WUTC v. Puget Sound Energy

February 13, 2017



1325 Fourth Avenue • Suite 1840 • Seattle, Washington 98101

206.287.9066

www.buellrealtime.com

Olympia | 360.534.9066 Spokane | 509.624.3261 National | 800.846.6989

email: info@buellrealtime.com



	nd UG-170034 (Consolidate	a) - voi	. I 2/13/2017
	Page 1		Page 3
1 BEFORE THE WASHING	GTON	1	A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont.)
2 UTILITIES AND TRANSPORT 3	TATION COMMISSION	² 3 EOR	NORTHWEST ENERGY COALITION, DURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL:
4 WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND) TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		4 RES	
5) Complainant,)	• /	5	AMANDA GOODIN Earth Justice 705 - 2nd Avenue, Suite 203 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 343-7340 2006 343-7340
6) vs.) DOCKET NOS. I		6	Seattle, Washington 98104
7) UG-170034 (Cons)	solidated)	7	agoodin@earthjustice.com
8 PUGET SOUND ENERGY,)		⁸ FOR	PUBLIC COUNSEL:
9) Respondent.)		9	
10		0	LISA GAFKEN ARMIKKA BRYANT Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055 Ilsaw4@atg.wa.gov armikkab@atg.wa.gov
PREHEARING CONFEREN		1	800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104
Pages 1-48		2	(206) 389-2055 lisaw4@atg.wa.gov
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES		.3	armikkab@atg.wa.gov
15		⁴ ₅ FOR	COMMISSION STAFF:
9:30 a.m. 16 February 13, 2017		.6	SALLY BROWN
17		.7	SALLY BROWN BRETT SHEARER Senior Assistant Attorney General PO Box 40128
18 Washington Utilities and Transpor 1300 South Evergreen Park I	tation Commission	.8	Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1193
19 Olympia, Washington 985	604	9	Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1 193 sbrown@utc.wa.gov bshearer@utc.wa.gov
20 REPORTED BY: TAYLER RUSSEL		0	
21 Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC	2	1 FOR	INVENERGY, LLC:
22 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840 Seattle, Washington 98101	2	2	RICHARD H. ALLAN
2 3 (206) 280-9066 Seattle (360) 534-9066 Olympia 2 4 (800) 846-6989 National	2	3	1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2150 Portland, Oregon 97204
	2	4	Marten Law 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2150 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 243-2200 rallan@martenlaw.com
25 www.buellrealtime.com	2	5	
	Page 2		Page 4
1 APPEARA	ANCES	1	A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont.)
² ADMINISTRATIVE LAW	JUDGE:	² FOR	INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF
3 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW		3 NOR	INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF IHWEST UTILITIES:
3 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW		3 NOR	TYI FR PEPPI F
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(A RAYNE PE 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW /ashington 98504 610	3 FOR 3 NOR 4	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW /ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov	3 NOR	TYI FR PEPPI F
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(DENNIS M(A RAYNE PE 1300 S. Eve 5 Olympia, W (360) 664-1 6 rpearson@u dmoss@utc	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov c.wa.gov	3 FOR 4 5 6 7	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS Ma ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMINISTRATIVE	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov c.wa.gov NERGY:	3 FOR 4 5 6 7	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS Ma ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS Ma ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMI	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov c.wa.gov NERGY:	 FOR. NOR 4 5 6 7 8 FOR 	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ARAYNE PE, 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 (425) 635-1	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov xwa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON ie fourth Street, Suite 700 422	 3 FOR 4 5 6 7 8 FOR 9 	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ARAYNE PE, 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 (425) 635-1	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov .wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e fourth Street, Suite 700 /ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com	 FOR NOR NOR FOR FOR FOR 0 	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ARAYNE PE, 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 Pearson@u FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 (425) 635-1 scarson@u	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov c.wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e fourth Street, Suite 700 422 erkinscoie.com	 FOR FOR FOR FOR 1 	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ACAYNE PE, 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 Pearson@u FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 (425) 635-1 scarson@p 13 FOR THE ENERGY PRO	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov .wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e fourth Street, Suite 700 /ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com	 FOR FOR FOR FOR 1 3 	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ACAYNE PE, 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 Pearson@u FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 (425) 635-1 scarson@p 13 FOR THE ENERGY PRO	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov .wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e fourth Street, Suite 700 /ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com	 FOR FOR FOR FOR 1 3 	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ACTIONA ACTION A	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov .wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e fourth Street, Suite 700 /ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com	 FOR FOR	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL USERS: TOMMY BROOKS Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen &
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ACAYNE PE, 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 Pearson@u FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 (425) 635-1 scarson@p 13 FOR THE ENERGY PRO	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov .wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON le ourth Street, Suite 700 /ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com DJECT: TCH Law chool Road NE ox No. 383 Island, Washington 98110	 FOR FOR	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL USERS: TOMMY BROOKS Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen &
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ARAYNE PE 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 rpearson@u (360) 664-1 rpearson@u (360) 664-1 FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 (425) 635-1 SCARSON PRO 14 SIMON FFI Attorney at 15 321 High Sc Suite D3, B 16 Bainbridge (206) 669-8 Simon@fitto 18 FOR THE STATE OF MO	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e- ourth Street, Suite 700 422 erkinscoie.com DJECT: TCH Law chool Road NE ox No. 383 Island, Washington 98110 187 chlaw.com DNTANA:	 FOR FOR	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL USERS: TOMMY BROOKS Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen & Lloyd 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(A RAYNE PE 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 Pearson@u admoss@utc FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 6425) 635-1 Scarson@p 13 FOR THE ENERGY PRO 14 SIMON FFI Attorney at 15 321 High Sc Suite D3, B 16 Bainbridge-8 (206) 669-8 17 Simon@ffitc 18 FOR THE STATE OF MO	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov .wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e fourth Street, Suite 700 /ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com DJECT: TCH Law chool Road NE ox No. 383 Island, Washington 98110 187 chlaw.com	 FOR FOR	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL USERS: TOMMY BROOKS Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen & Lloyd 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 tbrooks@cablehuston.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(A RAYNE PE 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 Pearson@u admoss@utc FOR PUGET SOUND EN FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 6425) 635-1 Scarson@p 13 FOR THE ENERGY PRO 14 SIMON FFI Attorney at 15 321 High Sc Suite D3, B 16 Bainbridge-8 (206) 669-8 17 Simon@ffitc 18 FOR THE STATE OF MO	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov .wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e fourth Street, Suite 700 /ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com DJECT: TCH Law chool Road NE ox No. 383 Island, Washington 98110 187 chlaw.com	 FOR FOR	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL USERS: TOMMY BROOKS Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen & Lloyd 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ARAYNE PE 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 rpearson@u (360) 664-1 rpearson@u (360) 664-1 rpearson@u (360) 664-1 FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 (425) 635-1 Scarson@p 13 FOR THE ENERGY PRC 14 SIMON FFI Attorney at 15 321 High Sc Suite J3, B 16 Bainbridge (206) 669-8 17 Simon@ffit Brian T. M Orrick, Herr 701 - 5th Av 21 Seattle, Wa (206) 839-4	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e- ourth Street, Suite 700 7-ourth Street, Suite 700 ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com DJECT: TCH Law chool Road NE ox No. 383 Island, Washington 98110 187 chlaw.com DNTANA: MORAN ington & Sutcliffe LLP venue, Suite 5600 ishington 98104 419	 FOR FOR	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL USERS: TOMMY BROOKS Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen & Llovd 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 tbrooks@cablehuston.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ARAYNE PE 1300 S. Eve V(360) 664-1 Person@u ADMINISTRATIVE LAW SEV FOR PUGET SOUND EN Person@u ADMOSS@UTC FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Person@u ADMOSS@UTC SHEREE S SHEREE S SHEREE S SHON FFI ATTORNEY SHON FFI ATTORNEY SHON THE STATE OF MC SHAN T. M OTTICK. Herr 701 - 5th AN Seattle, Wa (206) 839-4 20 SHEREE S SHON TAN SHAN T. M SHAN T.	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e ourth Street, Suite 700 422 erkinscoie.com DJECT: TCH Law chool Road NE ox No. 383 Island, Washington 98110 187 chlaw.com ONTANA: (ORAN ington & Sutcliffe LLP venue, Suite 5600 ishington 98104 419 corrick.com	 FOR FOR	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL USERS: TOMMY BROOKS Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen & Llovd 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 tbrooks@cablehuston.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(ARAYNE PE 1300 S. Eve Olympia, W (360) 664-1 Pearson@) FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Perkins Coi 10 10885 NE F Bellevue, W 11 (425) 635-1 Scarson@p 13 FOR THE ENERGY PRO 14 SIMON FFI Attorney at 15 321 High Sc Suite D3, B 16 Bainbridge (206) 669-8 17 Simon@ffitc 18 FOR THE STATE OF MC 19 BRIAN T. M 20 Orrick, Herr 701 - 5th AV 21 Seattle, Wa (206) 839-4 22 Drian.morar 23	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e fourth Street, Suite 700 /ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com DJECT: TCH Law chool Road NE ox No. 383 Island, Washington 98110 187 chilaw.com ONTANA: (ORAN ington & Sutcliffe LLP venue, Suite 5600 ishington 98104 419 @orrick.com	 FOR FOR	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL USERS: TOMMY BROOKS Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen & Llovd 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 tbrooks@cablehuston.com
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DENNIS M(A RAYNE PE 1300 S. Eve V(360) 664-1 Person@u ADMINISTRATIVE LAW SHERE PE Person@u FOR PUGET SOUND EN SHEREE S Person@u HEREE S Person@u ADMOSS@UTC SHEREE S Person@u HEREE S Person@u ADMOSS@UTC SHEREE S Person@u HEREE S Person@u ADMOSS@UTC SHEREE S Person@u HEREE S Person@u ADMOSS@UTC SHEREE S Person@u ADMOSS@UTC SHEREE S Person@u ADMOSS@UTC ADMOSS@UTC SHEREE S Person@u ADMOSS@UTC SHEREE S SHEREE S SHER	OSS ARSON ergreen Park Drive SW ashington 98504 610 utc.wa.gov NERGY: TROM CARSON e- ourth Street, Suite 700 /ashington 98004 422 erkinscoie.com DJECT: TCH Law chool Road NE ox No. 383 Island, Washington 98110 1187 chlaw.com ONTANA: MORAN ington & Sutcliffe LLP venue, Suite 5600 ishington 98104 419 n@orrick.com	 FOR FOR	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve 333 SW Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOLOUS Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW Eighth Floor - West Tower Washington, D.C., 20007 (202) 342-0800 dex@bbrslaw.com NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL USERS: TOMMY BROOKS Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen & Lloyd 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 tbrooks@cablehuston.com

Do	cket Nos. UE-170033 and UG-170034 (Consolidat	ed)	- Vol. I 2/13/2017
	Page 5		Page 7
1	A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont.)	1	And, of course, we will find out momentarily whether
2		2	there are any objections.
3		3	But the first order of business will be to
4	TRAVIS RITCHIE Sierra Club Associate Attorney	4	take appearances and we'll start with the Company.
5	Sierra Club, Associate Attorney 85 Second Street, Second Floor San Francisco, California 94105	5	MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honors.
6	travis.ritchie@sierraclub.org	б	Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie representing Puget
7		7	Sound Energy. Also, Jason Kuzma and Donna Barnett have
8		8	appeared in this case, although they are not here today.
9	000	9	JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.
L 0		10	Mr. ffitch.
1		11	MR. FFITCH: Good morning, Your Honor.
12		12	Simon ffitch representing the Energy Project. Would you
.3		13	like the full appearance?
4		14	JUDGE MOSS: No, thanks, as long as you give
15		15	the court reporter all the information. I think in
L6		16	fact, in this case, I'm happy to say that almost I
L7		17	believe everyone who's intending to intervene has filed
18		18	a petition, and we've had notices of appearances. So
.9		19	we've got a pretty full set of information, which is
20		20	very helpful. Thank you all for that. And we'll just
21		21	go around the room in this direction and then we'll pick
22		22	up over here, and don't let me forget, and then we will
23		23	take anybody who is on the phone.
24		24	So go ahead.
25		25	MR. MORAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Brian
	Page 6		Page 8
1	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; FEBRUARY 13, 2017	1	Moran with Orrick, Herrington representing the State of
2	9:30 A.M.	2	Montana.
3	000	3	JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Mr. Moran, welcome.
4	PROCEEDINGS	4	MS. GOODIN: Good morning, Your Honors.
5		5	Amanda Goodin with Earth Justice representing the
6	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Let's get started.	б	Northwest Energy Coalition, Renewable Northwest, and
7	Good morning, everybody. My name is Dennis Moss and	7	Natural Resources Defense Council.
8	sitting next to me is Rayne Pearson. We are	8	JUDGE MOSS: Nice to see you again,
9	administrative law judges with the Washington Utilities	9	Ms. Goodin.
0	and Transportation Commission, and we are convened here	10	MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken,
.1	today, and if I can remember, Dockets UE-170033 and	11	assistant attorney general.
2	UG-170034, which is PSE's 2017 general rate case	12	JUDGE MOSS: Is your mic on?
.3	following on the heels of a several-year hiatus in rate	13	MS. GAFKEN: It should be, but I might not
.4	cases under the great plan we approved what year was	14	be close enough.
15	that, 2013? I believe so.	15	JUDGE MOSS: There you go.
16	MS. CARSON: Yes.	16	MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken,
.7	JUDGE MOSS: Memory has not failed me yet.	17	assistant attorney general with Public Counsel, and also
.8	All right. Well, Judge Pearson and I will	18	appearing in this case with me is Armikka Bryant, who is
9	be co-presiding in this proceeding, and indeed, after	19	also an assistant attorney general.
20	appearances this morning, I'm going to turn the floor	20	JUDGE MOSS: Welcome. This is your first
21	over to her to take up the petitions to intervene with	21	appearance before the Commission, I believe?
5 IL	and execution, or three executions actually. I'm aging	22	MR. BRYANT: No, it's not.
22	one exception, or three exceptions actually, I'm going		
	to have a few things to say to the Sierra Club, the	23	JUDGE MOSS: It's not? Okay. Well, it's
22		23	JUDGE MOSS: It's not? Okay. Well, it's your first before me. There you go. Welcome, in any

Do	cket Nos. UE-170033 and UG-170034 (Consolida	ted)) - Vol. I 2/13/201
	Page 9		Page 11
1	MR. BRYANT: Thank you.	1	And let's see. All right. I'll just ask at
2	MS. BROWN: Sally Brown, senior assistant	2	this point whether I'm missing anybody else who I didn't
3	attorney general appearing on behalf of Commission	3	name.
4	Staff.	4	MS. LIOTTA: Yes, Your Honor
5	MR. SHEARER: And Brett Shearer, assistant	5	MR. BROOKS: Good morning, Your Honor
6	attorney general appearing on behalf of Commission Staff	6	(Inaudible.)
7	and assistant attorney generals, Jennifer	7	JUDGE MOSS: All right. The two of you were
8	Cameron-Rulkowski, Jeff Roberson, Andrew O'Connell, and	8	speaking at the same time. Mr. Brooks, I'll let you go
9	Chris Casey have also filed appearances in this case,	9	first for the Northwest Industrial Gas Users.
10	Your Honor.	10	MR. BROOKS: Thank you. Yes, this is Tommy
11	JUDGE MOSS: All right. And you will all be	11	Brooks and I am on the line.
12	active in the case?	12	JUDGE MOSS: All right. And, Ms. Liotta, if
13	MR. SHEARER: Yes, to varying extents.	13	you would go ahead and enter your appearance for the
14	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you very	14	FEA.
15	much.	15	MS. LIOTTA: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning.
16	All right. Let's shift over to the other	16	This is Rita Liotta with the Federal Executive Agencies.
L7	side of the room here.	17	JUDGE MOSS: Thank you and welcome.
L 8	MR. ALLAN: Good morning, Your Honor.	18	MS. LIOTTA: Thank you.
19	Richard Allan of Marten Law representing Invenergy, LLC.	19	JUDGE MOSS: Any others?
20	JUDGE MOSS: Mr. Allan, welcome. Is this	20	All right. That will complete our
21	your first time before the Commission?	21	appearances, then, and we will move on to the business
22	MR. ALLAN: Yes, it is.	22	of the day, and I will turn the floor over to Judge
23	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Welcome.	23	Pearson at this point.
24	MR. PEPPLE: Good morning. Tyler Pepple,	24	JUDGE PEARSON: Good morning. So with
25	attorney for the Industrial Customers of Northwest	25	respect to the petitions for intervention, are there any
	Page 10		Page 12
1	Utilities.	1	objections to the petitions for intervention filed by
2	JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Thank you.	2	those parties other than the three that Judge Moss
3	Now, do we have counsel on the telephone who	3	referenced in his opening remarks?
4	wish to enter appearances today? I think there are	4	MS. CARSON: Your Honor, the three that were
5	several, actually, who indicated they would be calling	5	referenced I believe are the State of Montana, Sierra
6	in. Do we have counsel for Kroger? How about Nucor	6	Club, and Invenergy; is that correct?
7	Steel? Mr. Xenopolous, are you there?	7	JUDGE PEARSON: Correct.
8	MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Your Honor. This is	8	MS. CARSON: PSE has no objections to the
9	Damon Xenopolous from Nucor Steel.	9	others, we do have one caveat. I talked with Ms. Amanda
LO	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you. I don't	10	Goodin from who is representing three different
11	know that you'll have any speaking role today, but I'll	11	entities, and PSE's concern was that we seem to have a
L2	tell you that you came through very faintly just now. I	12	lot of different groups with similar interests, these
L3	believe the court reporter was able to get your name.	13	three as well as Sierra Club, all with environmental
L4	I'll check the spelling with her later. So if you do	14	focus and interest on coal strip. And so I clarified
15	speak again, Mr. Xenopolous, speak up a little bit.	15	that, with respect to those three intervenors, they will
	Let's see, I don't think I heard we	16	collaborate, coordinate their argument, their
16		1	cross-examination, their testimony so that it will
	didn't hear anything from Cost Management Services. Do	17	
17	didn't hear anything from Cost Management Services. Do we have a representative from Cost Management?	17 18	will be as one as opposed to three different sets of
17 18			will be as one as opposed to three different sets of testimony and argument.
17 18 19	we have a representative from Cost Management?	18	
17 18 19 20	we have a representative from Cost Management? Apparently not. They filed a petition.	18 19	testimony and argument.
L7 L8 L9 20 21	we have a representative from Cost Management? Apparently not. They filed a petition. Lets see, Mr no, that's not right.	18 19 20	testimony and argument. Our concern is that it can become burdensome
17 18 19 20 21 22	we have a representative from Cost Management? Apparently not. They filed a petition. Lets see, Mr no, that's not right. Mr. Ritchie was going to appear by phone, I think. Are	18 19 20 21	testimony and argument. Our concern is that it can become burdensome and duplicative, and I guess we would be interested in
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	we have a representative from Cost Management? Apparently not. They filed a petition. Lets see, Mr no, that's not right. Mr. Ritchie was going to appear by phone, I think. Are you on the phone?	18 19 20 21 22	testimony and argument. Our concern is that it can become burdensome and duplicative, and I guess we would be interested in the Commission's, you know, input as to at what point in

2/13/2017

		icu)	
	Page 13		Page 15
1	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Did I understand	1	MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Your Honor.
2	you to say, then, that you were talking to the Sierra	2	JUDGE MOSS: Did you hear that?
3	Club in terms of its representation being somehow joined	3	MR. RITCHIE: I did hear that, and I did
4	with NWC and RBC and Renewables Northwest or just those	4	speak with counsel for PSE. Sierra Club's intention
5	three I just mentioned?	5	with this rate case is to address only issues that are
6	MS. CARSON: Just those three. I just	6	within the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction, and
7	wanted to clarify that there's agreement that those	7	so I am I'm fine agreeing to that. We understand the
8	three will be coordinated throughout the process.	8	Commission's role as an economic regulator. I
9	JUDGE MOSS: And I understood that by the	9	personally have represented Sierra Club before. Many
10	joint petition to intervene so	10	public utility commissions across the West including the
11	MS. GOODIN: Yes, Your Honor. We are	11	UTC, most recently in PacifiCorp's general rate case
12	planning to coordinate throughout with a single set of	12	from last year, and so we're very well versed how those
13	briefs, single set of cross-examination. So there's no	13	issues relate to each other.
14	issue there.	14	There's the one concern I think I maybe have
15	JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. I always appreciate	15	in trying to narrow Sierra Club's potential list of
16	you saving us 120 pages.	16	issues ahead of time is that even within that limitation
17	MS. GOODIN: Yes, we will do what we can.	17	of the Commission's jurisdiction on economic issues,
18	MS. CARSON: So with that caveat, then, we	18	there are several potential issues that may come up that
19	have no objection to the remainder of intervenors other	19	we've just not fully analyzed with our expert yet to
20	than the three that you mentioned.	20	know where that may end. Our primary interest here is
21	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.	21	certainly coal strip. The coal strip plan both with
22	Ms. Gafken.	22	regard to units one and two as well as the depreciation
23	MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel has no objection	23	schedule for units three and four. But we also plan on
24	to the petitions entered and the three that were	24	looking at issues related to revenue requirement,
25	mentioned.	25	impacts that could result from replacement power, and
	Page 14	1	Page 16
1	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.	1	potentially also revenue requirement impacts that could
2	MS. BROWN: Neither does Commission Staff,	2	result from plans for cleanup and site remediation at
3	although we would appreciate the coordination of both	3	the coal strip area.
4	parties.	4	So, you know, we are not looking to go on a
5	JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.	5	sprawling mission here, but we do want to be able to
6	So hearing no objections to the petitions,	6	have the opportunity to address those issues that are
7	we will grant those petitions to intervene. As Judge	7	related to both environmental issues that impact revenue
8	Moss said, it was our understanding that those three	8	requirement within the Commission's jurisdiction.
9	parties would be acting as one in this proceeding.	9	JUDGE MOSS: Well, I'm not sure those are
10	MS. GOODIN: Yes.	10	going to be issues in this proceeding. We can talk
11	JUDGE MOSS: All right. With that, let us	11	about that a little bit, but all we have before us in
12	take up the three, and I'm singling you three out	12	terms of coal strip in this case is some talk about
13	because of your special status given your interests	13	plans for the future. We won't be talking about
14	that's stated in your petitions and wanted to speak to	14	replacement power being a part of the Company's power
15	you. And I'll first ascertain whether there is any	15	cost in this case, I don't think. So I'm not sure. It
16	objections, in fact, to Sierra Club?	16	seems to me that the proper forum for discussing issues
17	MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE has tried to	17	related to the future shifts in power cost requirements
18	work with Sierra Club for a limited intervention. We	18	that may eventuate assuming coal strips one and two are
19	don't object to Sierra Club intervening with respect to	19	closed or other developments take place in the
20	coal strip issues that the Commission can address as an	20	environment, is a matter, at this juncture at least, it
21	economic regulator. And that's a similar limitation to	21	would be taken up in the integrated resource planning
22	what the what was agreed to in the 2011 general rate	22	process, which I imagine Sierra Club participates in as
23	case. So if there is agreement on that, then we do not	23	well.
	- /	1	
24	object to the Sierra Club's intervention.	24	So let me let me hear from Ms. Carson on
24 25	object to the Sierra Club's intervention. JUDGE MOSS: Mr. Ritchie?	24 25	So let me let me hear from Ms. Carson on this.

	Page 17	, 	Page 10
1	MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE agrees with	1	Page 19 intervention accordingly. So with that limitation, PSE
2	that. The replacement power is not an issue in this	1 2	does not object.
	case, and we agree that is more appropriately addressed		JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Any other objections to
3	in IRP.	3	the State of Montana?
4		4	
5	JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Anybody else want to be	5	MS. BROWN: This is Sally Brown for
6	heard on the Sierra Club at this juncture? Apparently	6	Commission Staff. I just want to make my record that I
7	not.	7	think it's abundantly clear that the Commission's
8	All right. Well, I am inclined,	8	regulatory jurisdiction does not extend to Montana or
9	Mr. Ritchie, to state at the outset here that I my	9	the State of Montana. So as you well know, I mean, the
10	understanding has been all along, and it's consistent	10	Commission's statutory obligation is to regulate in the
11	with your petition, that the Sierra Club's interest, as	11	public interest as provided by the public service laws
12	you said, your primary interest certainly is coal strip,	12	and the regulated utilities and that impact the rate
13	and we do believe the Sierra Club will contribute to our	13	payers of the State of Washington, not any other state
14	hearing process with respect to that issue.	14	in the union.
15	With that idea in mind, I just I'm not	15	Having said that, the Commission Staff is
16	going to set any specific limits on you at this juncture	16	not going to object to the State of Montana's limited
17	other than to say I'm expecting your focus to remain on	17	intervention in this proceeding, although I would like
18	that issue and issues that are directly implicated by	18	to have a commitment from Montana's representative on
19	it. And, again, I don't think replacement power is	19	the record today that it does not intend to broaden
20	going to be an issue in this case. There may be others	20	issues or impair the orderly and prompt conduct of the
21	that I'm not anticipating at this juncture.	21	proceedings in this case.
22	So as I say, I'm not going to impose some	22	JUDGE MOSS: We can have that next unless
23	sort of an arbitrary limit on you in terms of an issue	23	somebody else wants to be heard on the State of Montana.
24	that might arise that's directly related to the coal	24	Ms. Gafken, do you have a word?
25	strip discussions that we'll be having through testimony	25	MS. GAFKEN: I do have a word. I do agree
	Page 18		Page 20
1	and otherwise. But I think you're comfortable with the	1	with the points that Ms. Brown brought up and also
2	idea that that is the focus of your participation in	2	Ms. Carson with respect to the limits that the
3	this case, are you not?	3	Commission has in terms of what they can address and the
4	MR. RITCHIE: I am, Your Honor, yes. And to	4	substantial interest that Montana presented in their
5	the extent that that I appreciate not putting any	5	petition. I guess one thing I want to know is of course
6	any limits on ahead of time to the extent that we see	6	the Commission has a great deal of discretion in terms
7	something, we will be sure to address why we believe	7	of whether they grant a petition for intervention, and
8	it's within the scope and appropriate to address in this	8	the Commission does tend to view the standards broadly.
9	rate case. Fully understanding the difference between a		
10		9	So I recognize that, but I would also stress that there
1	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think	9 10	So I recognize that, but I would also stress that there can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a
11			-
	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think	10	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a
11	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir.	10 11	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate.
11 12	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good.	10 11 12	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns
11 12 13	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State	10 11 12 13	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for
11 12 13 14	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana?	10 11 12 13 14	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or
11 12 13 14 15	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana? MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel	10 11 12 13 14 15	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or the substantial interest prong. But understanding that
11 12 13 14 15 16	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana? MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel for State of Montana limited intervention for the State	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or the substantial interest prong. But understanding that the Commission does have wide latitude there.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana? MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel for State of Montana limited intervention for the State of Montana. We did have concerns. We do have concerns	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or the substantial interest prong. But understanding that the Commission does have wide latitude there. JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana? MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel for State of Montana limited intervention for the State of Montana. We did have concerns. We do have concerns that there's not a substantial interest here that the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or the substantial interest prong. But understanding that the Commission does have wide latitude there. JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. Anybody else want to be heard on this?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana? MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel for State of Montana limited intervention for the State of Montana. We did have concerns. We do have concerns that there's not a substantial interest here that the Commission is authorized to address in terms of the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or the substantial interest prong. But understanding that the Commission does have wide latitude there. JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. Anybody else want to be heard on this? All right. Let's hear from the State of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana? MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel for State of Montana limited intervention for the State of Montana. We did have concerns. We do have concerns that there's not a substantial interest here that the Commission is authorized to address in terms of the effect of the closing of coal strip on Montana	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or the substantial interest prong. But understanding that the Commission does have wide latitude there. JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. Anybody else want to be heard on this? All right. Let's hear from the State of Montana.
111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana? MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel for State of Montana limited intervention for the State of Montana. We did have concerns. We do have concerns that there's not a substantial interest here that the Commission is authorized to address in terms of the effect of the closing of coal strip on Montana residents. But that being said, PSE is willing to agree	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or the substantial interest prong. But understanding that the Commission does have wide latitude there. JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. Anybody else want to be heard on this? All right. Let's hear from the State of Montana. MR. MORAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Brian
111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana? MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel for State of Montana limited intervention for the State of Montana. We did have concerns. We do have concerns that there's not a substantial interest here that the Commission is authorized to address in terms of the effect of the closing of coal strip on Montana residents. But that being said, PSE is willing to agree to a limited intervention by Montana to address again	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or the substantial interest prong. But understanding that the Commission does have wide latitude there. JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. Anybody else want to be heard on this? All right. Let's hear from the State of Montana. MR. MORAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Brian Moran for the State of the Montana. We certainly don't
111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	rate case and a forward-looking IRP process. I think that works for us, sir. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Very good. All right. Ms. Carson, how about the State of Montana? MS. CARSON: PSE also discussed with counsel for State of Montana limited intervention for the State of Montana. We did have concerns. We do have concerns that there's not a substantial interest here that the Commission is authorized to address in terms of the effect of the closing of coal strip on Montana residents. But that being said, PSE is willing to agree to a limited intervention by Montana to address again coal strip issues that the Commission as an economic	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	can be limits placed on an intervention, and this is a case where limits would be appropriate. So Public Counsel does have some concerns that Montana does not meet the standards for intervention either under the public interest prong or the substantial interest prong. But understanding that the Commission does have wide latitude there. JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. Anybody else want to be heard on this? All right. Let's hear from the State of Montana. MR. MORAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Brian Moran for the State of the Montana. We certainly don't intend to bring this to a disorderly or inefficient

	Page 21		Page 23
1	broad discretion. You know, there are decommissioning	1	have here a certain difference in terms of your status.
2	and remediation issues. They're more direct, less	2	You are an independent power producer as I understand
3	tangential. We certainly understand the limits of the	3	it, and your interest in the proceeding as I read
4	regulatory body's authority on Montana residents, but we	4	through the lines of your petition is basically that
5	do think with the discretion that Montana does have a	5	maybe you would like to sell some power or a power plant
6	dog in this fight, to be colloquial, and we ask that you	6	or something like that to PSE some point in the future
7	use your authority to grant us the limited intervention	7	when they have to replace power from a facility such as
8	as outlined by Ms. Carson.	8	coal strip that they may shut down at some point in the
9	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Well, with the	9	future.
10	exception to the fact that I don't like your colloquy	10	So having said that and also that that I
11	because I don't like to think of this as a dog fight,	11	don't see a particular public interest prong here, I
12	rather I'd like to think of it as a concerted	12	want to give you an opportunity to convince me that
13	professional effort to address the issues that are	13	there is something more to that meets this eye here,
14	before us. And I think that you used the right word at	14	and we'll also hear from counsel with whether there are
15	the same time which is say cautions, both with respect	15	any objections. But I want to give you a chance as a
16	to the Sierra Club and also with respect to the State of	16	petitioner to speak first.
17	Montana.	17	MR. ALLAN: Yes, Your Honor. I appreciate
18	That was my purpose in speaking to you all	18	it. Richard Allan for Invenergy. To clarify, Invenergy
19	today was to say I do want you to be cautious as you	19	also is a customer of PSE. Invenergy purchases
20	proceed and to understand that there are procedural	20	electricity from PSE at its vantage substation. So we
20	and I know you know this but there are procedural		are we aren't simply a generator or an independent
	devices that other parties may use if they feel that you	21	power producer. We are also a customer of PSE that
22	are straying into territories where you should not	22	could conceivably be impacted by whatever the economic
23		23	
24	stray. And, of course, we will be careful to maintain	24	outcome is from decisions that are made with respect to
25	good order in the proceeding and keep people within the	25	coal strip one and two.
	Daga 22	1	Dece 24
1	Page 22	1	Page 24
1	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any	1	That said, we also are feel we do have an
2	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities.	2	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that
2 3	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just		That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and
2 3 4	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference	2 3 4	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are
2 3 4 5	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would.	2 3 4 5	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that
2 3 4 5 6	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had	2 3 4 5 6	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility
2 3 4 5 6 7	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and	2 3 4 5 6 7	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the State can't would have a very difficult time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the State can't would have a very difficult time exhibiting a substantial interest in the proceeding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's hear from the Company and see if we have any objection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the State can't would have a very difficult time exhibiting a substantial interest in the proceeding being a foreign entity as it were. But I think we did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's hear from the Company and see if we have any objection first from the Company and then we'll ask the other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the State can't would have a very difficult time exhibiting a substantial interest in the proceeding being a foreign entity as it were. But I think we did talk about this internally, and I think the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's hear from the Company and see if we have any objection first from the Company and then we'll ask the other parties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the State can't would have a very difficult time exhibiting a substantial interest in the proceeding being a foreign entity as it were. But I think we did talk about this internally, and I think the public interest will be served by Montana's participation so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's hear from the Company and see if we have any objection first from the Company and then we'll ask the other parties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the State can't would have a very difficult time exhibiting a substantial interest in the proceeding being a foreign entity as it were. But I think we did talk about this internally, and I think the public interest will be served by Montana's participation so and also, of course, by the public interest groups such	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's hear from the Company and see if we have any objection first from the Company and then we'll ask the other parties. MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE does object to Invenergy's intervention. The intervention was just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the State can't would have a very difficult time exhibiting a substantial interest in the proceeding being a foreign entity as it were. But I think we did talk about this internally, and I think the public interest will be served by Montana's participation so and also, of course, by the public interest groups such as the Sierra Club and the others who are participating.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's hear from the Company and see if we have any objection first from the Company and then we'll ask the other parties. MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE does object to Invenergy's intervention. The intervention was just filed Friday afternoon. We did not file any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the State can't would have a very difficult time exhibiting a substantial interest in the proceeding being a foreign entity as it were. But I think we did talk about this internally, and I think the public interest will be served by Montana's participation so and also, of course, by the public interest groups such as the Sierra Club and the others who are participating. So I did want to say that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's hear from the Company and see if we have any objection first from the Company and then we'll ask the other parties. MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE does object to Invenergy's intervention. The intervention was just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	bounds that they should be kept so as to avoid any any disruptive activities. I don't anticipate that at all. I just think it's important at our first prehearing conference to sort of get the ground rules straight, if you would. And, Ms. Carson, I understood you to say that you've had this conversation with Mr. Moran or his colleagues and everybody seems to be on the same page. That's right, Your Honor. MS. CARSON: Correct, Your Honor. JUDGE MOSS: I could see you were distracted there. Thank you very much. And then last we have Invenergy, and I do oh, one more thing about the State of Montana. Somebody made a comment about the substantial interest and the public interest. I do agree that there is not a the State can't would have a very difficult time exhibiting a substantial interest in the proceeding being a foreign entity as it were. But I think we did talk about this internally, and I think the public interest will be served by Montana's participation so and also, of course, by the public interest groups such as the Sierra Club and the others who are participating.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	That said, we also are feel we do have an interest in understanding and making sure that assumptions with respect to retirement and decommissioning costs of coal strip one and two are accurate because they ultimately and decisions that are made with respect to that that facility ultimately do impact on Invenergy's energy and generating assets. JUDGE MOSS: Or may. MR. ALLAN: May. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And what's your status as a customer? Are you a marketer or do you actually use electricity that you purchase from PSE for your own business? MR. ALLAN: Your Honor, I am not clear on that. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Well, let's hear from the Company and see if we have any objection first from the Company and then we'll ask the other parties. MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE does object to Invenergy's intervention. The intervention was just filed Friday afternoon. We did not file any

		icu)		
	Page 25		Page 2	27
1	clear to me what type of a customer Invenergy is and	1	,	
2	maybe takes power may be out of the open-access	2	So does anybody else want to be heard?	
3	transmission tariff may relate, but it's not clear to	3	MS. GAFKEN: I guess the only other thing I	
4	me. That wasn't really mentioned in their petition to	4	would add is along the lines of what I was saying	
5	intervene.	5	earlier is the limitations, if their petition was	
б	We do have concerns that the substantial	6	granted, then certain limitations could be appropriate.	
7	interest goes to PSE's customers and independent power	7	JUDGE MOSS: Sure.	
8	producers who want to sell power to PSE, that they are	8	Anybody else? Ms. Carson?	
9	not regulated by the Commission. There is not an	9	MS. CARSON: Yeah, it is true in some of	
10	interest that the Commission is authorized to consider	10	those cases, for example, the current ongoing case with	
11	under the substantial interest test based on prior	11	NIPPC, they were allowed to intervene, but the	
12	Commission decisions and court decisions.	12	Commission did find that there was not a substantial	
13	So we do have concerns about this. As Your	13	interest. And so it was justified based on the public	
14	Honor previously noted, replacement power is not an	14	interest, and it's not really clear to me in this case	
15	issue in this case so and even when it is, we don't	15	what Invenergy would contribute to the public interest	
16	typically have independent power providers who intervene	16	on the issue of coal strip that isn't already addressed	
17	in the cases. So we do object to this intervention.	17	by the many different parties that are in this case at	
18	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Does anybody else	18	this point in time.	
19	want to be heard on this?	19	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you for that.	
20	Ms. Gafken.	20	All right. So we will give you we will	
21	MS. GAFKEN: I'll just weigh in briefly. In	21	give you one last word on this, and then I will make a	
22	looking at the first of all, I will start with Public	22	ruling.	
23	Counsel has no particular objection to Invenergy's	23	MR. ALLAN: One thing that Your Honor,	
24	petition for intervention. In looking at it, it seemed	24	that Invenergy does have that the other intervenors	
25	to me like it was similar to petitions that were filed	25	concerned with coal strip don't have is the experience	
	Page 26		Page 2	28
1	in other recent dockets by the Northwest & Intermountain	1	of actually operating power plants and, you know, to the	
2	Power Producers Coalition, NIPPC, or Columbia Rural	2	extent that there is public interest to be served, I	
3	Electric Association, CREA, and Yakima Power in recent	3	think public interest would be served by having another	
4	dockets dealing with Microsoft and their request to go	4	entity that actually is in the business be able to	
5	to the open-access tariff, NIPPC petition that was	5	provide information and to cross-examine on the issues	
6	Docket UE-16113 I think 23, 161123, and then the	6	related to the actual operation, decommissioning, and	
7	PacifiCorp's Schedule 300, which is Docket UE-161204.	7	the associated costs.	
8	Based on the similarities that seem to be there, Public	8	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you,	
9	Counsel doesn't have any objections.	9	Mr. Allan. I think on balance, it our interests are	
10	JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Well, we are familiar,	10	better served by denying your petition to intervene.	
11	of course, with the cases to which you refer, but I note	11	While I recognize that you have an interest, that is to	
12	there is a somewhat what of a what I think is perhaps	12	say you are in the business, I don't think it is a	
13	an important distinction, and that is that the	13	substantial interest in what we will be doing in this	
14	organizations CREA and NIPPC are just that, they're	14	proceeding, nor do I think it would be particularly in	
15	organizations. They're trade groups. Their status is	15	the public interest.	
16	somewhat different where we might find the public	16	The public interest is well-represented here	
17	interest, for example, and participation by such groups.	17	not only by some of the intervenor groups who are	
18	It's a bit more of a stretch to find that for someone	18	representing perhaps environmental interests and that	
19	who's in the business of buying and selling power,	19	sort of thing, but also by our own Commission Staff.	
20	producing power, that sort of thing.	20	Our Staff is the representative of the public interest,	
21	It's been a long time since I've had an	21	so we tend to have less of a concern in terms of full	
22	independent power producer try to come into a Commission	22	participation because of that.	
22		1		
22	proceeding. I don't have a strong recollection one way	23	I do invite you to follow the proceeding,	
	proceeding. I don't have a strong recollection one way or the other of that ever having been allowed, and I	23 24	I do invite you to follow the proceeding, and all counsel should know and you included, Mr. Allan,	
23				

Page 29 Page 31 1 f you have procedural questions about the status of 3 3 something in the case at any given point in the future, 3 MR, SHEARER, And Commission Staff also 4 voic can contact us by phone or mail. 1 do ask fivou 3 MR, PEPFLE: ICMU agrees as well. 5 on the phone there? 3 MR, PEPFLE: ICMU agrees as well. 6 there is no question of an expander contact or someone JUDGE PEARSON: Ves. The Federal Executive 7 wants for taise a concern about that, they can know that 7 Agencies? 1 Act as matter of statute and under our own procedural 11 Industrial Gas Users? MR, BROOKS: Yes, we will consent to 13 that. 12 Ident thick Ive over that a call from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sorty. 14 I don't thick the over that a call from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sorty. 15 14 I don't thick the over that a call from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sorty. 14 14 orth thick the over that a call from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sorty. 14 14 orth thick the over			ieu)	
2 your case, perhaps quastions about the status of 2 agrees to electronic service from the Commission. 3 something in the case at any given point in the future. 3 MR. PEPFLE: ICMU agrees as well. 4 you can contation us by email, that any fixed to someone 6 JUDGE PEARSON: Ves. The Federal Executive 7 wants to risels and rain expate contator someone. 6 JUDGE PEARSON: Ves. The Federal Executive 7 wants to risels and rain acrise that end under our own procedural 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And Northwest 1 data as matter of statute and under our own procedural 1 Industrial Cas Users? 1 data as matter of statute and under our own procedural 1 Industrial Cas Users? 1 data as matter of statute and under our own procedural 1 Industrial Cas Users? 1 data as matter of statute and under our own procedural 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Chay. And Northwest 1 data as matter of statute and under our own procedural 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Chay. And Northwest 1 data as matter of statute and under our own procedural 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Chay. And Northwest 1 data as matter of stat	-	-	_	-
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 phone or email. I do ask if you 5 contact us by phone or email. I do ask if you 5 contact us by phone or email. I do ask if you 7 wants to raise a concern about that, they can know that 7 wents to raise a concern about that, they can know that 7 densities and 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. 10 UDGE PEARSON: Okay. And Northwest 14 Act as a matter of statute and under our own procedural 13 that. 14 I don't think I've ever had a call from 14 14 UDGE PEARSON: Okay. And Northwest 14 15 ourset that don't begin with, Judge Moss, can we tak 15 MR, PEPFLE: That was me. 16 16 out think will get through that over all these years 18 MR, REOKSI: Yes, Nucor Steel 19 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Silemar Club? 10 12 basies in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 20 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Silemar Club? 21 23 aud I'm havel I be haype. I'the glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission Thank you. 2 24 Pearson. 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Silemar Club? 20 24 Pearson. 21 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Silemar Club? 21 24				
4 you can contact us by phone or email. I do ask if you 4 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Want to take the total 5 on the phone there? 5 on the phone there? 7 wants to raise a concern about that, they can know that 5 on the phone there? 8 there is not upsets on an expanse the both under up rocedural 10 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, FEA agrees to electronic 9 here should be, and I'm sure is, familiar with our 9 service. 10 act as a matter of statute and under our ow procedural 11 Industrial Gas Users? 11 harts. 10 UDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 12 total a procedural issue, and then they issue hor our own procedural 11 Industrial Gas Users? 13 that. 10 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 14 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sony. 10 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sony. 15 out a procedural issue, and then they issue of a statute completes our 10 JUDGE PEARSON: Char, and ICNU? 15 business in terms of patitions to intervene, and I'm 10 JUDGE PEARSON: Char, and they then advent to statute and the sequent and the wer an endy. but that completes our 10 JUDGE PEARSON: Char, and they then advent to statute completes our				-
5 contact us by email, that you copy the parties so that 5 on the phone there? 6 there's is no question of an ex-parte contact or someone 6 JUDGE PEARSON: Yes. The Federal Executive 7 wants to risk as concern about that, they can know that 8 MS. LIOTTA: Yes. FEA agrees to electronic 9 here's been a contact and ministrative Procedures 10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And Northwest 11 here's no sure everybody will be catifications about 12 MR. BROOKS: Yes, we will consent to 13 that. 14 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 14 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me. 15 about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some 16 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 16 about aprocedural issue, and the metry launch into some 19 MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Nucor Steel consents to 17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay. 17 Nucor Steel. 10 18 MR Ver managed to get through that over all these years 18 MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Nucor Steel consents to 19 anterdw entered a standard protective order with highly 21 UDGE PEARSON: Chay. So that the sourenosion and all parties	3			-
6 there is no question of an ex-parte contact or someone y wants to riste a concert adout that, they can know that there's been a contact and riste that concent. Everyone bere should be, and I'm sure is, familiar with our low-parter rule both under the Administrative Procedural 11 Act as a matter of statute and under our own procedural 12 Act as a matter of statute and under our own procedural 13 Act as a matter of statute and under our own procedural 14 Act as a matter of statute and under our own procedural 15 Act as a matter of statute and under our own procedural 16 about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some 16 about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some 17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okey, 17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okey, 18 We'v managed to get through it again. 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thenk you. 20 So I believe with that, that completes our 21 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okey, 23 alang now and turn the floor back over to Judge 24 Pearson. 25 JuDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 21 butiess in times of petitons to intervene, and fm 23 alang now and turn the floor back over to Judge 24 add yentered a standard protective order with highly 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 2 consented to electronic service. The age 30 1 act add yentered a standard protective order with highly 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 3 the discover visias valiable 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 5 consented to electronic service in the documents that 5 consented to electronic service in the documents integronically. 10 We can begin with the Company and go around 11 the room. 11 the room. 12 detectronic service. 13 substantial get performs as a lange as a mana matter as a matter as anot and and protecet as an ano	4		4	-
7 wants to raise a concern about that, they can know that 7 Agencies? 8 there's beer a contact and raise that concern. Everyone 8 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, FEA agrees to electronic 10 exparte rule both under the Administrative Procedures 10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And Northwest 11 rules. So I'm sure everybody will be cautious about 11 Initiatial Gas Users? 12 rules. So I'm sure everybody will be cautious about 11 Initiatial Gas Users? 12 rules. So I'm sure everybody will be cautious about 11 Initiatial Gas Users? 13 that 11 Initiatial Gas Users? 14 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 15 counsel that divit begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk 16 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sorry. 17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay. 17 Nucor Steel. 18 We're managed to get through it again. 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you. 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and f'm 21 MR. RTCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club? 23 sue everyone will be happy. The glad to stop 22 electronic service. 23 sue of wey	5		5	
s there's been a contact and raise that concern. Everyone s MS. LIOTTA: Yes, FEA agrees to electronic o exparts rule both under the Administrative Procedures 10 JUDGE FEARSON: Okay. And Northwest 11 Act as a matter of statute and under our own procedural 11 Industrial Gas Users? 12 ulues. So I'm sure everybody will be cautious about 12 MR. BROOKS: Yes, we will consent to 13 that. 13 batt. 14 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 15 about a procedural issue, and then they leunch into some 15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me. 16 about a procedural issue, and then they leunch into some 16 JUDGE PEARSON: Chay. And the Siera Club consents 19 and think well get through it again. 19 to electronic service from the Commission and all parties 10 So I beliew with that that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Siera Club consents to 21 userservice 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Chay. And the Siera Club consents to 22 service with the flow that or only they 5 and enthusiastically prefixe electronic service. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Chay. So do t	6	·	6	
9 here should be, and I'm sure is, familiar with our 9 service. 10 exparts rule both under the Administrative Procedures 10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And Northwest 11 Act as a matter of statule and under our own procedural 11 Industrial Gas Users? 12 rules. So I'm sure everybody will be cautious about 12 MR. BROOKS: Yes, we will consent to 13 that. 13 electronic service. 14 I don't think I've ever had a call from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sory. 15 oursel that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk 15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me. 16 about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some 16 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sory. 17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay. 17 Nuccr Steel. 10 18 Were managed to get through that over all these years 18 MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Nucor Steel Consents to 19 ublew with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 21 baing now and turn the foor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PE	7		7	-
10 exparte rule both under the Administrative Procedures 10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And Northwest 11 Acta as matter of statule and under our own procedural 11 Industrial Gas Users? 12 rules. So I'm sure everybody will be cautious about 12 MR. BROOKS: Yes, we will consent to 13 that 13 electronic service. 14 I don't think I've ever had a cell from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 15 counsel that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk 15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me. 16 about ap rocedural issue, and them they launch into some 16 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sorry. 19 and I think Will get through thad over all these years 18 MR. XENPOPLOUS: Yes, Nuccor Steel consents to 10 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay. 10 DIGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 11 bit bit me low line thappy. I'b big did to top 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 12 sure everyone will be happy. I'b big did to top 22 electronic service. 24 14 JUDGE PEARSON: Cokay. Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. 14 barger yes was ble	8	•	8	-
11 Act as a matter of statute and under our own procedural 11 Industrial Gas Users? 12 Index. So fm sure everybody will be caulious about 12 MR. BROAKS: Yes, we will consent to 13 that. 13 electronic service. MR. BROAKS: Yes, we will consent to 14 I don't think I've ever had a call from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sory. 15 consent that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk 15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me. 16 about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some 16 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sory. 19 sol believe with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Siera Club? 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 10 MR. RICHE!: Yes, Siera Club consents to 22 usiness in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 10 MR. RICHE!: Yes, Siera Club consents to 23 talking now and tun the floor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. Page 32 1 already entered a standard protective order with highly 1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff 2 considential provisions in this proceeding and have made 3 the thearing, and I	9		9	
12 niles. So I'm sure everybody will be cautious about 12 MR. BROOKS: Yes, we will consent to 13 that. 13 electronic service. 14 I don't think I've ever had a call from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 15 course that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk 15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me. 16 about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some 16 JUDGE PEARSON: Oh, sorry. 17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay. 17 Nucor Steel. 18 WEX emanaged to get through it again. 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you. 20 So I believe with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 21 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to 23 suid everyone will be happ., I'lb e glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Siera Club? 25 taready entered a standard protective order with highly 1 So that brings us to the sectedule. Staff 2 2 confidential provisions in	10		10	-
13 that. 13 electronic service. 14 I don't think I've ever had a call from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 15 coursel that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk 15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me. 16 about a procedural issue, and then they lunch into some 16 JJUDGE PEARSON: Oh, sorry. 17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay. 17 Nucor Steel. 18 We've managed to get through it again. 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you. 20 So I believe with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 21 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to 22 sure everyone will be happy, I'll be glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 talking now and turn the floor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think 25 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 3 the discovery rul	11		11	
14 I don't think I've ever had a call from 14 JUDGE PEARSON: And ICNU? 15 counsel that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we taik 15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me. 16 about a proceedural issue, and then they launch into some 16 JUDGE PEARSON: On, sorry. 17 substantial question and make me angr, but that's okay. 17 Nucor Steel. 18 We've managed to get through it again. 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you. 20 So I believe with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club consents to 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 21 MR. RTCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to 22 sure everyone will be happy, I'll be glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 talking now and turn the floor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 25 onfidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 3 the haering, and I notice that the suspension date is 4 brings us to the lisue of service, ind many of you have 5 that's the corrr	12	rules. So I'm sure everybody will be cautious about	12	
15 counsel that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk 15 MR. PEPPLE: That was me. 16 about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some 16 JUDGE PEARSON: Oh, sorry. 17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay. 17 Nucor Steel. 18 We're managed to get through that over all these years 18 MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Nucor Steel consents 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you. 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club consents to 21 sure everyone will be happy. I'll be glad to stop 21 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 sure everyone will be happy. I'll be glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 provided a proposed procedural schedule to us prior to 1 the discovery rules available to the partiles. So that 3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 4 bridgs us to the issue of service, in the documents that 5 that's the correct suspension date? 5 ovoufifed with the Commission. But for the recor	13		13	
16 about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some 16 JUDGE PEARSON: Oh, sory. 17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay. 17 Nucor Steel. 18 We've managed to get through it again. 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you. 20 So I believe with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 21 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to 22 sure everyone will be happy. I'll be glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 talking now and turn the floor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. Page 30 1 already entered a standard protective order with highly 1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 3 to belectronic service in the documents that 5 to sonsented to electronic service in the documents that 4 broings us to the iscase of soruce of the trecord	14		14	
17 substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay. 17 Nucor Steel. 18 We've managed to get through that over all these years 18 MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Nucor Steel consents 19 and 1 think we'll get through that over all these years 18 MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Nucor Steel consents 19 and 1 think we'll get through that over all these years 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you. 20 So To believe with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay, And the Sierra Club? 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and 1'm 21 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think 25 that was everyone. 25 JUDGE PEARSON: New you. So we have 25 that was everyone. Page 32 1 andenthes issue of service, and many of you have 5 so that brings us to the suse of service, and many of you have 4 December 13th, 2017. Do all the parties agree that 3 rotidential provisions. But for the record 6 MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor. <t< td=""><td>15</td><td>counsel that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk</td><th>15</th><td>MR. PEPPLE: That was me.</td></t<>	15	counsel that didn't begin with, Judge Moss, can we talk	15	MR. PEPPLE: That was me.
18 We've managed to get through that over all these years 18 MR.XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Nucor Steel consents 19 and 1 think we'll get through it again. 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you. 20 So I believe with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 21 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to 22 sure everyone will be happy, I'll be glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think 25 JUDGE pEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. Page 32 1 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. Page 32 1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 4 brings us to the issue of service, in the documents that 5 that's the correct suspension date? 5 that's the correct suspension date? 10 MS. CARSON: Yes, the Commission elocides 9<	16	about a procedural issue, and then they launch into some	16	JUDGE PEARSON: Oh, sorry.
19 and I think we'll get through it again. 19 to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you. 20 So I believe with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and Im 21 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to 22 serve everyone will be happy, III be glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 talking now and turn the floor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. Page 32 1 already entered a standard protective order with highly 1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff 2 provided a proposed procedural schedule to us prior to 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 3 the thearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 4 brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have 5 that's the correct suspension date is 5 consented to electronic service if the Commission decides 8 need a reccess to discuss cheduling or has this already 9 to filed with the Company and go around 10	17	substantial question and make me angry, but that's okay.	17	Nucor Steel.
20 So I believe with that, that completes our 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And the Sierra Club? 21 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 21 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to 22 sue everyone will be happy, fil be glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 talking now and turn the floor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. Page 32 1 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. Page 32 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 2 provided a proposed procedural schedule to us prior to 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 4 brings us to the issue of service in the documents that 5 that's the corrrect suspension date? 6 volicel with the Commission decides 8 need a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already 9 to serve documents electronic service. 11 to the extent we ca	18	We've managed to get through that over all these years	18	MR. XENOPOLOUS: Yes, Nucor Steel consents
1 business in terms of petitions to intervene, and I'm 21 MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sierra Club consents to 22 sure everyone will be happy, I'll be glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 talking now and turn the floor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. Page 32 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 2 provided a proposed procedural schedule to us prior to 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 4 brings us to the issue of service in the documents that 5 that's the correct suspension date? 5 consent to electronic service if the Commission decides 8 need a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already 9 to serve documents electronically. 9 been discussed? 9 10 We can begin with the Company and go around 10 MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email 11 the recom.	19	and I think we'll get through it again.	19	to electronic service from the Commission. Thank you.
22 sure everyone will be happy. I'll be glad to stop 22 electronic service from the Commission and all parties 23 talking now and turn the floor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think 26 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 4 brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have 4 December 13th, 2017. Do all the parties agree that 5 consented to electronic service if the documents that 5 that's the correct suspension date? 6 you filed with the Commission. But for the record 6 MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor. 10 We can begin with the Company and go around 10 MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email 11 the room. 11 to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go 12 MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to 12<	20	So I believe with that, that completes our	20	-
23 taking now and turn the floor back over to Judge 23 and enthusiastically prefers electronic service. 24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. Page 32 1 already entered a standard protective order with highly 1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 2 provided a proposed procedural schedule to us prior to 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 4 brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have 5 5 consented to electronic service in the documents that 5 that's the correct suspension date? 6 you filed with the Commission. But for the record 6 MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor. 7 today. I will ask each of you to confirm whether you 7 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So do the parties 8 consent to electronic service if the Commission decides 8 need a recess to discuss cheduling or has this already 9 to serve documents electronically. 10 MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email 11 the room. 11 to the extent we can di	21	-	21	·
24 Pearson. 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. 1 think 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. 26 already entered a standard protective order with highly 1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 3 the discovery nues available to the parties. So that 3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 4 brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have 4 December 13th, 2017. Do all the parties agree that 5 consented to electronic service if the documents that 5 that's the correct suspension date? 6 you filed with the Commission. But for the record 6 MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor. 7 today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you 7 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So do the parties 8 consent to electronic service if the Company and go around 10 MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email 11 the room. 11 to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go 12 MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to 12 forward. 13 elect	22	sure everyone will be happy, I'll be glad to stop	22	electronic service from the Commission and all parties
25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have 25 that was everyone. Page 30 Page 32 1 already entered a standard protective order with highly 1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 1 So that brings us to the schedule to us prior to 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 5 consented to electronic service in the documents that 5 that 's the correct suspension date? 6 you filed with the Commission. But for the record 6 MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor. 7 today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you 7 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So do the parties 8 consent to electronic service if the Company and go around 10 MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email 11 the room. 11 to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go 12 MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to 12 forward. 13 electronic service. 13 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a 14 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. 14 recess, then?	23	talking now and turn the floor back over to Judge	23	and enthusiastically prefers electronic service.
Page 30 Page 32 1 already entered a standard protective order with highly 1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff 2 confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made 1 So that brings us to the schedule. Staff 3 the discovery rules available to the parties. So that 3 the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is 4 brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have 5 consented to electronic service in the documents that 5 6 you filed with the Commission. But for the record 6 MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor. 7 today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you 7 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So do the parties 8 consent to electronic service if the Company and go around 10 MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email 11 the room. 11 to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go 12 MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to 12 forward. 13 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. 14 recess, then? 14 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. 15 MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor, 16 electronic service. 12 forward. 13 <td>24</td> <td>Pearson.</td> <th>24</th> <td>JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think</td>	24	Pearson.	24	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think
1already entered a standard protective order with highly1So that brings us to the schedule. Staff2confidential provisions in this proceeding and have madeprovided a proposed procedural schedule to us prior to3the discovery rules available to the parties. So thatthe hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is4brings us to the issue of service, and many of you haveDecember 13th, 2017. Do all the parties agree that5consented to electronic service in the documents thatMR. SCARSON: Yes, Your Honor.7today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you78consent to electronic service if the Commission decidesneed a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already9been discussed?MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email11the room.11to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to12forward.13JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: Thask you.18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.21MS. GOADIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agree	25	JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So we have	25	that was everyone.
2confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made3the discovery rules available to the parties. So that4brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have5consented to electronic service in the documents that6you filed with the Commission. But for the record7today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you8consent to electronic service if the Commission decides9to serve documents electronically.10We can begin with the Company and go around11the room.12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to13electronic service.14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to16electronic service.17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to19electronic service.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.21MS. GODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable22MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to24electronic service from the Commission.24electronic service from the Commission.25MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to26MS. CARSON: Thank you.27JUDGE PEARSON: Thank y		Page 30		Page 32
3the discovery rules available to the parties. So that3the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is4brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have5consented to electronic service in the documents that4December 13th, 2017. Do all the parties agree that6you filed with the Commission. But for the record6MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor.7today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you7JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So do the parties8consent to electronic service if the Commission decides8need a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already9to serve documents electronically.9been discussed?10We can begin with the Company and go around10MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email11the room.11to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to12forward.13electronic service.13JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to1819electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.21MS. GODDIN:	1	already entered a standard protective order with highly	1	-
4brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have 54December 13th, 2017. Do all the parties agree that that's the correct suspension date?6you filed with the Commission. But for the record today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you 86MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor.7JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So do the parties 98need a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already 99to serve documents electronically.9been discussed?10We can begin with the Company and go around 1110MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email 1111the room.11to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go 1212MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to 1312JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.13JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.1414JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.1415MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to electronic service.1516electronic service.1417JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.1718MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to 91819electronic service.1920JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.1021MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable 21022Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.2223MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few 2424electronic service from the Commission.2324electronic service from the Commission.2425SogoDIN: The Energy	2	confidential provisions in this proceeding and have made	2	provided a proposed procedural schedule to us prior to
5consented to electronic service in the documents that 65that's the correct suspension date?6MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor.7today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you 878consent to electronic service if the Commission decides 989to serve documents electronically.90We can begin with the Company and go around 111011the room.1112MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to 91213electronic service.1314JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a 1415MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to 91516electronic service.1517JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.1618MR. ORAN: The State of Montana agrees to 91819electronic service.1919JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.1011think there's a lot of progress to be made among the 1417JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.1118MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to 181819electronic service.1920JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.2021MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable 222123MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to 232224electronic service from the Commission.2225Do you have this, Ms. Carson?26electronic service from the Commission.2227JUDGE PEARSON	3	the discovery rules available to the parties. So that	3	the hearing, and I notice that the suspension date is
6you filed with the Commission. But for the record6MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor.7today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you7JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So do the parties8consent to electronic service if the Commission decides8need a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already9to serve documents electronically.9been discussed?10We can begin with the Company and go around10MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email11the room.11to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to12forward.13electronic service.13JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23	4	brings us to the issue of service, and many of you have	4	December 13th, 2017. Do all the parties agree that
7today, I will ask each of you to confirm whether you7JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So do the parties8consent to electronic service if the Commission decides8need a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already9to serve documents electronically.9been discussed?10We can begin with the Company and go around10MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email11the room.11to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to12forward.13electronic service.13JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	5	consented to electronic service in the documents that	5	that's the correct suspension date?
8consent to electronic service if the Commission decides b o serve documents electronically.8need a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already been discussed?10We can begin with the Company and go around the room.10MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email11the room.11to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to electronic service.13JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to electronic service.15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor, 1616electronic service.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't 1717JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the 1818MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.10JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.11think there's a lot of progress. Now, you have these hearing1012MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable2113dates that are on here.2214or you have this, MS. Carson?15MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to electronic service from the Commission.2314electronic service from the Commission.2415with the tere service from the Commission.2316but I'm sure there with sink. Carson?<			6	MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor.
9to serve documents electronically.9been discussed?10We can begin with the Company and go around10MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email11the room.11to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to12forward.13electronic service.13JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	7		7	
10We can begin with the Company and go around10MR. SHEARER: We've discussed it via email11the room.11to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to12forward.13JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.13JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24suggested changes.24suggested changes.	8	consent to electronic service if the Commission decides	8	need a recess to discuss scheduling or has this already
11the room.11to the extent we can discuss it. So we may as well go12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to12forward.13electronic service.13JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	9	-	9	been discussed?
12MS. CARSON: Yes, the Company will agree to12forward.13electronic service.13JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	10	We can begin with the Company and go around	10	
13electronic service.13JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you want to take a14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	11		11	
14JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.14recess, then?15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	12		12	
15MR. FFITCH: The Energy Project agrees to15MR. SHEARER: That's up to you, Your Honor,16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	13		13	
16electronic service by the Commission.16but I'm sure there will be some tinkering, but I don't17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	14	·	14	
17JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.17think there's a lot of progress to be made among the18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	15		15	
18MR. MORAN: The State of Montana agrees to18parties anymore by ourselves.19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	16	•	16	-
19electronic service.19JUDGE PEARSON: I see. Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.20JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	17	-	17	
20 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. 20 JUDGE MOSS: Now, you have these hearing 21 MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable 21 dates that are on here. 22 Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service. 22 Do you have this, Ms. Carson? 23 MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to 23 MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few 24 electronic service from the Commission. 24 suggested changes.	18	-	18	
21MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable21dates that are on here.22Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.22Do you have this, Ms. Carson?23MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to23MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few24electronic service from the Commission.24suggested changes.	19		19	-
22 Northwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service. 22 Do you have this, Ms. Carson? 23 MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to 23 MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few 24 electronic service from the Commission. 24 suggested changes.	20	·	20	
23 MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to 23 MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few 24 electronic service from the Commission. 24 suggested changes.	21	MS. GOODIN: The Energy Coalition, Renewable	21	
24 electronic service from the Commission. 24 suggested changes.		Northwest and NDDC series to electronic service	22	Do you have this, Ms. Carson?
	22	Nonnwest, and NRDC agree to electronic service.	22	-
25 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. 25 JUDGE MOSS: Well, sure, sure. I don't have		MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to		-
	23	MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel also agrees to electronic service from the Commission.	23	MS. CARSON: I do, and we do have a few suggested changes.

Page 33 P 1 a problem with that, but I wanted to start by saying we 1 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, that's a long way off. 2 did have a discussion internally on the subject of 3 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, and we don't know at 4 the question of working around that, those dates, unless 5 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, and we don't know at 5 there's an irreconcilable conflict that you can bring to 5 recent periods, the practice seems to have been for 6 our attention? 7 MS. CARSON: No, there's not. PSE was 7 cross-examination. That has sometimes been fuer is 10 date got pushed back to the 24th, and it does not give 10 l forget the exact number, but I think PSE 11 much time for parties to – for witnesses and attorneys 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like th 12 to review the cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses. In whice see one open to considering 15 witnesses on average, and were probably looking at the 13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 13 number of intervenors and thinking well, one and a h 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses on average, and were probably looking at the 15 than the other parties. So we were open to considering 15 relating the 29th and continuing on Friday.
2 did have a discussion internally on the subject of 3 MS. GAFKEN: That too. 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 3 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, and we don't know at 6 our attention? 7 MS. CARSON: No, there's not. PSE was 3 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, and we don't know at 9 29th instead of the 28th because the cross-exam exhibit 6 coursel to do, shall we say, more focused 10 date got pushed back to the 24th, and it does not give 1 If orget the exact number, but I think PSE 11 much time for parties to - for witnesses and attorneys 10 I forget the exact number, but I think PSE 12 to review the cross-exam exhibits 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like 10 13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 11 number of intervenors and thinking well, one and a h 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 16 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 15 starting the addit continuing on Friday. 10 I further witn eresparse. 16 relat
3 hearing dates and we're pretty fixed on these. So are 3 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, and we don't know at 4 the question of working around that, those dates, unless 5 5 there's an irreconcilable conflict that you can bring to 5 6 our attention? 6 7 MS. CARSON: No, there's not. PSE was 5 8 interested in potentially starting the hearing on the 9 9 29th instead of the 28th because the cross-exam exhibit 9 10 date got pushed back to the 24th, and it does not give 10 10 11 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like th 12 to review the cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at the 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 15 than the other parties. So we were open to considering 15 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm looking at their parso 19 schedules to accommodate that. I know I will arrang 17 the extent necessary. Lunderstand the
4 the question of working around that, those dates, unless 4 juncture how extensive the hearing will need to be. If 5 there's an irreconcilable conflict that you can bring to 5 recent periods, the practice seems to have been for 6 our attention? 6 courattention? 6 7 MS. CARSON: No, there's not. PSE was 5 recent periods, the practice seems to have been for 9 20th instead of the 28th because the cross-exam exhibits 9 adays and three days, that sort of thing. 10 date got pushed back to the 24th, and it does not give 10 1 forget the exact number, but 1 think PSE 11 much time for parties to for witnesses and attorneys 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like th 12 to review the cross-exam exhibits 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at the 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more construing on Friday. 14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at the 15 that the other parties. So we were open to considering 15 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at the <td< td=""></td<>
5 there's an irreconcilable conflict that you can bring to 5 recent periods, the practice seems to have been for 6 our attention? 6 coursel to do, shall we say, more focused 7 MS. CARSON: No, there's not. PSE was 7 cross-examination. That has sometimes been true in 8 interested in potentially starting the hearing on the 9 earlier years, and so our hearings have gone down to 9 29th instead of the 28th because the cross-exam exhibit 10 I forget the exact number, but I think PSE 11 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like th 12 to review the cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 15 than the other parties. So we were open to considering 13 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 16 starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm looking at the 17 will be existen this case. So that's quite a number 16 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need to 16 starting the Again and continuing on through that week to 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm looking at
6 our attention? 6 counsel to do, shall we say, more focused 7 MS. CARSON: No, there's not. PSE was 6 cross-examination. That has sometimes been true in 8 interested in potentially starting the hearing on the 9 date got pushed back to the 28th because the cross-exam exhibits. 10 date got pushed back to the 24th, and it does not give 10 I forget the exact number, but I think PSE 11 much time for parties to – for witnesses and attorneys 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like th 12 to review the cross-exam exhibits. And for course, 11 has something well, one and a h 13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 11 number of intervenors and thinking well, one and a h 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 15 starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm looking at the perso 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm looking at the perso 17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need to 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm looking at the perso 16 relative to what we normally
7 MS. CARSON: No, there's not. PSE was 7 cross-examination. That has sometimes been true in 8 interested in potentially starting the hearing on the 9 9 29th instead of the 28th because the cross-exam exhibit 9 date got pushed back to the 24th, and it does not give 10 date got pushed back to the 24th, and it does not give 10 I forget the exact number, but I think PSE 11 much time for parties to for witnesses and attorneys 10 I forget the exact number, but I think PSE 13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 11 has something like th 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses in this case. So that's quite a number 16 starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to 14 witnesses in this case. So that's quite a number 17 the extent necessary. I understand there's an open 17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need to 18 meeting I think the that Thursday, so perhaps in the 18 spill over, so everybody needs to arrange their perso 19 afternoon on Thursday and then continuing on through that week to 18 spill over, so everybody needs to arrange their perso 19 afterno
8 interested in potentially starting the hearing on the 9 earlier years, and so our hearings have gone down to 9 29th instead of the 28th because the cross-exam exhibit 10 lf orget the exact number, but I think PSE 11 much time for parties to for witnesses and attorneys 10 I forget the exact number, but I think PSE 12 to review the cross-exam exhibits. And, of course, 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like th 13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something well, one and a huitnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses in this case. So that's quite a number 15 than the other parties. So we were open to considering 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm looking at the 16 starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm sure there 18 meeting I think the that Thursday, so perhaps in the 18 spill over, so everybody needs to arrange their perso 19 afternoon on Thursday and then continuing on Friday. 10 schedules to accommodate that. I know I will arrang 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.
 9 29th instead of the 28th because the cross-exam exhibit 9 days and three days, that sort of thing. 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 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 work near exame the continuing on through that week to 16 starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm sure there 17 the extent necessary. I understand there's an open 17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need to 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? 24 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 29 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 21 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 22 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 23 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein, 4 perhaps our request has already been granted, but we 5 were going to request hat 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 8 supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main
10 date got pushed back to the 24th, and it does not give 10 I forget the exact number, but I think PSE 11 much time for parties to for witnesses and attorneys 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like th 12 to review the cross-exam exhibits. 12 Pretty close to that number, and I'm looking at the 13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 13 number of intervenors and thinking well, one and a h 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 15 than the other parties. So we were open to considering 15 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm sure there 17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need th 17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need th 19 18 meeting I think the – that Thursday, so perhaps in the 18 spill over, so everybody needs to arrange their perso 19 affermoon on Thursday and then continuing on Friday. 19 schedules to accommodate that. I know I will arrang. 20 what whole week blocked off in the event that it 22 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 21
11 much time for parties to for witnesses and attorneys 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like th 12 to review the cross-exam exhibits. And, of course, 11 has something like 20 witnesses or something like th 13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 13 number of intervenors and thinking well, one and a h 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 15 than the other parties. So we were open to considering 15 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 16 starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm sure there 17 the extent necessary. I understand there's an open 17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need their perso 18 meeting 1 think the that Thursday, so perhaps in the 18 spill over, so everybody needs to arrange their perso 19 afternoon on Thursday and then continuing on Friday. 19 schedules to accommodate that. I know I will arrange 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So that will work for 19 schedules, so descard that. I know I will arrange 21 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 21 Just kidding.
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 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 25 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein, 4 perhaps our request that the hearing be formally 6 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein, 4 perhaps even Friday, the 1st because we have a witness 8 who would only be available on those days so that would
13 that's also always primarily an issue for PSE because, 13 number of intervenors and thinking well, one and a here 14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 14 witnesses on average, and we're probably looking at 15 than the other parties. So we were open to considering 14 witnesses in this case. So that's quite a number 16 starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm sure there 17 the extent necessary. I understand there's an open 17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need to 18 meeting I think the that Thursday, so perhaps in the 18 spiil over, so everybody needs to arrange their perso 19 afternoon on Thursday and then continuing on Friday. 19 schedules to accommodate that. I know I will arrange 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So that will work for 20 mine that way and forgo my vacation plans as usual. 21 the Commission. As far as the Commissioners' schedules, 21 Just kidding. 22 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 21 Just kidding. 23 mR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 25 question. We've discussed among the parties a date 23 JUDGE PEARSON:
14 you know, we get hit with a lot more cross-exam exhibits 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. Page 34 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 2 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in
15than the other parties. So we were open to considering16starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to17the extent necessary. I understand there's an open18meeting I think the that Thursday, so perhaps in the19afternoon on Thursday and then continuing on Friday.20JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So that will work for21the Commission. As far as the Commissioners' schedules,22we had that whole week blocked off in the event that it23was needed. So does Staff have any objection to24starting the hearing on the 29th?25MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff.26JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.27JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.28JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.29JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.20JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.21JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.22JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.23MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein,4perhaps our request has already been granted, but we5were going to request that the hearing be formally6the hearing dates actually formally include the 31st and7perhaps even Friday, the 1st because we have a witness8who would only be available on those days so that would
16 starting the 29th and continuing on through that week to 16 relative to what we normally have, and I'm sure there 17 the extent necessary. I understand there's an open 17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need to 18 meeting I think the that Thursday, so perhaps in the 18 spill over, so everybody needs to arrange their perso 19 afternoon on Thursday and then continuing on Friday. 19 schedules to accommodate that. I know I will arrange 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So that will work for 20 mine that way and forgo my vacation plans as usual. 21 the Commission. As far as the Commissioners' schedules, 21 Jut kidding. 22 we had that whole week blocked off in the event that it 22 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So is there anyth 23 was needed. So does Staff have any objection to 23 further with respect to the schedule? 24 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 25 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 2 1 that's on this, April 3rd, 2017, which is labeled "PSE 2 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. ffitch has something. 3 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need 3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, j
17 the extent necessary. I understand there's an open 17 will be waiver for some of those. Still, we may need to a rrange their perso 18 meeting I think the that Thursday, so perhaps in the 18 spill over, so everybody needs to arrange their perso 19 afternoon on Thursday and then continuing on Friday. 19 schedules to accommodate that. I know I will arrange 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So that will work for 19 schedules to accommodate that. I know I will arrange 21 the Commission. As far as the Commissioners' schedules, 20 mine that way and forgo my vacation plans as usual. 23 was needed. So does Staff have any objection to 23 further with respect to the schedule? 24 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 24 MR. SHEARER: Yes, Your Honor. Staff had 25 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 25 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 1 that's on this, April 3rd, 2017, which is labeled "PSE 2 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. ffitch has something. 3 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need 3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein, 4 that opportunity. So we're happy to let PSE try to 5 5
18 meeting I think the that Thursday, so perhaps in the 18 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. 26 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 27 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 28 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 29 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 29 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 29 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 21 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 22 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
19 afternoon on Thursday and then continuing on Friday. 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. 26 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 27 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 28 was needed. So does Staff have any objection to 29 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 29 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 29 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 29 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 20 mine that way and forgo my vacation plans as usual. 21 Jut kidding. 22 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So is there anyth 23 further with respect to the schedule? 24 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 29 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 20 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. ffitch has something. 3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein,<
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. Page 34 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
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. 26 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 27 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 28 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 29 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 20 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
22 we had that whole week blocked off in the event that it 22 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So is there anyth 23 was needed. So does Staff have any objection to 23 further with respect to the schedule? 24 starting the hearing on the 29th? 24 MR. SHEARER: Yes, Your Honor. Staff had 25 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 25 question. We've discussed among the parties a date Page 34 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 1 that's on this, April 3rd, 2017, which is labeled "PSE 2 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. fflich has something. 3 mR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein, 3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein, 4 that opportunity. So we're happy to let PSE try to 5 were going to request that the hearing be formally 6 MS. CARSON: Certainly. PSE has in its past 6 who would only be available on those days so that would 8 supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main
 23 was needed. So does Staff have any objection to 24 starting the hearing on the 29th? 25 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 26 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 27 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 28 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 23 further with respect to the schedule? 24 MR. SHEARER: Yes, Your Honor. Staff had 25 question. We've discussed among the parties a date 26 question. We've discussed among the parties a date 27 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 general cases and power cost only rate cases submittee 8 who would only be available on those days so that would
24 starting the hearing on the 29th? 24 MR. SHEARER: Yes, Your Honor. Staff had 25 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 25 question. We've discussed among the parties a date Page 34 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 1 that's on this, April 3rd, 2017, which is labeled "PSE 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 3 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need 5 were going to request that the hearing be formally 6 that opportunity. So we're happy to let PSE try to 6 the hearing dates actually formally include the 31st and 7 general cases and power cost only rate cases submittee 8 who would only be available on those days so that would 8 supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main
25 MR. SHEARER: No objection from Staff. 25 question. We've discussed among the parties a date Page 34 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 1 that's on this, April 3rd, 2017, which is labeled "PSE 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 3 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need 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
Page 34 P 1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 1 that's on this, April 3rd, 2017, which is labeled "PSE 2 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. ffitch has something. 2 supplemental testimony." Staff is still a little 3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein, 3 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need 4 perhaps our request has already been granted, but we 4 that opportunity. So we're happy to let PSE try to 5 were going to request that the hearing be formally 6 MS. CARSON: Certainly. PSE has in its past 6 ms. cARSON: Certainly. PSE has in its past 7 general cases and power cost only rate cases submitted 8 who would only be available on those days so that would 8 supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main
1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 1 that's on this, April 3rd, 2017, which is labeled "PSE 2 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. ffitch has something. 2 supplemental testimony." Staff is still a little 3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein, 3 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need 4 perhaps our request has already been granted, but we 4 that opportunity. So we're happy to let PSE try to 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
2 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. ffitch has something. 2 supplemental testimony." Staff is still a little 3 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in that vein, 3 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need 4 perhaps our request has already been granted, but we 3 unclear as to what that will be and why PSE would need 5 were going to request that the hearing be formally 6 that opportunity. So we're happy to let PSE try to 6 the hearing dates actually formally include the 31st and 7 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 submittee 8 who would only be available on those days so that would 8 supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main
3MR. 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 would3 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.30405060707080809 </td
 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 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
5were going to request that the hearing be formally5clarify that for us if we can on the record.6the hearing dates actually formally include the 31st and6MS. CARSON: Certainly. PSE has in its past7perhaps even Friday, the 1st because we have a witness7general cases and power cost only rate cases submitted8who would only be available on those days so that would8supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main
6the hearing dates actually formally include the 31st and6MS. CARSON: Certainly. PSE has in its past7perhaps even Friday, the 1st because we have a witness7general cases and power cost only rate cases submitted8who would only be available on those days so that would8supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main
7perhaps even Friday, the 1st because we have a witness7general cases and power cost only rate cases submitted8who would only be available on those days so that would8supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main
8 who would only be available on those days so that would 8 supplemental testimony. Primarily one of the main
9 be helpful to the Energy Project. 9 issues is to update power costs, and we did that
10JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. That sounds good. We10in 2009, 2011, 2013, and '14 precourse. The Commissi
11 can certainly do that, and we can schedule it for the 11 had at one time expressed a desire that its such
12afternoon of the 31st or whenever the open meeting12supplemental filing be provided with ample time for
13concludes with a short break. Whatever works for the13other parties to review it before their response
14 parties.14 testimony is due. And so in 2011, we started doing that
15Anyone else?15as part of the procedural schedule.
16MS. GAFKEN: Yes, I have one thing. I have16But it also sets a date if there's any, you
17 mentioned this to the parties, but we have a witness 17 know, corrections or numbers that were estimates that
18that has a hearing in Arkansas on the 30th. And so18have become known and measurable that we can update
19 travel could be a little tricky if we start on the 29th, 19 and give other parties sufficient time to audit the
20I think we're willing to do that with the understanding20information. But primarily its updating power costs.
20 I think we're willing to do that with the understanding 20 information. But primarily its updating power costs.
20I think we're willing to do that with the understanding20information. But primarily its updating power costs.21that we may be coming to the parties and the Commission21The power costs projections for the filed case I believe
20I think we're willing to do that with the understanding20information. But primarily its updating power costs.21that we may be coming to the parties and the Commission21The power costs projections for the filed case I believe22with a proposal on how to deal with that witness in22used the forward natural gas prices for a period for

	Page 37	100.	Page 39
1	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.	1	that?
2	MR. SHEARER: We're still a little unclear	2	Thank you, Ms. Brown. I appreciate the
3	about a power cost update in April and the need for	3	confirmation.
4	that. And will it not be updated again later in the	4	MS. BROWN: I like mud.
5	case? And if I just make sure we understand	5	MS. CARSON: Well, that is why we proposed
6	correctly that PSE believes updates to be known as just	6	it early in April.
7	numerical updates. You know, we're not going to get 75	7	JUDGE MOSS: Yeah, and I don't want to
8	pages of supplemental testimony or something along those	8	discourage you from doing it that early. That still
9	lines.	9	gives the responsive parties three months and, of
10	MS. CARSON: No.	10	course, if you file it and they don't like, they can
11	MR. SHEARER: That's obviously a Staff	11	object to it even then or just as they can object to
12	concern.	12	your original testimony and ask me to strike or ask
13	MS. CARSON: That hasn't been the case in	13	us to strike portions of that. I mean, this is, you
14	the past with significant amount of testimony. There	14	know, we play we play by the rules and we give
15	won't be a change in the methodologies. It will just be	15	everybody the full opportunity to do what they need to
16	refreshing numbers. And we have in some cases updated	16	do to represent the interests of their clients. So
17	supplemental testimony power cost, and then again in	17	having said all of that, I will be quiet again. Thank
18	rebuttal, just really depending on what's happening with	18	you.
19	power costs. But, you know, that's that's up to the	19	MR. SHEARER: Thank you. With those
20	Commission. If the Commission doesn't want us to update	20	clarifications from Ms. Carson and Judge Moss, Staff has
21	again in rebuttal, we certainly don't need to.	21	no objection to including April 3rd on the schedule, and
22	JUDGE MOSS: Let me just interject here that	22	we appreciate the parties having that discussion on the
23	I appreciate your last comment because we have been	23	record.
24	having some internal discussions about the subject of	24	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Is there anything
25	power cost updates. In recent cases, we've had power	25	
	Page 38		Page 40
1	cost updates in rate cases and sometimes multiple power	1	MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE does have one
2	cost updates, and sometimes very near the end of the	2	other request for a change. The settlement conference
3	case, and in some instances per a request to do it after	3	number two, July 25th, falls at a time of a NARUC
4	the end of the case and so forth and so on.	4	meeting, I believe. And so some people will not be
5	The practice of doing power cost updates in	5	available, and we would like to move it up. Didn't have
б	general rate cases came into being in a time when power	6	a chance to talk with other parties about this, but I
7	costs were high and volatile, and it was an appropriate	7	would think maybe earlier in July would work. And I
8	thing to do. It often saved the customers a lot of	8	don't know that we have to come up with that date today,
9	money when we were able to update the power cost in a	9	but anyway, July 25th isn't a good date.
10	period when gas prices were flying or what have you,	10	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. As long as we have
11	but, of course, there was the double threat there that	11	the first settlement conference schedule and then the
12	might go the other way. We've had fairly stable gas	12	prehearing conference, that's fine, and the parties can
13	prices and other fuel source prices, electric prices	13	determine at a later date when the second one will be
14	relatively speaking during more recent periods.	14	held.
15	So I think it will be a case of it's all	15	MR. SHEARER: Yes, Staff has no objection to
16	well and good to file supplemental testimony and to plan	16	that.
17	to do that, but I think the parties need to be aware	17	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.
18	that partainly the further aut any hady wants to go with	18	MR. SHEARER: Sounds like a good plan.
ΤO	that certainly the further out anybody wants to go with		
19	that, it's going to be subject to objection from other	19	JUDGE PEARSON: Ms. Gafken, did you have
		19 20	JUDGE PEARSON: Ms. Gatken, did you have something to add?
19	that, it's going to be subject to objection from other		-
19 20	that, it's going to be subject to objection from other parties, and it may even be something that the	20	something to add?
19 20 21	that, it's going to be subject to objection from other parties, and it may even be something that the Commission itself decides it's not something we want to	20 21	something to add? MS. GAFKEN: Yes, I have two things. I just
19 20 21 22	that, it's going to be subject to objection from other parties, and it may even be something that the Commission itself decides it's not something we want to do. So just a caution in that regard. And I don't want	20 21 22	something to add? MS. GAFKEN: Yes, I have two things. I just wanted to put in a plug for two public comment hearings

	Page 41		Page 43
1	those are two places where PSE general rate cases and	1	respond to that?
2	comment hearings have been held before. That seems to	2	MS. GAFKEN: Public Counsel supports that
3	work well. I proposed a couple of weeks there that	3	request.
4	hopefully will work with the schedule.	4	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. ffitch?
5	The other thing that I wanted to note that's	5	MR. FFITCH: We have no objection to that,
6	not on there and that's the customer notice report	6	although it plays havoc with our embedded numbering
7	that's generally about a month or so after the	7	templates for our system. One must change with the
8	prehearing conference, and that's a letter usually that	8	times and save paper. And after this matter, I did
9	Public Counsel will file alerting the Commission about	9	think of one other minor administrative issue to raise.
10	the status of the customer notice that goes in with the	10	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Ms. Goodin?
11	bills and informs them about the rate case. I have	11	MS. GOODIN: We also support that request
12	talked to the Company, and it looks like a slightly	12	and would request electric service of those copies as
13	longer time period will be needed in this case.	13	well if possible from other parties.
14	Primarily because lots of files happen in the month of	14	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Moran?
15	March for the Company, and so we've talked about having	15	MR. MORAN: We support the request, Your
16	that report due on April 12th.	16	Honor.
17	JUDGE PEARSON: Can you tell me the name of	17	MS. CARSON: PSE doesn't object to the
18	it one more time?	18	request.
19	MS. GAFKEN: Sure, the customer notice	19	MR. PEPPLE: ICNU supports the request.
20	report.	20	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And for those on the
21	JUDGE PEARSON: Customer notice report,	21	phone.
22	okay. All the other parties are okay with that?	22	MR. XENOPOLOUS: Nucor has no objection,
23	JUDGE MOSS: I used to not let Mr. ffitch do	23	Your Honor.
24	this to our procedural schedule, but Ms. Gafken thinks	24	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.
25	it's matured around here I guess, so	25	MR. BROOKS: No objection from NIGU.
	—		
	Page 42		Page 44
1	Page 42 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else?	1	Page 44 MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either.
1 2	-	1 2	C C
	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else?		MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either.
2	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your	2	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the
2 3	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further,	2 3	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request.
2 3 4	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks.	2 3 4	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.	2 3 4 5	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about
2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us	2 3 4 5 6	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the
2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you know, please provide copies of any and all of your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me, and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you know, please provide copies of any and all of your requests and responses to all the parties.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me, and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that doesn't matter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you know, please provide copies of any and all of your requests and responses to all the parties. JUDGE MOSS: Instead of having to do the DR	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me, and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that doesn't matter. BPA has done this for years and it seems to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you know, please provide copies of any and all of your requests and responses to all the parties. JUDGE MOSS: Instead of having to do the DR asking for exactly the same thing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me, and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that doesn't matter. BPA has done this for years and it seems to work very, very well in their proceedings. The only one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you know, please provide copies of any and all of your requests and responses to all the parties. JUDGE MOSS: Instead of having to do the DR asking for exactly the same thing. MR. SHEARER: Exactly. So if everybody is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me, and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that doesn't matter. BPA has done this for years and it seems to work very, very well in their proceedings. The only one I was ever involved in was 17 or 18 years ago when there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you know, please provide copies of any and all of your requests and responses to all the parties. JUDGE MOSS: Instead of having to do the DR asking for exactly the same thing. MR. SHEARER: Exactly. So if everybody is willing, all the parties are willing to stipulate to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me, and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that doesn't matter. BPA has done this for years and it seems to work very, very well in their proceedings. The only one I was ever involved in was 17 or 18 years ago when there were 68 parties and it works pretty well. I don't think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you know, please provide copies of any and all of your requests and responses to all the parties. JUDGE MOSS: Instead of having to do the DR asking for exactly the same thing. MR. SHEARER: Exactly. So if everybody is willing, all the parties are willing to stipulate to that now, that would be helpful. Save everybody ten DRs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me, and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that doesn't matter. BPA has done this for years and it seems to work very, very well in their proceedings. The only one I was ever involved in was 17 or 18 years ago when there were 68 parties and it works pretty well. I don't think I had a single problem while I was presiding in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you know, please provide copies of any and all of your requests and responses to all the parties. JUDGE MOSS: Instead of having to do the DR asking for exactly the same thing. MR. SHEARER: Exactly. So if everybody is willing, all the parties are willing to stipulate to that now, that would be helpful. Save everybody ten DRs from going out to each other.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me, and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that doesn't matter. BPA has done this for years and it seems to work very, very well in their proceedings. The only one I was ever involved in was 17 or 18 years ago when there were 68 parties and it works pretty well. I don't think I had a single problem while I was presiding in the case, and it went real well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Anything else? MR. FFITCH: May I just have a moment, Your Honor, to confer with counsel? We have nothing further, Your Honor. Thanks. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So we appreciate the parties coming to us with this schedule and we will adopt it in the prehearing conference order with the modifications. MR. SHEARER: We did have one more administrative question. I guess I've learned from my colleagues it has become recent practice to stipulate to the standard first DR that all the parties serve each other. It struck me that that might be a good idea in this case, given that we have so many intervenors, you know, please provide copies of any and all of your requests and responses to all the parties. JUDGE MOSS: Instead of having to do the DR asking for exactly the same thing. MR. SHEARER: Exactly. So if everybody is willing, all the parties are willing to stipulate to that now, that would be helpful. Save everybody ten DRs from going out to each other. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. That sounds good.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. LIOTTA: FEA has no objection either. MR. RITCHIE: Sierra Club supports the request. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: Well, you all be thinking about during the course of discovery in this case, the proposal that I made years ago and it never went anywhere that and that was to come up with some means to have a common site for discovery so that you don't have to have all this back and forth and back and forth, but everybody can find access to the same site and discovery can all be available in one place. And, of course, in our electronic age, this is increasingly possible to do and easy to do for everybody except me, and I'm not involved in the discovery process so that doesn't matter. BPA has done this for years and it seems to work very, very well in their proceedings. The only one I was ever involved in was 17 or 18 years ago when there were 68 parties and it works pretty well. I don't think I had a single problem while I was presiding in the case, and it went real well. MS. CARSON: Your Honor, PSE did make such a

	cket Nos. DE-170033 and DG-170034 (Consolida	ieu,) - VOI. I Z/13/20
	Page 45		Page 47
1	parties objected to that. I believe Commission Staff or	1	adjourned. Thank you.
2	some members of Commission Staff were not comfortable	2	(Adjourned at 10:23 a.m.)
3	with that. We certainly would endorse that. It saves a	3	
4	lot of time and email correspondence, and we think it's	4	
5	a good solution.	5	
б	JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Well, I think it's	6	
7	probably best left to the parties to work that sort of	7	
8	thing out among themselves rather than us trying to	8	
9	dictate something from the bench. But I did want to	9	
10	raise the idea again. Thank you for making that point.	10	
11	Perhaps you can have some further discussions and make	11	
12	some progress in this direction.	12	
13	MS. BROWN: I just want say that it does	13	
14	raise issues with regard to compliance with the State's	14	
15	Public Records Act and the Records Retention Act. We	15	
16	have a special database that files within the utility.	16	
17	JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Thank you.	17	
18	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.	18	
19	JUDGE MOSS: It's the virtue of having the	19	
20	head of the division appearing in the case. Gives you a	20	
21	broader perspective on things.	21	
22	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So for filing, so we	22	
23	took a count and we will need an original plus 11 copies	23	
24	for internal distribution at the Commission. And if	24	
25	filings include information designated as confidential	25	
	Page 46		Page 48
1		1	CERTIFICATE
2	of the fully unredacted version, an original and one	2	
3	copy of any partly redacted version, and an original and	3	STATE OF WASHINGTON
4	one copy of the fully redacted version. So we will	4	COUNTY OF THURSTON
5	require you to submit a witness list showing order of	5	
6	presentation, time estimates for cross-examination of	6	I, Tayler Russell, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
7	each witness, and cross-examination exhibit list shortly	7	in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify
8	before the evidentiary hearings, and we will exchange	8	that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to
9	cross-examination exhibits prior to the hearing and take	9	the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
10	up any other business that will maximize efficiency at	10	
11	the hearing such as stipulating to the admission of	11	
12	testimony and exhibits.	12	Tayler Russell, CCR
13	And if any party has not yet designated a	13	
	lead representative for service, please do so via an	14	
14 15	email to Judge Moss and myself as soon as possible. And	14 15	
15 16	if anyone would like to add names and email addresses of		
	other representatives or support staff who should	16 17	
17		17	
18	receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents	18	
19	filed in this proceeding, please email that to us as	19	
20	well.	20	
21	Is there anything else that we need to	21	
22	address while we're here today? Okay. Hearing nothing,	22	
23	just want to thank the parties for all coming and	23	
24	participating today, and we will issue an order	24	
25	reflecting what was discussed here today, and we are	25	