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1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; FEBRUARY 13, 2017

2 9:30 A.M.

3 --o0o--

4 P R O C E E D I N G S

5

6 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Let's get started.

7 Good morning, everybody. My name is Dennis Moss and

8 sitting next to me is Rayne Pearson. We are

9 administrative law judges with the Washington Utilities

10 and Transportation Commission, and we are convened here

11 today, and if I can remember, Dockets UE-170033 and

12 UG-170034, which is PSE's 2017 general rate case

13 following on the heels of a several-year hiatus in rate

14 cases under the great plan we approved -- what year was

15 that, 2013? I believe so.

16 MS. CARSON: Yes.

17 JUDGE MOSS: Memory has not failed me yet.

18 All right. Well, Judge Pearson and I will

19 be co-presiding in this proceeding, and indeed, after

20 appearances this morning, I'm going to turn the floor

21 over to her to take up the petitions to intervene with

22 one exception, or three exceptions actually, I'm going

23 to have a few things to say to the Sierra Club, the

24 State of Montana, and Invenergy. Other than those

25 three, I don't feel any particular need to say anything.
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1 And, of course, we will find out momentarily whether

2 there are any objections.

3 But the first order of business will be to

4 take appearances and we'll start with the Company.

5 MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honors.

6 Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie representing Puget

7 Sound Energy. Also, Jason Kuzma and Donna Barnett have

8 appeared in this case, although they are not here today.

9 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

10 Mr. ffitch.

11 MR. FFITCH: Good morning, Your Honor.

12 Simon ffitch representing the Energy Project. Would you

13 like the full appearance?

14 JUDGE MOSS: No, thanks, as long as you give

15 the court reporter all the information. I think -- in

16 fact, in this case, I'm happy to say that almost -- I

17 believe everyone who's intending to intervene has filed

18 a petition, and we've had notices of appearances. So

19 we've got a pretty full set of information, which is

20 very helpful. Thank you all for that. And we'll just

21 go around the room in this direction and then we'll pick

22 up over here, and don't let me forget, and then we will

23 take anybody who is on the phone.

24 So go ahead.

25 MR. MORAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Brian
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1 Moran with Orrick, Herrington representing the State of

2 Montana.

3 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Mr. Moran, welcome.

4 MS. GOODIN: Good morning, Your Honors.

5 Amanda Goodin with Earth Justice representing the

6 Northwest Energy Coalition, Renewable Northwest, and

7 Natural Resources Defense Council.

8 JUDGE MOSS: Nice to see you again,

9 Ms. Goodin.

10 MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken,

11 assistant attorney general.

12 JUDGE MOSS: Is your mic on?

13 MS. GAFKEN: It should be, but I might not

14 be close enough.

15 JUDGE MOSS: There you go.

16 MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken,

17 assistant attorney general with Public Counsel, and also

18 appearing in this case with me is Armikka Bryant, who is

19 also an assistant attorney general.

20 JUDGE MOSS: Welcome. This is your first

21 appearance before the Commission, I believe?

22 MR. BRYANT: No, it's not.

23 JUDGE MOSS: It's not? Okay. Well, it's

24 your first before me. There you go. Welcome, in any

25 event.
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1 MR. BRYANT: Thank you.

2 MS. BROWN: Sally Brown, senior assistant

3 attorney general appearing on behalf of Commission

4 Staff.

5 MR. SHEARER: And Brett Shearer, assistant

6 attorney general appearing on behalf of Commission Staff

7 and assistant attorney generals, Jennifer

8 Cameron-Rulkowski, Jeff Roberson, Andrew O'Connell, and

9 Chris Casey have also filed appearances in this case,

10 Your Honor.

11 JUDGE MOSS: All right. And you will all be

12 active in the case?

13 MR. SHEARER: Yes, to varying extents.

14 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you very

15 much.

16 All right. Let's shift over to the other

17 side of the room here.

18 MR. ALLAN: Good morning, Your Honor.

19 Richard Allan of Marten Law representing Invenergy, LLC.

20 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. Allan, welcome. Is this

21 your first time before the Commission?

22 MR. ALLAN: Yes, it is.

23 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Welcome.

24 MR. PEPPLE: Good morning. Tyler Pepple,

25 attorney for the Industrial Customers of Northwest
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1 Utilities.

2 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Thank you.

3 Now, do we have counsel on the telephone who

4 wish to enter appearances today? I think there are

5 several, actually, who indicated they would be calling

6 in. Do we have counsel for Kroger? How about Nucor

7 Steel? Mr. Xenopolous, are you there?

8 MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Your Honor. This is

9 Damon Xenopolous from Nucor Steel.

10 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you. I don't

11 know that you'll have any speaking role today, but I'll

12 tell you that you came through very faintly just now. I

13 believe the court reporter was able to get your name.

14 I'll check the spelling with her later. So if you do

15 speak again, Mr. Xenopolous, speak up a little bit.

16 Let's see, I don't think I heard -- we

17 didn't hear anything from Cost Management Services. Do

18 we have a representative from Cost Management?

19 Apparently not. They filed a petition.

20 Lets see, Mr. -- no, that's not right.

21 Mr. Ritchie was going to appear by phone, I think. Are

22 you on the phone?

23 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Your Honor. This is

24 Travis Ritchie with the Sierra Club.

25 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Welcome.
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1 And let's see. All right. I'll just ask at

2 this point whether I'm missing anybody else who I didn't

3 name.

4 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, Your Honor --

5 MR. BROOKS: Good morning, Your Honor --

6 (Inaudible.)

7 JUDGE MOSS: All right. The two of you were

8 speaking at the same time. Mr. Brooks, I'll let you go

9 first for the Northwest Industrial Gas Users.

10 MR. BROOKS: Thank you. Yes, this is Tommy

11 Brooks and I am on the line.

12 JUDGE MOSS: All right. And, Ms. Liotta, if

13 you would go ahead and enter your appearance for the

14 FEA.

15 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning.

16 This is Rita Liotta with the Federal Executive Agencies.

17 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you and welcome.

18 MS. LIOTTA: Thank you.

19 JUDGE MOSS: Any others?

20 All right. That will complete our

21 appearances, then, and we will move on to the business

22 of the day, and I will turn the floor over to Judge

23 Pearson at this point.

24 JUDGE PEARSON: Good morning. So with

25 respect to the petitions for intervention, are there any
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1 objections to the petitions for intervention filed by

2 those parties other than the three that Judge Moss

3 referenced in his opening remarks?

4 MS. CARSON: Your Honor, the three that were

5 referenced I believe are the State of Montana, Sierra

6 Club, and Invenergy; is that correct?

7 JUDGE PEARSON: Correct.

8 MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the

9 others, we do have one caveat. I talked with Ms. Amanda

10 Goodin from -- who is representing three different

11 entities, and PSE's concern was that we seem to have a

12 lot of different groups with similar interests, these

13 three as well as Sierra Club, all with environmental

14 focus and interest on coal strip. And so I clarified

15 that, with respect to those three intervenors, they will

16 collaborate, coordinate their argument, their

17 cross-examination, their testimony so that it will --

18 will be as one as opposed to three different sets of

19 testimony and argument.

20 Our concern is that it can become burdensome

21 and duplicative, and I guess we would be interested in

22 the Commission's, you know, input as to at what point in

23 time these interests are represented and, you know, how

24 many different groups might be allowed to intervene to

25 represent various environmental interests.
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1 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Did I understand

2 you to say, then, that you were talking to the Sierra

3 Club in terms of its representation being somehow joined

4 with NWC and RBC and Renewables Northwest or just those

5 three I just mentioned?

6 MS. CARSON: Just those three. I just

7 wanted to clarify that there's agreement that those

8 three will be coordinated throughout the process.

9 JUDGE MOSS: And I understood that by the

10 joint petition to intervene so...

11 MS. GOODIN: Yes, Your Honor. We are

12 planning to coordinate throughout with a single set of

13 briefs, single set of cross-examination. So there's no

14 issue there.

15 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. I always appreciate

16 you saving us 120 pages.

17 MS. GOODIN: Yes, we will do what we can.

18 MS. CARSON: So with that caveat, then, we

19 have no objection to the remainder of intervenors other

20 than the three that you mentioned.

21 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

22 Ms. Gafken.

23 MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel has no objection

24 to the petitions entered and the three that were

25 mentioned.
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1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

2 MS. BROWN: Neither does Commission Staff,

3 although we would appreciate the coordination of both

4 parties.

5 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.

6 So hearing no objections to the petitions,

7 we will grant those petitions to intervene. As Judge

8 Moss said, it was our understanding that those three

9 parties would be acting as one in this proceeding.

10 MS. GOODIN: Yes.

11 JUDGE MOSS: All right. With that, let us

12 take up the three, and I'm singling you three out

13 because of your special status given your interests

14 that's stated in your petitions and wanted to speak to

15 you. And I'll first ascertain whether there is any

16 objections, in fact, to Sierra Club?

17 MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE has tried to

18 work with Sierra Club for a limited intervention. We

19 don't object to Sierra Club intervening with respect to

20 coal strip issues that the Commission can address as an

21 economic regulator. And that's a similar limitation to

22 what the -- what was agreed to in the 2011 general rate

23 case. So if there is agreement on that, then we do not

24 object to the Sierra Club's intervention.

25 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. Ritchie?
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1 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Your Honor.

2 JUDGE MOSS: Did you hear that?

3 MR. RITCHIE: I did hear that, and I did

4 speak with counsel for PSE. Sierra Club's intention

5 with this rate case is to address only issues that are

6 within the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction, and

7 so I am -- I'm fine agreeing to that. We understand the

8 Commission's role as an economic regulator. I

9 personally have represented Sierra Club before. Many

10 public utility commissions across the West including the

11 UTC, most recently in PacifiCorp's general rate case

12 from last year, and so we're very well versed how those

13 issues relate to each other.

14 There's the one concern I think I maybe have

15 in trying to narrow Sierra Club's potential list of

16 issues ahead of time is that even within that limitation

17 of the Commission's jurisdiction on economic issues,

18 there are several potential issues that may come up that

19 we've just not fully analyzed with our expert yet to

20 know where that may end. Our primary interest here is

21 certainly coal strip. The coal strip plan both with

22 regard to units one and two as well as the depreciation

23 schedule for units three and four. But we also plan on

24 looking at issues related to revenue requirement,

25 impacts that could result from replacement power, and
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1 potentially also revenue requirement impacts that could

2 result from plans for cleanup and site remediation at

3 the coal strip area.

4 So, you know, we are not looking to go on a

5 sprawling mission here, but we do want to be able to

6 have the opportunity to address those issues that are

7 related to both environmental issues that impact revenue

8 requirement within the Commission's jurisdiction.

9 JUDGE MOSS: Well, I'm not sure those are

10 going to be issues in this proceeding. We can talk

11 about that a little bit, but all we have before us in

12 terms of coal strip in this case is some talk about

13 plans for the future. We won't be talking about

14 replacement power being a part of the Company's power

15 cost in this case, I don't think. So I'm not sure. It

16 seems to me that the proper forum for discussing issues

17 related to the future shifts in power cost requirements

18 that may eventuate assuming coal strips one and two are

19 closed or other developments take place in the

20 environment, is a matter, at this juncture at least, it

21 would be taken up in the integrated resource planning

22 process, which I imagine Sierra Club participates in as

23 well.

24 So let me -- let me hear from Ms. Carson on

25 this.
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1 MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE agrees with

2 that. The replacement power is not an issue in this

3 case, and we agree that is more appropriately addressed

4 in IRP.

5 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Anybody else want to be

6 heard on the Sierra Club at this juncture? Apparently

7 not.

8 All right. Well, I am inclined,

9 Mr. Ritchie, to state at the outset here that I -- my

10 understanding has been all along, and it's consistent

11 with your petition, that the Sierra Club's interest, as

12 you said, your primary interest certainly is coal strip,

13 and we do believe the Sierra Club will contribute to our

14 hearing process with respect to that issue.

15 With that idea in mind, I just -- I'm not

16 going to set any specific limits on you at this juncture

17 other than to say I'm expecting your focus to remain on

18 that issue and issues that are directly implicated by

19 it. And, again, I don't think replacement power is

20 going to be an issue in this case. There may be others

21 that I'm not anticipating at this juncture.

22 So as I say, I'm not going to impose some

23 sort of an arbitrary limit on you in terms of an issue

24 that might arise that's directly related to the coal

25 strip discussions that we'll be having through testimony
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1 and otherwise. But I think you're comfortable with the

2 idea that that is the focus of your participation in

3 this case, are you not?

4 MR. RITCHIE: I am, Your Honor, yes. And to

5 the extent that -- that I appreciate not putting any --

6 any limits on ahead of time to the extent that we see

7 something, we will be sure to address why we believe

8 it's within the scope and appropriate to address in this

9 rate case. Fully understanding the difference between a

10 rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think

11 that works for us, sir.

12 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good.

13 All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State

14 of Montana?

15 MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel

16 for State of Montana limited intervention for the State

17 of Montana. We did have concerns. We do have concerns

18 that there's not a substantial interest here that the

19 Commission is authorized to address in terms of the

20 effect of the closing of coal strip on Montana

21 residents. But that being said, PSE is willing to agree

22 to a limited intervention by Montana to address again

23 coal strip issues that the Commission as an economic

24 regulator may address. And we did reach agreement with

25 counsel for the State of Montana to limit their
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1 intervention accordingly. So with that limitation, PSE

2 does not object.

3 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Any other objections to

4 the State of Montana?

5 MS. BROWN: This is Sally Brown for

6 Commission Staff. I just want to make my record that I

7 think it's abundantly clear that the Commission's

8 regulatory jurisdiction does not extend to Montana or

9 the State of Montana. So as you well know, I mean, the

10 Commission's statutory obligation is to regulate in the

11 public interest as provided by the public service laws

12 and the regulated utilities and that impact the rate

13 payers of the State of Washington, not any other state

14 in the union.

15 Having said that, the Commission Staff is

16 not going to object to the State of Montana's limited

17 intervention in this proceeding, although I would like

18 to have a commitment from Montana's representative on

19 the record today that it does not intend to broaden

20 issues or impair the orderly and prompt conduct of the

21 proceedings in this case.

22 JUDGE MOSS: We can have that next unless

23 somebody else wants to be heard on the State of Montana.

24 Ms. Gafken, do you have a word?

25 MS. GAFKEN: I do have a word. I do agree
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1 with the points that Ms. Brown brought up and also

2 Ms. Carson with respect to the limits that the

3 Commission has in terms of what they can address and the

4 substantial interest that Montana presented in their

5 petition. I guess one thing I want to know is of course

6 the Commission has a great deal of discretion in terms

7 of whether they grant a petition for intervention, and

8 the Commission does tend to view the standards broadly.

9 So I recognize that, but I would also stress that there

10 can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a

11 case where limits would be appropriate.

12 So Public Counsel does have some concerns

13 that Montana does not meet the standards for

14 intervention either under the public interest prong or

15 the substantial interest prong. But understanding that

16 the Commission does have wide latitude there.

17 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

18 Anybody else want to be heard on this?

19 All right. Let's hear from the State of

20 Montana.

21 MR. MORAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Brian

22 Moran for the State of the Montana. We certainly don't

23 intend to bring this to a disorderly or inefficient

24 process, so we take counsel's cautions to heart and will

25 certainly play by those rules. The Commission does have
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1 broad discretion. You know, there are decommissioning

2 and remediation issues. They're more direct, less

3 tangential. We certainly understand the limits of the

4 regulatory body's authority on Montana residents, but we

5 do think with the discretion that Montana does have a

6 dog in this fight, to be colloquial, and we ask that you

7 use your authority to grant us the limited intervention

8 as outlined by Ms. Carson.

9 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Well, with the

10 exception to the fact that I don't like your colloquy

11 because I don't like to think of this as a dog fight,

12 rather I'd like to think of it as a concerted

13 professional effort to address the issues that are

14 before us. And I think that you used the right word at

15 the same time which is say cautions, both with respect

16 to the Sierra Club and also with respect to the State of

17 Montana.

18 That was my purpose in speaking to you all

19 today was to say I do want you to be cautious as you

20 proceed and to understand that there are procedural --

21 and I know you know this -- but there are procedural

22 devices that other parties may use if they feel that you

23 are straying into territories where you should not

24 stray. And, of course, we will be careful to maintain

25 good order in the proceeding and keep people within the
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1 bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any --

2 any disruptive activities.

3 I don't anticipate that at all. I just

4 think it's important at our first prehearing conference

5 to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would.

6 And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had

7 this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and

8 everybody seems to be on the same page.

9 That's right, Your Honor.

10 MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor.

11 JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted

12 there. Thank you very much.

13 And then last we have Invenergy, and I do --

14 oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody

15 made a comment about the substantial interest and the

16 public interest. I do agree that there is not a -- the

17 State can't -- would have a very difficult time

18 exhibiting a substantial interest in the proceeding

19 being a foreign entity as it were. But I think we did

20 talk about this internally, and I think the public

21 interest will be served by Montana's participation so --

22 and also, of course, by the public interest groups such

23 as the Sierra Club and the others who are participating.

24 So I did want to say that.

25 Now I will turn to Invenergy. I think we
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1 have here a certain difference in terms of your status.

2 You are an independent power producer as I understand

3 it, and your interest in the proceeding as I read

4 through the lines of your petition is basically that

5 maybe you would like to sell some power or a power plant

6 or something like that to PSE some point in the future

7 when they have to replace power from a facility such as

8 coal strip that they may shut down at some point in the

9 future.

10 So having said that and also that -- that I

11 don't see a particular public interest prong here, I

12 want to give you an opportunity to convince me that

13 there is something more to -- that meets this eye here,

14 and we'll also hear from counsel with whether there are

15 any objections. But I want to give you a chance as a

16 petitioner to speak first.

17 MR. ALLAN: Yes, Your Honor. I appreciate

18 it. Richard Allan for Invenergy. To clarify, Invenergy

19 also is a customer of PSE. Invenergy purchases

20 electricity from PSE at its vantage substation. So we

21 are -- we aren't simply a generator or an independent

22 power producer. We are also a customer of PSE that

23 could conceivably be impacted by whatever the economic

24 outcome is from decisions that are made with respect to

25 coal strip one and two.
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1 That said, we also are -- feel we do have an

2 interest in understanding and making sure that

3 assumptions with respect to retirement and

4 decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are

5 accurate because they ultimately -- and decisions that

6 are made with respect to that -- that facility

7 ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and

8 generating assets.

9 JUDGE MOSS: Or may.

10 MR. ALLAN: May.

11 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status

12 as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually

13 use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own

14 business?

15 MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on

16 that.

17 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's

18 hear from the Company and see if we have any objection

19 first from the Company and then we'll ask the other

20 parties.

21 MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE does object to

22 Invenergy's intervention. The intervention was just

23 filed Friday afternoon. We did not file any

24 counterresponse, but we do have concerns that Invenergy

25 has not demonstrated a substantial interest. It's not
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1 clear to me what type of a customer Invenergy is and

2 maybe takes power -- may be out of the open-access

3 transmission tariff may relate, but it's not clear to

4 me. That wasn't really mentioned in their petition to

5 intervene.

6 We do have concerns that the substantial

7 interest goes to PSE's customers and independent power

8 producers who want to sell power to PSE, that they are

9 not regulated by the Commission. There is not an

10 interest that the Commission is authorized to consider

11 under the substantial interest test based on prior

12 Commission decisions and court decisions.

13 So we do have concerns about this. As Your

14 Honor previously noted, replacement power is not an

15 issue in this case so -- and even when it is, we don't

16 typically have independent power providers who intervene

17 in the cases. So we do object to this intervention.

18 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Does anybody else

19 want to be heard on this?

20 Ms. Gafken.

21 MS. GAFKEN: I'll just weigh in briefly. In

22 looking at the -- first of all, I will start with Public

23 Counsel has no particular objection to Invenergy's

24 petition for intervention. In looking at it, it seemed

25 to me like it was similar to petitions that were filed
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1 in other recent dockets by the Northwest & Intermountain

2 Power Producers Coalition, NIPPC, or Columbia Rural

3 Electric Association, CREA, and Yakima Power in recent

4 dockets dealing with Microsoft and their request to go

5 to the open-access tariff, NIPPC petition that was

6 Docket UE-16113 -- I think 23, 161123, and then the

7 PacifiCorp's Schedule 300, which is Docket UE-161204.

8 Based on the similarities that seem to be there, Public

9 Counsel doesn't have any objections.

10 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Well, we are familiar,

11 of course, with the cases to which you refer, but I note

12 there is a somewhat what of a -- what I think is perhaps

13 an important distinction, and that is that the

14 organizations CREA and NIPPC are just that, they're

15 organizations. They're trade groups. Their status is

16 somewhat different where we might find the public

17 interest, for example, and participation by such groups.

18 It's a bit more of a stretch to find that for someone

19 who's in the business of buying and selling power,

20 producing power, that sort of thing.

21 It's been a long time since I've had an

22 independent power producer try to come into a Commission

23 proceeding. I don't have a strong recollection one way

24 or the other of that ever having been allowed, and I

25 know the Commission doesn't have a completely uniform
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1 history with these sorts of things.

2 So does anybody else want to be heard?

3 MS. GAFKEN: I guess the only other thing I

4 would add is along the lines of what I was saying

5 earlier is the limitations, if their petition was

6 granted, then certain limitations could be appropriate.

7 JUDGE MOSS: Sure.

8 Anybody else? Ms. Carson?

9 MS. CARSON: Yeah, it is true in some of

10 those cases, for example, the current ongoing case with

11 NIPPC, they were allowed to intervene, but the

12 Commission did find that there was not a substantial

13 interest. And so it was justified based on the public

14 interest, and it's not really clear to me in this case

15 what Invenergy would contribute to the public interest

16 on the issue of coal strip that isn't already addressed

17 by the many different parties that are in this case at

18 this point in time.

19 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you for that.

20 All right. So we will give you -- we will

21 give you one last word on this, and then I will make a

22 ruling.

23 MR. ALLAN: One thing that -- Your Honor,

24 that Invenergy does have that the other intervenors

25 concerned with coal strip don't have is the experience
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1 of actually operating power plants and, you know, to the

2 extent that there is public interest to be served, I

3 think public interest would be served by having another

4 entity that actually is in the business be able to

5 provide information and to cross-examine on the issues

6 related to the actual operation, decommissioning, and

7 the associated costs.

8 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you,

9 Mr. Allan. I think on balance, it -- our interests are

10 better served by denying your petition to intervene.

11 While I recognize that you have an interest, that is to

12 say you are in the business, I don't think it is a

13 substantial interest in what we will be doing in this

14 proceeding, nor do I think it would be particularly in

15 the public interest.

16 The public interest is well-represented here

17 not only by some of the intervenor groups who are

18 representing perhaps environmental interests and that

19 sort of thing, but also by our own Commission Staff.

20 Our Staff is the representative of the public interest,

21 so we tend to have less of a concern in terms of full

22 participation because of that.

23 I do invite you to follow the proceeding,

24 and all counsel should know and you included, Mr. Allan,

25 you can only talk to us about procedural matters. But
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1 if you have procedural questions along the way, and in

2 your case, perhaps questions about the status of

3 something in the case at any given point in the future,

4 you can contact us by phone or email. I do ask if you

5 contact us by email, that you copy the parties so that

6 there is no question of an ex-parte contact or someone

7 wants to raise a concern about that, they can know that

8 there's been a contact and raise that concern. Everyone

9 here should be, and I'm sure is, familiar with our

10 ex-parte rule both under the Administrative Procedures

11 Act as a matter of statute and under our own procedural

12 rules. So I'm sure everybody will be cautious about

13 that.

14 I don't think I've ever had a call from

15 counsel that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk

16 about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some

17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay.

18 We've managed to get through that over all these years

19 and I think we'll get through it again.

20 So I believe with that, that completes our

21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm

22 sure everyone will be happy, I'll be glad to stop

23 talking now and turn the floor back over to Judge

24 Pearson.

25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have
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1 already entered a standard protective order with highly

2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made

3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that

4 brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have

5 consented to electronic service in the documents that

6 you filed with the Commission. But for the record

7 today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you

8 consent to electronic service if the Commission decides

9 to serve documents electronically.

10 We can begin with the Company and go around

11 the room.

12 MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to

13 electronic service.

14 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.

15 MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to

16 electronic service by the Commission.

17 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.

18 MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to

19 electronic service.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.

21 MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable

22 Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.

23 MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to

24 electronic service from the Commission.

25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.
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1 MR. SHEARER: And Commission Staff also

2 agrees to electronic service from the Commission.

3 MR. PEPPLE: ICNU agrees as well.

4 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Want to take the total

5 on the phone there?

6 JUDGE PEARSON: Yes. The Federal Executive

7 Agencies?

8 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, FEA agrees to electronic

9 service.

10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And Northwest

11 Industrial Gas Users?

12 MR. BROOKS: Yes, we will consent to

13 electronic service.

14 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU?

15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me.

16 JUDGE PEARSON: Oh, sorry.

17 Nucor Steel.

18 MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Nucor Steel consents

19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club?

21 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to

22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties

23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service.

24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think

25 that was everyone.
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1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff

2 provided a proposed procedural schedule to us prior to

3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is

4 December 13th, 2017. Do all the parties agree that

5 that's the correct suspension date?

6 MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor.

7 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So do the parties

8 need a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already

9 been discussed?

10 MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email

11 to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go

12 forward.

13 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a

14 recess, then?

15 MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,

16 but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't

17 think there's a lot of progress to be made among the

18 parties anymore by ourselves.

19 JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.

20 JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing

21 dates that are on here.

22 Do you have this, Ms. Carson?

23 MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few

24 suggested changes.

25 JUDGE MOSS: Well, sure, sure. I don't have
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1 a problem with that, but I wanted to start by saying we

2 did have a discussion internally on the subject of

3 hearing dates and we're pretty fixed on these. So are

4 the question of working around that, those dates, unless

5 there's an irreconcilable conflict that you can bring to

6 our attention?

7 MS. CARSON: No, there's not. PSE was

8 interested in potentially starting the hearing on the

9 29th instead of the 28th because the cross-exam exhibit

10 date got pushed back to the 24th, and it does not give

11 much time for parties to -- for witnesses and attorneys

12 to review the cross-exam exhibits. And, of course,

13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because,

14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits

15 than the other parties. So we were open to considering

16 starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to

17 the extent necessary. I understand there's an open

18 meeting I think the -- that Thursday, so perhaps in the

19 afternoon on Thursday and then continuing on Friday.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So that will work for

21 the Commission. As far as the Commissioners' schedules,

22 we had that whole week blocked off in the event that it

23 was needed. So does Staff have any objection to

24 starting the hearing on the 29th?

25 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff.
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1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

2 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. ffitch has something.

3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein,

4 perhaps our request has already been granted, but we

5 were going to request that the hearing be formally --

6 the hearing dates actually formally include the 31st and

7 perhaps even Friday, the 1st because we have a witness

8 who would only be available on those days so that would

9 be helpful to the Energy Project.

10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. That sounds good. We

11 can certainly do that, and we can schedule it for the

12 afternoon of the 31st or whenever the open meeting

13 concludes with a short break. Whatever works for the

14 parties.

15 Anyone else?

16 MS. GAFKEN: Yes, I have one thing. I have

17 mentioned this to the parties, but we have a witness

18 that has a hearing in Arkansas on the 30th. And so

19 travel could be a little tricky if we start on the 29th,

20 I think we're willing to do that with the understanding

21 that we may be coming to the parties and the Commission

22 with a proposal on how to deal with that witness in

23 either getting her here or not. But maybe video or

24 something along those lines, but I think there's enough

25 dates that are in play that we can work with this.
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1 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, that's a long way off.

2 MS. GAFKEN: That too.

3 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, and we don't know at this

4 juncture how extensive the hearing will need to be. In

5 recent periods, the practice seems to have been for

6 counsel to do, shall we say, more focused

7 cross-examination. That has sometimes been true in

8 earlier years, and so our hearings have gone down to two

9 days and three days, that sort of thing.

10 I forget the exact number, but I think PSE

11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like that.

12 Pretty close to that number, and I'm looking at the

13 number of intervenors and thinking well, one and a half

14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 40

15 witnesses in this case. So that's quite a number

16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm sure there

17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need to

18 spill over, so everybody needs to arrange their personal

19 schedules to accommodate that. I know I will arrange

20 mine that way and forgo my vacation plans as usual.

21 Just kidding.

22 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So is there anything

23 further with respect to the schedule?

24 MR. SHEARER: Yes, Your Honor. Staff had a

25 question. We've discussed among the parties a date
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1 that's on this, April 3rd, 2017, which is labeled "PSE

2 supplemental testimony." Staff is still a little

3 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need

4 that opportunity. So we're happy to let PSE try to

5 clarify that for us if we can on the record.

6 MS. CARSON: Certainly. PSE has in its past

7 general cases and power cost only rate cases submitted

8 supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main

9 issues is to update power costs, and we did that

10 in 2009, 2011, 2013, and '14 precourse. The Commission

11 had at one time expressed a desire that its such

12 supplemental filing be provided with ample time for

13 other parties to review it before their response

14 testimony is due. And so in 2011, we started doing that

15 as part of the procedural schedule.

16 But it also sets a date if there's any, you

17 know, corrections or numbers that were estimates that

18 have become known and measurable that we can update that

19 and give other parties sufficient time to audit the

20 information. But primarily its updating power costs.

21 The power costs projections for the filed case I believe

22 used the forward natural gas prices for a period for

23 September 2016, and this would be updated by four or

24 five months. So that's -- we're just doing what we've

25 done for several cases in the past.
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1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

2 MR. SHEARER: We're still a little unclear

3 about a power cost update in April and the need for

4 that. And will it not be updated again later in the

5 case? And if I -- just make sure we understand

6 correctly that PSE believes updates to be known as just

7 numerical updates. You know, we're not going to get 75

8 pages of supplemental testimony or something along those

9 lines.

10 MS. CARSON: No.

11 MR. SHEARER: That's obviously a Staff

12 concern.

13 MS. CARSON: That hasn't been the case in

14 the past with significant amount of testimony. There

15 won't be a change in the methodologies. It will just be

16 refreshing numbers. And we have in some cases updated

17 supplemental testimony power cost, and then again in

18 rebuttal, just really depending on what's happening with

19 power costs. But, you know, that's -- that's up to the

20 Commission. If the Commission doesn't want us to update

21 again in rebuttal, we certainly don't need to.

22 JUDGE MOSS: Let me just interject here that

23 I appreciate your last comment because we have been

24 having some internal discussions about the subject of

25 power cost updates. In recent cases, we've had power
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1 cost updates in rate cases and sometimes multiple power

2 cost updates, and sometimes very near the end of the

3 case, and in some instances per a request to do it after

4 the end of the case and so forth and so on.

5 The practice of doing power cost updates in

6 general rate cases came into being in a time when power

7 costs were high and volatile, and it was an appropriate

8 thing to do. It often saved the customers a lot of

9 money when we were able to update the power cost in a

10 period when gas prices were flying or what have you,

11 but, of course, there was the double threat there that

12 might go the other way. We've had fairly stable gas

13 prices and other fuel source prices, electric prices

14 relatively speaking during more recent periods.

15 So I think it will be a case of -- it's all

16 well and good to file supplemental testimony and to plan

17 to do that, but I think the parties need to be aware

18 that certainly the further out anybody wants to go with

19 that, it's going to be subject to objection from other

20 parties, and it may even be something that the

21 Commission itself decides it's not something we want to

22 do. So just a caution in that regard. And I don't want

23 to refer to specific recent cases, but it can become

24 disruptive at the end of a case, and so we don't want to

25 let that happen here. Have I been muddy enough about
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1 that?

2 Thank you, Ms. Brown. I appreciate the

3 confirmation.

4 MS. BROWN: I like mud.

5 MS. CARSON: Well, that is why we proposed

6 it early in April.

7 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, and I don't want to

8 discourage you from doing it that early. That still

9 gives the responsive parties three months and, of

10 course, if you file it and they don't like, they can

11 object to it even then or just as they can object to

12 your original testimony and ask me to strike -- or ask

13 us to strike portions of that. I mean, this is, you

14 know, we play -- we play by the rules and we give

15 everybody the full opportunity to do what they need to

16 do to represent the interests of their clients. So

17 having said all of that, I will be quiet again. Thank

18 you.

19 MR. SHEARER: Thank you. With those

20 clarifications from Ms. Carson and Judge Moss, Staff has

21 no objection to including April 3rd on the schedule, and

22 we appreciate the parties having that discussion on the

23 record.

24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Is there anything

25 else with respect to the schedule?
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1 MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE does have one

2 other request for a change. The settlement conference

3 number two, July 25th, falls at a time of a NARUC

4 meeting, I believe. And so some people will not be

5 available, and we would like to move it up. Didn't have

6 a chance to talk with other parties about this, but I

7 would think maybe earlier in July would work. And I

8 don't know that we have to come up with that date today,

9 but anyway, July 25th isn't a good date.

10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. As long as we have

11 the first settlement conference schedule and then the

12 prehearing conference, that's fine, and the parties can

13 determine at a later date when the second one will be

14 held.

15 MR. SHEARER: Yes, Staff has no objection to

16 that.

17 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

18 MR. SHEARER: Sounds like a good plan.

19 JUDGE PEARSON: Ms. Gafken, did you have

20 something to add?

21 MS. GAFKEN: Yes, I have two things. I just

22 wanted to put in a plug for two public comment hearings

23 in this matter. I see that it's on the draft that's up

24 there. I just wanted to verbalize that for the record.

25 We're proposing, and Olympia and Bellevue, I understand
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1 those are two places where PSE general rate cases and

2 comment hearings have been held before. That seems to

3 work well. I proposed a couple of weeks there that

4 hopefully will work with the schedule.

5 The other thing that I wanted to note that's

6 not on there and that's the customer notice report

7 that's generally about a month or so after the

8 prehearing conference, and that's a letter usually that

9 Public Counsel will file alerting the Commission about

10 the status of the customer notice that goes in with the

11 bills and informs them about the rate case. I have

12 talked to the Company, and it looks like a slightly

13 longer time period will be needed in this case.

14 Primarily because lots of files happen in the month of

15 March for the Company, and so we've talked about having

16 that report due on April 12th.

17 JUDGE PEARSON: Can you tell me the name of

18 it one more time?

19 MS. GAFKEN: Sure, the customer notice

20 report.

21 JUDGE PEARSON: Customer notice report,

22 okay. All the other parties are okay with that?

23 JUDGE MOSS: I used to not let Mr. ffitch do

24 this to our procedural schedule, but Ms. Gafken thinks

25 it's matured around here I guess, so...
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1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else?

2 MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your

3 Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further,

4 Your Honor. Thanks.

5 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

6 So we appreciate the parties coming to us

7 with this schedule and we will adopt it in the

8 prehearing conference order with the modifications.

9 MR. SHEARER: We did have one more

10 administrative question. I guess I've learned from my

11 colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to

12 the standard first DR that all the parties serve each

13 other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in

14 this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you

15 know, please provide copies of any and all of your

16 requests and responses to all the parties.

17 JUDGE MOSS: Instead of having to do the DR

18 asking for exactly the same thing.

19 MR. SHEARER: Exactly. So if everybody is

20 willing, all the parties are willing to stipulate to

21 that now, that would be helpful. Save everybody ten DRs

22 from going out to each other.

23 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. That sounds good.

24 MR. SHEARER: If you're willing to ask.

25 JUDGE PEARSON: Sure, parties want to
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1 respond to that?

2 MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel supports that

3 request.

4 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. ffitch?

5 MR. FFITCH: We have no objection to that,

6 although it plays havoc with our embedded numbering

7 templates for our system. One must change with the

8 times and save paper. And after this matter, I did

9 think of one other minor administrative issue to raise.

10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Ms. Goodin?

11 MS. GOODIN: We also support that request

12 and would request electric service of those copies as

13 well if possible from other parties.

14 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Moran?

15 MR. MORAN: We support the request, Your

16 Honor.

17 MS. CARSON: PSE doesn't object to the

18 request.

19 MR. PEPPLE: ICNU supports the request.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And for those on the

21 phone.

22 MR. XENOPOLOUS: Nucor has no objection,

23 Your Honor.

24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR. BROOKS: No objection from NIGU.

0044

1 MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either.

2 MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the

3 request.

4 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

5 JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about

6 during the course of discovery in this case, the

7 proposal that I made years ago and it never went

8 anywhere that -- and that was to come up with some means

9 to have a common site for discovery so that you don't

10 have to have all this back and forth and back and forth,

11 but everybody can find access to the same site and

12 discovery can all be available in one place. And, of

13 course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly

14 possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me,

15 and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that

16 doesn't matter.

17 BPA has done this for years and it seems to

18 work very, very well in their proceedings. The only one

19 I was ever involved in was 17 or 18 years ago when there

20 were 68 parties and it works pretty well. I don't think

21 I had a single problem while I was presiding in the

22 case, and it went real well.

23 MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE did make such a

24 site available in a current case before the Commission,

25 and many parties very much appreciated that and some
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1 parties objected to that. I believe Commission Staff or

2 some members of Commission Staff were not comfortable

3 with that. We certainly would endorse that. It saves a

4 lot of time and email correspondence, and we think it's

5 a good solution.

6 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Well, I think it's

7 probably best left to the parties to work that sort of

8 thing out among themselves rather than us trying to

9 dictate something from the bench. But I did want to

10 raise the idea again. Thank you for making that point.

11 Perhaps you can have some further discussions and make

12 some progress in this direction.

13 MS. BROWN: I just want say that it does

14 raise issues with regard to compliance with the State's

15 Public Records Act and the Records Retention Act. We

16 have a special database that files within the utility.

17 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Thank you.

18 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

19 JUDGE MOSS: It's the virtue of having the

20 head of the division appearing in the case. Gives you a

21 broader perspective on things.

22 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So for filing, so we

23 took a count and we will need an original plus 11 copies

24 for internal distribution at the Commission. And if

25 filings include information designated as confidential
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1 or highly confidential, file the original and 11 copies

2 of the fully unredacted version, an original and one

3 copy of any partly redacted version, and an original and

4 one copy of the fully redacted version. So we will

5 require you to submit a witness list showing order of

6 presentation, time estimates for cross-examination of

7 each witness, and cross-examination exhibit list shortly

8 before the evidentiary hearings, and we will exchange

9 cross-examination exhibits prior to the hearing and take

10 up any other business that will maximize efficiency at

11 the hearing such as stipulating to the admission of

12 testimony and exhibits.

13 And if any party has not yet designated a

14 lead representative for service, please do so via an

15 email to Judge Moss and myself as soon as possible. And

16 if anyone would like to add names and email addresses of

17 other representatives or support staff who should

18 receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents

19 filed in this proceeding, please email that to us as

20 well.

21 Is there anything else that we need to

22 address while we're here today? Okay. Hearing nothing,

23 just want to thank the parties for all coming and

24 participating today, and we will issue an order

25 reflecting what was discussed here today, and we are

0047

1 adjourned. Thank you.

2 (Adjourned at 10:23 a.m.)
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