suspend 41:15	70:14,21,23 72:25	63:10 68:23 69:8
state 60:10 101:3,7	<b>submit</b> 39:14 42:17	95:10	73:4 96:12,13,18	69:9,19 70:15,18
stated 32:10	44:1	suspension 75:10	96:23,24 99:15	71:14,14,18,20,21
statement 88:22	submits 32:24	78:9,10	100:1,4	73:23 74:3 76:8
94:5	submitted 20:25	system 29:1	thank 9:3,11,18,23	77:21 78:21 79:3
states 31:23 59:21	91:8 97:11,15	T	10:8,14,21,22	80:5 82:7,11,16
stating 32:2	Subsection 55:1	$\frac{1}{T \cdot 101:1,1}$	11:2,4,6,13,19	83:17 84:12 89:18
		1 101.1,1		

	Ī		Ī	i
91:13 92:4 94:4	52:2 65:22 79:15	<b>truly</b> 78:6	100:6	vbaldwin@parso
98:11 99:16	84:8 85:20 95:3	<b>try</b> 50:19 67:25	understood 99:21	4:19
<b>thinking</b> 74:6 89:5	97:4	<b>trying</b> 58:17 67:19	undoubtedly 62:3	verbal 12:7 14:11
<b>Third</b> 5:15 30:10	today's 85:17	72:9	unfamiliarity	16:5 38:3 40:9
<b>Thomas</b> 4:10 6:8	top 58:1 77:11	turn 13:20 14:13	58:19	56:1
12:3	93:22	16:15 17:17 19:15	Unfortunately	<b>Verna</b> 5:7 11:11
thoughts 63:1 71:5	topic 57:25	19:23 25:16,17	77:25	verna.bromley@
thousands 27:17	total 15:18	27:7 42:6 73:3	uniformly 78:12	5:11
<b>three</b> 15:6 18:6,16	touch 85:7,10	two 19:15 25:22,25	<b>unique</b> 54:19 55:14	versus 8:9 34:7
25:1 90:17 99:25	94:16	33:15,20 34:3	<b>Unit</b> 3:5	<b>vested</b> 53:14
three-day 19:6	<b>Tower</b> 4:11	46:18 56:11 65:24	unnecessary 48:16	Vicki 4:16 10:25
three-year 59:22	track 63:12 72:20	70:22 71:9,20	unreasonable 57:6	25:20
Thuraisingham	transcript 101:8	72:3,17,19 73:5	unredacted 99:15	videoconference
6:14 12:9,10 13:3	Transformation	74:6 75:13 77:10	100:1	1:18
13:4,6,9,18 15:1	23:24 42:15 43:8	81:13 82:20 95:2	unsubstantiated	view 34:23 53:22
15:14 67:1	60:12	98:19 99:20	34:25	VIRTUAL 1:9
tied 61:1 82:8	transmission 24:21	<b>Tyler</b> 7:3 12:18	unsuccessfully	virtually 28:17
tight 76:16,17	34:18 36:7 40:18	13:23	28:11	77:14
time 15:3,13 16:12	Transportation 1:2	type 48:7 52:10	unwieldy 66:21	vitae 23:1
17:11 20:11,25	1:4,15 8:9	54:20	update 79:24 80:1	voice 54:19 55:14
23:7 28:10 34:11	treat 48:14	types 42:24 50:13	80:7,20 81:3,13	voiced 29:10
34:16 44:16,16	treated 80:13	51:16 67:8	updated 80:9	<b>VOLUME</b> 1:10
47:3 55:3,9 58:16	treatment 48:17	typically 31:3	<b>updating</b> 79:19	vs 1:6
62:12,19 63:12	trial 41:13	74:18	urges 35:25	vulnerable 23:22
65:10 69:10 70:13	tribal 49:12,14,21	U	USC 43:11	42:12 67:23
70:20,23 71:25	54:6 55:11	U-210595 85:13	use 8:12 22:13	
72:25 73:21 74:7	tribe 6:2,4 11:21,24	UE-190334 27:25	24:22 28:13,14,21	$\overline{\mathbf{W}}$ 3:3
78:1,6,8 79:24	11:25 12:3 15:24	UE-220066 1:3 8:7	29:19 33:3 36:4	<b>WAC</b> 18:14 93:24
83:3 85:17 86:21	16:16 17:17 19:16 41:25 42:9,17,21	UG-190335 27:25	36:16 48:2,17 51:10 52:1 60:21	97:10
87:25 89:1,2,22	, ,	UG-220067 1:4 8:8		wait 91:8,13 92:25
90:21,25 97:15,19 timeframe 87:3	43:12,24 44:2,3,6 46:25 48:14,14	ultimately 53:17	60:25 87:1 94:23 useful 25:9 93:8	waiting 16:18
timeline 77:14	49:2,3 50:8,14,17	77:21	Utah 4:18	waive 75:10,12
timely 25:23 97:7,8	50:18 51:24 53:6	unable 72:1,4	UTC 62:7 72:15	96:20,20
98:9	53:14,25 54:19,20	unacceptable 70:16	utilities 1:2,3,15	waiving 100:3
times 63:7 72:21	54:24 55:13,17,19	understand 18:5	8:9 72:17 74:22	<b>Wallace</b> 6:9 12:4
75:25 98:22,24	56:8,12,13,17	21:19 25:24 48:6	utility 44:15 75:15	Walmart 4:15
timestamps 98:13	Tribe's 16:1 42:4,4	48:9,20 52:15	utilize 44:16	10:23 11:1 15:21
to-be-determined	42:9 47:15 49:13	80:3,23 83:5		25:21
87:12	51:6 53:10,19	88:24 91:6 97:18	V	Walmart's 26:7
today 8:7,17,23	55:5,23 56:3,5,10	99:19	<b>valid</b> 79:4 98:11	want 17:18,24
12:7 16:6 18:11	65:14	understandable	valuable 34:24	18:19 19:10,16,19
19:11 24:15 32:22	<b>tried</b> 71:19	20:20	35:16 54:18,20	19:22 30:6 35:5
33:21 34:5 46:16	trouble 71:13	understanding	Van 3:12 7:4 9:21	38:24 39:12,15
47:13 49:1 50:3	<b>true</b> 71:18 101:8	18:3,7 19:3 45:17	12:19 64:17	40:25 42:3 46:24
		91:10 97:9 100:3	<b>various</b> 37:17 61:4	48:20 49:3,19
	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	ı

		I	I	
53:24 57:11 58:10	93:9,25	61:17 72:1,5,20	<b>1:28</b> 97:24	<b>206-487-4303</b> 6:16
58:15 59:13 63:23	we've 22:25 23:16	73:17 74:12 77:4	<b>1025</b> 4:10	<b>206-623-7580</b> 5:6
64:10 66:9,10,10	24:1,3 25:25 39:4	77:6 87:5 91:19	<b>10885</b> 2:20	<b>206-625-9515</b> 6:22
66:14,18 67:18	48:6,7 50:3 57:23	91:22 92:13	<b>11</b> 15:18 78:20	<b>206-669-8197</b> 3:19
70:4 71:5 73:10	62:6 63:6 65:12	workable 39:2,5	<b>11:13</b> 79:7	<b>20th</b> 84:18 85:2
74:5,13,25 76:10	70:16 73:24,25	41:11	<b>11:25</b> 78:20 79:6,8	<b>21036100</b> 1:25
78:23,24 81:7	77:25 87:1 93:4	worked 63:6 89:12	79:9	101:14
82:22 83:22,23	93:21 94:2	92:9	<b>11:56</b> 100:20	<b>22nd</b> 94:21
85:10 86:25 87:14	web 97:12	working 73:7	<b>1151</b> 43:11	<b>23</b> 55:1
90:24 91:4 93:21	website 52:15	world 67:20	<b>1191</b> 5:9	<b>25,000</b> 62:8
94:6 97:7 99:19	week 18:10,11,25	wouldn't 33:13	<b>11th</b> 84:17,24	<b>250</b> 6:15
99:24 100:12	19:1 73:18 86:13	63:23 92:25	<b>1300</b> 6:21	<b>253-573-7852</b> 6:6
wanted 16:12 21:16	94:21 96:6	writing 14:22	<b>13th</b> 85:24	<b>26th</b> 83:17
26:20 27:7 38:7,8	weeks 23:15 70:15	written 15:25 17:20	<b>14</b> 85:20	<b>27th</b> 65:25 72:5
38:14 66:22 68:4	70:18 73:23 76:11	18:6,15 32:11,19	<b>14th</b> 77:4 85:19	77:10
80:25 82:3,4,10	Weinberger 3:21	39:13 40:5 50:1	<b>15-minute</b> 78:19	<b>28</b> 1:24 8:1
83:20 84:11,14,19	well-positioned	51:22 85:21	<b>1501</b> 6:15	<b>28th</b> 65:25 72:5
86:8 88:24 94:16	25:9	<b>Wrolson</b> 6:4 12:1	<b>15th</b> 84:17,24	77:10
99:21 100:12	went 75:19	wrong 31:3 46:22	<b>161</b> 4:5	<b>2900</b> 5:5
wanting 61:4	weren't 35:23	WUTC 48:8	<b>1700</b> 5:9	<b>2C</b> 97:10
wants 74:13	46:21		<b>1750</b> 3:12 7:5 14:4	
Washington 1:1,3	<b>West</b> 4:11	<u>X</u>	<b>18</b> 43:11	3
1:15,16 2:11,21	<b>Western</b> 3:10 9:22	Xenopoulos 4:8,10	<b>1800</b> 4:17	<b>30</b> 85:24
3:5,7,18 4:11 5:5	whichever 18:17	10:16,17,17,20	<b>18th</b> 84:17 85:2	<b>3009</b> 6:5
5:10,16 6:6,10,16	wholeheartedly	<u> </u>	<b>19.405.020</b> 54:25	<b>31st</b> 78:7 97:22
6:22 8:1,8 44:7	67:15	yeah 18:12,24	<b>1A</b> 18:14	<b>321</b> 3:18
101:3,7	wholly 36:4	26:11 67:4 69:9		<b>34.05.443</b> 30:10
Washington's	<b>willing</b> 30:23 75:10	100:14	2	<b>3500</b> 6:10
60:11,14	75:12 80:2,5	years 24:21 45:15	<b>20</b> 75:24	<b>360-664-1186</b> 2:12
wasn't 38:9,14 66:7	<b>window</b> 19:6 84:15	50:16,18 72:15	<b>2000</b> 3:6	<b>396</b> 3:21
84:5	<b>winter</b> 31:18	Yochi 3:20 10:5	<b>20007</b> 4:11	<b>3rd</b> 77:9 83:9
way 3:12 7:5 14:5	wish 14:11 23:21	Yom 82:17 83:6	<b>201</b> 4:17	4
43:2,17 45:14	32:18 84:7 85:4	vzakai@smwlaw	<b>2014</b> 28:7	40128 2:11
47:17 62:20 63:24	wishes 40:19 56:13	3:23	<b>2015</b> 46:16	<b>40126</b> 2:11 <b>415-552-7272</b> 3:22
71:23 73:13,16	witness 35:7	3.23	<b>2016</b> 46:16	<b>415-977-5532</b> 4:24
74:12 76:8 96:8	witnesses 23:2,2	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	<b>2017</b> 25:8	<b>415-977-5532</b> 4:24 <b>425-635-1400</b> 2:21
we'll 15:15 40:15	25:1 37:24 77:15	<b>Zakai</b> 3:20 10:5	<b>2019</b> 27:24 70:16	<b>425-035-1400</b> 2:21 <b>450</b> 3:13 7:5 14:5
76:22 95:3	82:21 83:22	<b>Zero</b> 75:25	75:19	<b>480-07-355</b> 18:14
we're 8:6 13:18	wondered 89:5		<b>202-342-0800</b> 4:12	<b>480-07-365</b> 97:10
23:7 24:11 41:10	wondering 58:21	0	<b>2022</b> 1:24 8:1 85:19	<b>480-07-405</b> 93:24
55:9 63:11 67:19	58:22 79:20	<b>02</b> 56:13	85:24 97:22	4th 72:22 77:9 83:9
68:17,20 71:4,14	Woodland 1:15		101:17	83:11
71:21 72:12 73:20	word 62:16	1	206-343-7340 5:17	05.11
79:9 80:10 90:13	words 30:7	1 4:4	206-447-7000 6:11	5
90:21,22 92:11	work 24:23 26:1	<b>1-101</b> 1:11	206-464-65953:7	<b>5:00</b> 83:10,15 97:19
			<b>206-477-1097</b> 5:10	

				Page 120
	I	1	I	ı
97:20,22 98:3,5,9	<b>98404</b> 6:6			
<b>5:06</b> 97:25	<b>98503</b> 1:16			
<b>5:20</b> 97:25	<b>98504</b> 2:11			
<b>5:26</b> 98:1				
<b>503-241-7242</b> 7:6				
<b>5295</b> 60:12				
6				
<b>6</b> 101:17				
<b>60</b> 80:1 81:19				
<b>60-day</b> 80:7,20				
<b>610</b> 5:16				
<b>621</b> 1:15				
7				
<b>700</b> 2:20				
<b>705</b> 6:21				
8				
<b>8:49</b> 20:7				
<b>80.28.430</b> 55:1				
<b>800</b> 3:6				
<b>801-536-6918</b> 4:18				
<b>810</b> 5:15				
<b>84111</b> 4:18				
<b>85</b> 4:22				
<b>8F</b> 4:5				
<b>8th</b> 4:11				
9				
<b>9:26</b> 8:2				
<b>9:34</b> 21:14				
<b>901</b> 6:9				
<b>925</b> 5:4				
<b>94102</b> 3:22				
<b>94105</b> 4:23				
<b>94130</b> 4:5				
<b>971-710-1157</b> 3:14				
<b>97201</b> 3:13 7:6 14:5				
<b>98004</b> 2:21				
<b>98101</b> 5:10				
<b>98104</b> 3:7 5:5,16				
6:22				
<b>98110</b> 3:18				
<b>98122</b> 6:16				
<b>98164</b> 6:10				