Docket Nos. TG-200650 and TG-200651 (Consolidated) - Vol. III

Murrey's Disposal Co. Inc. v. Waste Management of Washington, Inc.

January 26, 2021



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u> email: <u>info@buellrealtime.com</u>



Page 116	Page 118
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
MURREY'S DISPOSAL CO., INC.,)DOCKETS TG-200650 and)TG-200651 (Consolidated) Complainant,)	3 ANDREW O'CONNELL 4 5
vs.)	6 FOR MURREY'S DISPOSAL: 7 BLAIR FASSBURG DAVE WILEY
WASTE MGMT. OF WASH., INC.,) WASTE MGMT. DISPOSAL SERVICES) OF OR., AND MJ TRUCKING &)	8 Williams Kastner 601 Union Street, Suite 4100
CONTRACTING,)) Respondents.)*Caption Continued*	9 Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 628-6600 10 bfassburg@williamskastner.com dwiley@williamskastner.com
VIRTUAL STATUS CONFERENCE, VOLUME III	11 12
Pages 116-141	13 FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT: 14 ANDREW KENEFICK Waste Management
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ANDREW O'CONNELL	15 720 Fourth Avenue, Suite 400 Kirkland, Washington 98033 16 (425) 825-2003
January 26, 2021 10:10 a.m.	akenefick@wm.com
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast	18 FOR RESPONDENTS: 19
Lacey, Washington 98503 REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358	JESSICA GOLDMAN 20 Summit Law Group 315 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 1000
Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840 Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 287-9066 Seattle	21 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 676-7000 22 jessicag@summitlaw.com
(360) 534-9066 Olympia (800) 846-6989 National www.buellrealtime.com	 23 24 (All participants appeared via Teams) 25 * * * * *
Page 117	Page 119
1 MURREY'S DISPOSAL CO., INC.,)	1 LACEY, WASHINGTON; JANUARY 26, 2021
2 Complainant,))	2 10:10 A.M. 3000
3 vs.))	4 PROCEEDINGS 5
4 WASTE MGMT. OF WASH., INC.,) WASTE MGMT. DISPOSAL SERVICES)	 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be on the record. Good morning. The time is approximately ten after 10:00
5 OF OR., AND DANIEL ANDERSON) TRUCKING AND EXCAVATION, LLC,)	8 in the morning on Tuesday, January 26th, 2020. 2021, I
6) Respondents.)	9 apologize. 10 My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an
7 8	 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I am co-presiding in
7 8 9 10 11	11 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I am co-presiding in these matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual status conference is consolidated Dockets TG-200650 and
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I am co-presiding in these matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual status conference is consolidated Dockets TG-200650 and TG-200651 to discuss the procedure for these consolidated dockets.
7	 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I am co-presiding in these matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual status conference is consolidated Dockets TG-200650 and TG-200651 to discuss the procedure for these consolidated dockets. After this conference, I will issue an order or a notice describing the procedural events and dates
7	 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I am co-presiding in these matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual status conference is consolidated Dockets TG-200650 and TG-200651 to discuss the procedure for these consolidated dockets. After this conference, I will issue an order or a notice describing the procedural events and dates that will apply going forward. I sent some preliminary thoughts to the
7	 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I am co-presiding in these matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual status conference is consolidated Dockets TG-200650 and TG-200651 to discuss the procedure for these consolidated dockets. After this conference, I will issue an order or a notice describing the procedural events and dates that will apply going forward. I sent some preliminary thoughts to the parties and ask that they collaborate to determine if an
7	 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I am co-presiding in these matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual status conference is consolidated Dockets TG-200650 and TG-200651 to discuss the procedure for these consolidated dockets. After this conference, I will issue an order or a notice describing the procedural events and dates that will apply going forward. I sent some preliminary thoughts to the parties and ask that they collaborate to determine if an

1 (Pages 116 to 119)

	Page 120		Page 122
1	Let's begin with Murrey's Disposal.	1	determination.
2	MR. FASSBURG: Good morning, Your Honor.	2	I'll say for our part, we were awfully close
3	Blair Fassburg here today with Dave Wiley, both at	3	to agreeing on a stipulated record, and I'm not sure in
4	Williams Kastner, representing the complainant, Murrey's	4	the end the facts will be in dispute. It may be just a
5	Disposal Company.	5	dispute about which facts are material, which means to
6	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.	6	me that it's pretty ripe for summary determination.
7	And for respondents.	7	And so we think after a short period for
8	MS. GOLDMAN: Good morning, Your Honor.	8	discovery, we would be prepared to file a motion for
9	Jessica Goldman from The Summit Law Group on behalf of	9	summary determination in approximately six weeks, but we
10	all of the respondents, and also with me is Andrew	10	would definitely like the opportunity to do that before
11	Kenefick, in-house counsel for the Waste Management	11	going forward with preparing prefiled testimony and
12	respondents.	12	having a live hearing.
13	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	13	But in the event for some reason the
14	So prior to this hearing, I sent a message	14	Commission determines there is either a factual dispute
15	to the parties with some general expectations of a	15	or it doesn't want to resolve the case on summary
16	schedule. I'd included that the parties consider dates	16	determination, I think ideally we'd like to have the
17	for the filing of written direct response and rebuttal	17	hearing date and other scheduled dates in an order now
18	testimony followed by a hearing at which we would hear	18	to avoid the potential delay that occurs if we wait to
19	any cross-examination.	19	schedule those things until we determine if these
20	I want to hear from the parties because the	20	dispositive motions will be successful.
21	Commission will consider whether it is more efficient	21	So, again, without a hearing date, some of
22	simply to have all witnesses testify at a single hearing	22	these dates would be sort of hard to fill in now, but we
23	with exhibits filed a few weeks prior or any other	23	do have some proposed dates for motions for summary
24	options for the producing of testimony and exhibits that	24	determination, responses, and then the next phase.
25	maybe the parties have discussed.	25	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Ms. Goldman, what
	Page 121		Page 123
1	I'd also included the Commission's	1	are your thoughts?
2	expectation that the parties would likely want to move	2	MS. GOLDMAN: Yeah, I think I am generally
3	for a summary determination at some point. If that is	3	in agreement with Mr. Fassburg regarding the procedure
4	the case, the Commission wants to consider setting dates	4	going forward. I and we do have some dates that we
5	for simultaneous cross motions for summary determination	5	discussed that would should work for both parties.
6	and response briefs followed by another conference to	6	I there are two issues that I wanted to
7	determine a procedure going forward from there if the	7	flag for Your Honor. One is whether we need to file
8	Commission is unable to grant summary determination.	8	cross motions for summary judgment. In court, the
9	So with that, let me turn to the parties and	9	responding party can effectively move for summary
10	hear from them starting with Murrey's Disposal.	10	judgment and the the court always had the authority
11	Mr. Fassburg, have you discussed a	11	to grant summary judgment for the nonmoving party.
		12	
12	procedural schedule with the respondents and what are	12	Given the amount of briefing that has been
12 13	procedural schedule with the respondents and what are your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for	13	done here, one idea I had was that they file their
			·
13	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for	13	done here, one idea I had was that they file their
13 14	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination?	13 14	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four
13 14 15	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination? MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So yes, Dave Wiley and	13 14 15	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four briefs, there are two. But that I wanted to make sure
13 14 15 16	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination? MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So yes, Dave Wiley and I spoke with Ms. Goldman yesterday to go over the	13 14 15 16	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four briefs, there are two. But that I wanted to make sure that would preserve the your and the UTC's ability to
13 14 15 16 17	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination? MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So yes, Dave Wiley and I spoke with Ms. Goldman yesterday to go over the potential schedule. With your email in mind, from your	13 14 15 16 17	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four briefs, there are two. But that I wanted to make sure that would preserve the your and the UTC's ability to grant summary judgment for either party or if you would
13 14 15 16 17 18	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination? MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So yes, Dave Wiley and I spoke with Ms. Goldman yesterday to go over the potential schedule. With your email in mind, from your email, it appeared as though you preferred a schedule	13 14 15 16 17 18	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four briefs, there are two. But that I wanted to make sure that would preserve the your and the UTC's ability to grant summary judgment for either party or if you would prefer that we actually did four four briefs.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination? MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So yes, Dave Wiley and I spoke with Ms. Goldman yesterday to go over the potential schedule. With your email in mind, from your email, it appeared as though you preferred a schedule that went ahead and set all dates. So without knowing	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four briefs, there are two. But that I wanted to make sure that would preserve the your and the UTC's ability to grant summary judgment for either party or if you would prefer that we actually did four four briefs. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. This is something
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination? MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So yes, Dave Wiley and I spoke with Ms. Goldman yesterday to go over the potential schedule. With your email in mind, from your email, it appeared as though you preferred a schedule that went ahead and set all dates. So without knowing exactly when the hearing could be scheduled, we couldn't	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four briefs, there are two. But that I wanted to make sure that would preserve the your and the UTC's ability to grant summary judgment for either party or if you would prefer that we actually did four four briefs. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. This is something that we've discussed, the summary the motions for
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination? MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So yes, Dave Wiley and I spoke with Ms. Goldman yesterday to go over the potential schedule. With your email in mind, from your email, it appeared as though you preferred a schedule that went ahead and set all dates. So without knowing exactly when the hearing could be scheduled, we couldn't fill in all of the potential dates. But I will say we	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four briefs, there are two. But that I wanted to make sure that would preserve the your and the UTC's ability to grant summary judgment for either party or if you would prefer that we actually did four four briefs. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. This is something that we've discussed, the summary the motions for summary determination, and we do want to see it as cross
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination? MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So yes, Dave Wiley and I spoke with Ms. Goldman yesterday to go over the potential schedule. With your email in mind, from your email, it appeared as though you preferred a schedule that went ahead and set all dates. So without knowing exactly when the hearing could be scheduled, we couldn't fill in all of the potential dates. But I will say we worked out ideas on how the schedule would work, and I	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four briefs, there are two. But that I wanted to make sure that would preserve the your and the UTC's ability to grant summary judgment for either party or if you would prefer that we actually did four four briefs. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. This is something that we've discussed, the summary the motions for summary determination, and we do want to see it as cross motions for summary determination, one from each side.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your thoughts about setting a date for cross motions for summary determination? MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So yes, Dave Wiley and I spoke with Ms. Goldman yesterday to go over the potential schedule. With your email in mind, from your email, it appeared as though you preferred a schedule that went ahead and set all dates. So without knowing exactly when the hearing could be scheduled, we couldn't fill in all of the potential dates. But I will say we worked out ideas on how the schedule would work, and I do believe both sides I can't speak for the	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	done here, one idea I had was that they file their motion and we respond, so there's instead of four briefs, there are two. But that I wanted to make sure that would preserve the your and the UTC's ability to grant summary judgment for either party or if you would prefer that we actually did four four briefs. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. This is something that we've discussed, the summary the motions for summary determination, and we do want to see it as cross motions for summary determination, one from each side. MS. GOLDMAN: Okay. So that settled that.

2 (Pages 120 to 123)

		1	
	Page 124		Page 126
1	from our part we we want to make sure that that	1	have for discovery and preparing a brief, the first
2	you and the Commission have enough time to resolve the	2	deadline we are suggesting for filing the cross motions
3	summary determination motion before moving on to the	3	is March 16th, and then giving approximately three weeks
4	hearing. So we in that schedule we contemplated, we	4	to each side to respond to the opposing motion, the next
5	built that time in, which was our guess, but we would	5	response deadline would be April 7th. Your email
6	want to make sure that that's okay with you, that you	6	contemplated a settlement conference, and so we're
7	feel that that's enough time, because I don't think	7	proposing that be on April 14th, and then the next
8	either of the parties or any of the parties wants to	8	deadline that we believe would come up would be the
9	start taking those prehearing steps until we have a	9	filing of prefiled direct testimony, and there is where
10	determination from Your Honor as on the merits.	10	Ms. Goldman was correct, we agree there needs to be
11	So those are really the only things that I	11	enough time for the Commission to rule before we should
12	wanted to raise.	12	have to get to that step.
13	JUDGE O'CONNELL: That was going to be the	13	We contemplated about four weeks and/or
14	very next thing I was going to raise, because in hearing	14	proposed May 4th. If the Commission wants more time
15	the suggestion for setting all of the dates now, my	15	than four weeks, obviously that could bump back all of
16	concern would have been the time allotted for the	16	the deadlines. But after May 4th, I know Ms. Goldman
17	Commission to make a decision. So that's going to be	17	wanted about a month before the respondents would file
18	something that I am going to take under advisement and	18	their response testimony. And so the date we were
19	discuss with the Commissioners to discuss how much time	19	proposing was June 1st with rebuttal testimony due June
20	the Commission is going to need to make that decision	20	22nd, a deadline for service of data requests of June
21	after we receive the motions and then the response	21	29th, and then discovery period cutoff July 13.
22	briefs.	22	All of the other dates are really in our
23	So I can't give you an absolute answer right	23	minds tied to the hearing date. And so the deadline for
24	now about how long is going to be sufficient. I'd like	24	cross-examination exhibits and exhibit lists and witness
25	to hear how much you built in already into your schedule	25	lists really all just tie to the hearing date. So we
	Page 125		Page 127
1		1	
1 2	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or	1	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas
	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with		don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each
2	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other	2	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that
2 3	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a	2 3	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each
2 3 4	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the	2 3 4	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific
2 3 4 5	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a	2 3 4 5	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates.
2 3 4 5 6	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission.	2 3 4 5 6	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the	2 3 4 5 6 7	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to Ms. Goldman yesterday when we were floating these dates,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two weeks, and so we just wanted to put those two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to Ms. Goldman yesterday when we were floating these dates, which was that for Mr. Wiley and myself, we tend to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two weeks, and so we just wanted to put those two alternative proposals to you. And then when it comes to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to Ms. Goldman yesterday when we were floating these dates, which was that for Mr. Wiley and myself, we tend to prefer deadlines that are in the middle of the week	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two weeks, and so we just wanted to put those two alternative proposals to you. And then when it comes to post-hearing briefs, we'd like at least 30 days after
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to Ms. Goldman yesterday when we were floating these dates, which was that for Mr. Wiley and myself, we tend to prefer deadlines that are in the middle of the week rather than a Friday or a Monday. That may not seem	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two weeks, and so we just wanted to put those two alternative proposals to you. And then when it comes to post-hearing briefs, we'd like at least 30 days after the hearing for our simultaneous opening briefs with an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to Ms. Goldman yesterday when we were floating these dates, which was that for Mr. Wiley and myself, we tend to prefer deadlines that are in the middle of the week rather than a Friday or a Monday. That may not seem typical for others, but we often find that if it's on a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two weeks, and so we just wanted to put those two alternative proposals to you. And then when it comes to post-hearing briefs, we'd like at least 30 days after the hearing for our simultaneous opening briefs with an additional 20 days I believe it was for response briefs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to Ms. Goldman yesterday when we were floating these dates, which was that for Mr. Wiley and myself, we tend to prefer deadlines that are in the middle of the week rather than a Friday or a Monday. That may not seem typical for others, but we often find that if it's on a Friday, somehow that creates a crunch. If it's on a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two weeks, and so we just wanted to put those two alternative proposals to you. And then when it comes to post-hearing briefs, we'd like at least 30 days after the hearing for our simultaneous opening briefs with an additional 20 days I believe it was for response briefs. And then we I think both sides agree that we'd like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to Ms. Goldman yesterday when we were floating these dates, which was that for Mr. Wiley and myself, we tend to prefer deadlines that are in the middle of the week rather than a Friday or a Monday. That may not seem typical for others, but we often find that if it's on a Friday, somehow that creates a crunch. If it's on a Monday, that seems to create a different crunch. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two weeks, and so we just wanted to put those two alternative proposals to you. And then when it comes to post-hearing briefs, we'd like at least 30 days after the hearing for our simultaneous opening briefs with an additional 20 days I believe it was for response briefs. And then we I think both sides agree that we'd like to have at least two days for the hearing. I knay not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to Ms. Goldman yesterday when we were floating these dates, which was that for Mr. Wiley and myself, we tend to prefer deadlines that are in the middle of the week rather than a Friday or a Monday. That may not seem typical for others, but we often find that if it's on a Friday, somehow that creates a crunch. If it's on a Monday, that seems to create a different crunch. It always just seems to work out a little better if it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two weeks, and so we just wanted to put those two alternative proposals to you. And then when it comes to post-hearing briefs, we'd like at least 30 days after the hearing for our simultaneous opening briefs with an additional 20 days I believe it was for response briefs. And then we I think both sides agree that we'd like to have at least two days for the hearing. I t may not go two days, but there's a good chance it could.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and then I can either give you some initial thoughts or I can take it to the Commissioners, check with Commission availability, as I would for all of the other dates you might propose, and then I would issue a procedural order or notice depending on which is the most appropriate containing the dates that work for the Commission. I'm able to give you some feedback on the availability for hearing dates. So let me let's let's go through the schedule that the parties have come up with and then we'll see what we can do going from there. Who would like to present that? MR. FASSBURG: I'll I'll go ahead. And, Your Honor, I'll point out the same thing I did to Ms. Goldman yesterday when we were floating these dates, which was that for Mr. Wiley and myself, we tend to prefer deadlines that are in the middle of the week rather than a Friday or a Monday. That may not seem typical for others, but we often find that if it's on a Friday, somehow that creates a crunch. If it's on a Monday, that seems to create a different crunch. It always just seems to work out a little better if it's not on a bookend. So most of these dates I believe are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	don't have specific dates there. I know we have ideas about how those should be spaced to allow time for each side to prepare for the hearing. I can give you that that timing if you'd like, but we don't have specific dates. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. MR. FASSBURG: So I know Ms. Goldman wanted cross-exhibits time JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead and give me that timing so I know what your expectations are. MR. FASSBURG: Right. So for the complainants, we thought all of the cross-exhibits, witness lists, and time estimates could be due a week before the hearing. I know Ms. Goldman wanted two weeks, and so we just wanted to put those two alternative proposals to you. And then when it comes to post-hearing briefs, we'd like at least 30 days after the hearing for our simultaneous opening briefs with an additional 20 days I believe it was for response briefs. And then we I think both sides agree that we'd like to have at least two days for the hearing. It may not go two days, but there's a good chance it could. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And what I'm going

3 (Pages 124 to 127)

	Page 128		Page 130
1	are available or might be available. All of this would	1	At the same time, the the hearing
2	be subject to me checking and confirming with, you know,	2	schedule will be protracted no matter what, and so we're
3	our our scheduling at the Commission and with the	3	hoping not to do that if we can help it. And so
4	Commissioners as to availability.	4	ultimately, it comes down to how much time does the
5	MR. KENEFICK: Your Honor, this is Andrew	5	Commission really need to issue its order. If it needs
6	Kenefick for Waste Management. If I may make two	6	more than two weeks or three weeks, then we may want to
7	observations just as you think about this.	7	think about pushing back the dates a little bit, but I
8	One observation, and I and I concede I	8	know for the complainants, we don't want to protract
9	was not in the discussions yesterday with with	9	this any more than necessary.
10	Mr. Fassburg. One question really is, is whether or not	10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Understood.
11	on the motions for summary determination you would be	11	Is if when I discuss with the
12	requesting oral argument. If that were the case, then	12	Commissioners and I look at the Commission's
13	we'd probably have to find time in there to do that.	13	availability, if we do want to push back the filing of
14	And then secondly, the time period from the	14	direct testimony by a week or two and subsequently move
15	deadline for filing the responsive pleadings on the	15	back the well, and move back the subsequent dates by
16	motions for summary determination until the date of the	16	a week or two, is is that running into any conflict
17	direct testimony is just under a month. So that's	17	for the parties if we were to extend each of the
18	and obviously I think the parties would want to have,	18	subsequent dates by the same amount of time or are there
19	you know, one or two weeks in notice if they if	19	conflicts that with parties that have been considered
20	they have to put out direct testimony.	20	in coming up with these particular dates?
21	So that's just a consideration. And I don't	21	MR. FASSBURG: I will say I don't personally
22	want to I'm not going to upset the agreement that	22	have any conflicts. I don't know that Mr. Wiley does,
23	Jessica and Mr. Fassburg came to, but it just a just	23	and we didn't yet have a chance to confer with our
24	noting that that probably does create a little bit of a	24	clients about hearing dates or availability for other
25	compressed time schedule for the Commission to make a	25	dates because the hearing date itself is obviously still
	Page 129		Page 131
1	decision if we hope to get a decision in time to forego	1	unknown. But I can say for the complainants, we're not
2	the time expense of putting together the direct	2	aware of any conflicts.
3	testimony.	3	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman?
4	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	4	MS. GOLDMAN: Yeah, that's the same for me,
5	That's that's helpful. I understand that's a concern	5	Your Honor. I would want a heads-up on if you're going
6	and it's a reasonable concern. Two weeks would not be	6	to have a hearing on a summary judgment. That is
7	enough time I'm positive for the Commission to consider	7	something I would precisely like to check my calendar.
8	the cross motions for summary judgment and issue a	8	But generally bumping these by a week or two would not
9	decision. And what I'm hearing is that if there's a	9	be a problem for me.
10	month that's set between the filing of response briefs	10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Typically the Commission
11	and the filing of direct testimony, that that might	11	does not hold oral argument
12	not that the parties would probably like some more	12	MS. GOLDMAN: Okay.
13	warning whether they're going to need to file that.	13	JUDGE O'CONNELL: for motions for summary
14	Let me keep that in mind, and since it is	14	determination, and we had not planned on having that in
15	direct testimony, I will turn back to Mr. Fassburg in	15	this proceeding.
16	just a moment to see what he thinks. Let me continue to	16	MS. GOLDMAN: Okay.
17	just look at the Commission's calendar.	17	JUDGE O'CONNELL: So I think going forward
18	Okay. Mr. Fassburg, let me let me hear	18	our expectation is not to have a hearing where there
19	your thoughts about what Mr. Kenefick just brought up.	19	would be oral argument. I think everything could be
20	MR. FASSBURG: So if time were not a	20	done in writing given that we're we're allowing for
21	concern, I would agree with that wholeheartedly in a	21	motions from both parties to make all of your arguments
22	sense that we would want time after the order to prepare	22	and then response briefs to respond to the other
23	our direct testimony so that we're not spending time on	23	parties' arguments.
24	that, and frankly, our client's money on that if it	24	MR. WILEY: Your Honor, this is Dave Wiley.
25	turns out to be unnecessary.	25	I would say that I think once in my whole career of four

4 (Pages 128 to 131)

	Page 132		Page 134
1	decades-plus at the Commission have they allowed oral	1	and confirm with Commission availability in, you know,
2	argument on motions in my experience, so I I totally	2	that timeframe of late August, September. If it gets
3	agree with you.	3	pushed back by a couple weeks, it might be even late
4	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So I I reviewed	4	September.
5	the Commission's availability and judging by the the	5	So I'm going to be giving the parties
6	discovery end date that the parties have given me until	6	several options based upon what the Commission decides
7	middle of July, I would expect that we're looking at	7	we want to do with the direct testimony filing and the
8	somewhere in mid to late August for a potential hearing	8	Commission's availability for a hearing in that
9	or perhaps even the middle of September.	9	timeframe.
10	Given that the parties have not or sorry,	10	We will take into consideration conflicts
11	the representatives have not confirmed with all of the	11	that the parties bring up like thank you, Ms. Goldman,
12	parties' availability for a hearing date or for two	12	we will we will take that into consideration your
13	days, what I would propose is that I take some time to	13	concern. I will get those options and I will send them
14	determine availability for the Commission for a handful	14	to the parties via email, and then I will use the
15	of dates around that timeline of late August, early	15	information from the parties as to whether there can be
16	September and and, you know, perhaps a week or two	16	agreement on any of those dates, and then I will include
17	later than that depending on what the Commission decides	17	that in a procedural order which will memorialize the
18	to do with the direct testimony filing. And then I	18	dates and outline them for going forward in this
19	would send those options to the parties and ask that the	19	proceeding.
20	parties collaborate and determine whether there is an	20	So with that understanding, is there
21	agreeable date for hearing among the options that the	21	anything else that we should discuss today?
22	Commission has available.	22	MR. FASSBURG: Nothing from the
23	What are the parties' thoughts on that?	23	complainants.
24	Mr. Fassburg.	24	MS. GOLDMAN: Nothing from the respondents.
25	MR. FASSBURG: I think that makes a lot of	25	Thank you, Your Honor.
		<u> </u>	
	Page 133		Page 135
1	Page 133	1	Page 135
1	sense. Obviously this year being a little different	1	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste
2	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of	2	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a
2 3	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be	2 3	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be
2 3 4	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that.	2 3 4	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting
2 3 4 5	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman?	2 3 4 5	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary
2 3 4 5 6	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college	2 3 4 5 6	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors
2 3 4 5 6 7	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary anyway depending on what the Commission decides to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing, that you expect that discovery may likely include
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary anyway depending on what the Commission decides to do with the direct testimony filing date. But I understand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing, that you expect that discovery may likely include information that is confidential or sensitive in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary anyway depending on what the Commission decides to do with the direct testimony filing date. But I understand that and, you know, we'll try to come up with a hearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing, that you expect that discovery may likely include information that is confidential or sensitive in a business nature; is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary anyway depending on what the Commission decides to do with the direct testimony filing date. But I understand that and, you know, we'll try to come up with a hearing date that works for everyone, all parties and their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing, that you expect that discovery may likely include information that is confidential or sensitive in a business nature; is that correct? MR. KENEFICK: Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary anyway depending on what the Commission decides to do with the direct testimony filing date. But I understand that and, you know, we'll try to come up with a hearing date that works for everyone, all parties and their representatives, and I would like that date to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing, that you expect that discovery may likely include information that is confidential or sensitive in a business nature; is that correct? MR. KENEFICK: Correct. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary anyway depending on what the Commission decides to do with the direct testimony filing date. But I understand that and, you know, we'll try to come up with a hearing date that works for everyone, all parties and their representatives, and I would like that date to be agreeable for all parties. But at the end of the day,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing, that you expect that discovery may likely include information that is confidential or sensitive in a business nature; is that correct? MR. KENEFICK: Correct. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. MR. KENEFICK: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary anyway depending on what the Commission decides to do with the direct testimony filing date. But I understand that and, you know, we'll try to come up with a hearing date that works for everyone, all parties and their representatives, and I would like that date to be agreeable for all parties. But at the end of the day, we're going to set a date determined based upon the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing, that you expect that discovery may likely include information that is confidential or sensitive in a business nature; is that correct? MR. KENEFICK: Correct. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. MR. KENEFICK: Yes. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And would Mr. Fassburg,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary anyway depending on what the Commission decides to do with the direct testimony filing date. But I understand that and, you know, we'll try to come up with a hearing date that works for everyone, all parties and their representatives, and I would like that date to be agreeable for all parties. But at the end of the day, we're going to set a date determined based upon the Commission's availability is the primary concern. So what I would like to do, I would like to take the dates that the parties have proposed under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing, that you expect that discovery may likely include information that is confidential or sensitive in a business nature; is that correct? MR. KENEFICK: Correct. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. MR. KENEFICK: Yes. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And would Mr. Fassburg, I'm not sure if you're familiar with the different types
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sense. Obviously this year being a little different with vacation schedules, but nonetheless kids are out of school then and we'd like to make sure witnesses will be available, so I like that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Goldman? MS. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have a college student who I'm very much hoping to return out of my house to college in August, and I have no idea when that's going to happen. So my preference, my strong preference given that I just don't know what that will be will be to push it into the second week of September or later to give me the wiggle room needed that I'm going to have to drive. So that would be my request. JUDGE O'CONNELL: That may be necessary anyway depending on what the Commission decides to do with the direct testimony filing date. But I understand that and, you know, we'll try to come up with a hearing date that works for everyone, all parties and their representatives, and I would like that date to be agreeable for all parties. But at the end of the day, we're going to set a date determined based upon the Commission's availability is the primary concern. So what I would like to do, I would like to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. KENEFICK: Andrew Kenefick from Waste Management. I am trying to recall whether we had a protective order put in place, because as we will be entering into a discovery phase and I would be expecting a discovery that might be inquiring into proprietary information, competitive information, we are competitors obviously, that we have a protective order. I concede I am not as familiar with the protective order procedures as I know Mr. Wiley would be, but I know we would want to be seeking a protective order with respect to competitive information. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before I hear from Mr. Wiley and Mr. Fassburg from the respondents, am I I want to confirm that I understand what I'm hearing, that you expect that discovery may likely include information that is confidential or sensitive in a business nature; is that correct? MR. KENEFICK: Correct. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. MR. KENEFICK: Yes. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And would Mr. Fassburg, I'm not sure if you're familiar with the different types of protective orders that the Commission typically

5 (Pages 132 to 135)

	Page 136		Page 138
1	provisions for the sharing of confidential information,	1	the attorneys representing Murrey's that might be shared
2	but not highly confidential information, which is an	2	with the Murrey's clients themselves. You know, if the
3	additional protection, which from what I'm hearing from	3	redaction is fine, then just I I assume a regular
4	you does not apply, but I want to ask if a standard	4	protective order would be adequate.
5	protective order would resolve your concerns.	5	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me step in
6			here to explain. The Commission's standard protective
7			order has two appendices. One is an attorney agreement
8	that Mr. Wiley is certainly the expert on that topic. I	8	for being able to view confidential or information
9	will say I wouldn't imagine it would need to be anything	9	that is marked confidential.
10	protecting highly confidential information. And I think	10	The second is a nondisclosure agreement for
11	if I if I understand correctly, it won't be my	11	a witness to view things that have been marked as
12	client's information that will be at issue in this	12	confidential.
13	proceeding. If Mr. Kenefick believes they need a	13	The the the company that the
14	protective order and that a standard protective order is	14	nondisclosure agreement protects would have the ability
15	sufficient, I imagine it would be.	15	to object to either being to any nondisclosure
16	The information we're seeking won't include	16	agreement being signed and submitted. And there's a
17	the proprietary information I don't believe. We will be	17	procedure for that that is outlined in what would
18	seeking documents that would likely include proprietary	18	what I would issue as the protective order.
19	information. And so if if a standard protective	19	So when you're talking about information
20	order gives him that protection, I think it's probably	20	that you wouldn't want to be available to some witnesses
21	adequate.	21	but perhaps to attorneys, you, Mr. Kenefick, the company
22	Dave, do you have anything you wanted to	22	would be able to object to someone who has signed a
23 24	chime in on?	23	nondisclosure agreement being able to access that
24	MR. WILEY: Yes, I I concur with that analysis, and I have not seen a highly confidential	24	information.
25	analysis, and thave not seen a highly confidential	25	MR. KENEFICK: Okay. Thank you.
	Page 137		Page 139
1	Page 137	1	Page 139
1	protective order ever issued in a transportation case.	1	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with
2	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything	2	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you
2 3	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order,	2 3	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what?
2	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically.	2 3 4	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds
2 3 4	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley	2 3	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that
2 3 4 5	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically.	2 3 4 5	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing
2 3 4 5 6	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could	2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to
2 3 4 5 6 7	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.]	2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them from sharing it even with their clients, because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective order. But the Commission does is familiar with them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them from sharing it even with their clients, because obviously if their clients know what pricing we've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective order. But the Commission does is familiar with them through other cases at the Commission. So that's why I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them from sharing it even with their clients, because obviously if their clients know what pricing we've offered to customers, that would put us into a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective order. But the Commission does is familiar with them through other cases at the Commission. So that's why I brought it up and I apologize if it's added confusion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them from sharing it even with their clients, because obviously if their clients know what pricing we've offered to customers, that would put us into a significant competitive disadvantage.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective order. But the Commission does is familiar with them through other cases at the Commission. So that's why I brought it up and I apologize if it's added confusion for this, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them from sharing it even with their clients, because obviously if their clients know what pricing we've offered to customers, that would put us into a significant competitive disadvantage. On the other hand, if we're going into this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective order. But the Commission does is familiar with them through other cases at the Commission. So that's why I brought it up and I apologize if it's added confusion for this, but MR. KENEFICK: Thank you, Your Honor. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them from sharing it even with their clients, because obviously if their clients know what pricing we've offered to customers, that would put us into a significant competitive disadvantage. On the other hand, if we're going into this acknowledging that pricing information should it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective order. But the Commission does is familiar with them through other cases at the Commission. So that's why I brought it up and I apologize if it's added confusion for this, but MR. KENEFICK: Thank you, Your Honor. That should be adequate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them from sharing it even with their clients, because obviously if their clients know what pricing we've offered to customers, that would put us into a significant competitive disadvantage. On the other hand, if we're going into this acknowledging that pricing information should it should it appear in a document requested could be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective order. But the Commission does is familiar with them through other cases at the Commission. So that's why I brought it up and I apologize if it's added confusion for this, but MR. KENEFICK: Thank you, Your Honor. That should be adequate. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them from sharing it even with their clients, because obviously if their clients know what pricing we've offered to customers, that would put us into a significant competitive disadvantage. On the other hand, if we're going into this acknowledging that pricing information should it should it appear in a document requested could be redacted and they're not going to be fighting over	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective order. But the Commission does is familiar with them through other cases at the Commission. So that's why I brought it up and I apologize if it's added confusion for this, but MR. KENEFICK: Thank you, Your Honor. That should be adequate. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So I will issue a protective order in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	protective order ever issued in a transportation case. So I I can't imagine that that there's anything but a conventional one that issues the form order, Your Honor, that that issues typically. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley [Multiple speakers.] MR. KENEFICK: If I could JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Kenefick, go ahead. MR. KENEFICK: Yes, if it it may be fine to have a and I'm I'm not a student of the protective order, so the the major concern I have is that if Murrey's insists upon Waste Management or the haulers disclosing pricing information, that information and they insist on that being disclosed without it being redacted from documents, then we would need to have a protective order that would preclude them from sharing it even with their clients, because obviously if their clients know what pricing we've offered to customers, that would put us into a significant competitive disadvantage. On the other hand, if we're going into this acknowledging that pricing information should it should it appear in a document requested could be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me check back with you. Does that satisfy your concerns knowing that you would be able to know who would be seeing what? MR. KENEFICK: Yes, that that sounds right. And I'm also operating on the assumption that even Murrey's lawyers would not be insisting on seeing the pricing information, but they would simply want to understand the contractual relationships. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, let's do it this way. From what I've heard from the parties, I think there's cause to issue a protective order. If it turns out that the Commission's standard protective order is insufficient, the respondents could always move for a highly confidential protective order. From what I've seen, heard, or read of any transportation case they usually don't have a highly confidential protective order. But the Commission does is familiar with them through other cases at the Commission. So that's why I brought it up and I apologize if it's added confusion for this, but MR. KENEFICK: Thank you, Your Honor. That should be adequate. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.

		1
	Page 140	
1	because I understand that discovery's going to begin.	
2	Okay. With that plus how I discussed I'm	
3	going to move forward with the proposed dates for a	
4	procedural schedule moving forward, is there anything	
5	else from the parties we should discuss at this	
6	conference?	
7	Ms. Goldman.	
8	MS. GOLDMAN: No, Your Honor, we're fine.	
9	Thank you so much for your time.	
10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay.	
11	MR. KENEFICK: Your Honor, it appears that	
12	Mr. Fassburg, we may have lost him.	
13	MR. WILEY: I'm here.	
14	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wiley?	
15	MR. WILEY: Yes, nothing else from the	
16	complainants, Your Honor, at this stage.	
17	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Okay. Thank you.	
18	Then with that, we will be adjourned for today. Thank	
19 20	you and we're off the record.	
20 21	(Adjourned at 10:41 a.m.)	
22		
22		
24		
25		
	Page 141	
1	CERTIFICATE	
2		
3		
4	COUNTY OF THURSTON	
5 6	I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand	
0 7	Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby	
8	certify that the foregoing transcript is true and	
9	accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.	
10		
11	Store State	
12		
13	Janlis ameinghouse_ Mont	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

7 (Pages 140 to 141)

	I	I	I	
A	analysis 136:25	awfully 122:2	cases 139:18	139:12
a.m 116:16 119:2	and/or 126:13		cause 139:11	Commissioners
140:20	ANDERSON 117:5	<u> </u>	CCR 116:20	119:13 124:19
ability 123:16	Andrew 116:13	back 126:15 129:15	141:14	125:2 128:4
138:14 141:9	118:3,14 119:10	130:7,13,15,15	certain 119:23	130:12 133:25
able 125:8 138:8,22	120:10 128:5	134:3 139:1	certainly 136:8	company 120:5
138:23 139:3	135:1	based 133:21 134:6	Certified 141:6	138:13,21
absolute 124:23	answer 124:23	behalf 120:9	certify 141:8	competitive 135:6
access 138:23	anyway 133:15	believe 121:23	chance 127:22	135:11 137:20
accurate 141:9	apologize 119:9	125:23 126:8	130:23	competitors 135:6
acknowledging	139:19	127:19 136:17	check 125:2 131:7	complainant 116:5
137:22	appear 137:23	believes 136:13	139:1	117:2 120:4
added 139:19	appearances	best 141:9	checking 128:2	complainants
additional 127:19	119:25	better 125:22	chime 136:23	127:12 130:8
136:3	appeared 118:24	bfassburg@willi	client's 129:24	131:1 134:23
adequate 136:21	121:18	118:10	136:12	140:16
138:4 139:22	appears 140:11	bit 128:24 130:7	clients 130:24	compressed 128:25
adjourned 140:18	appendices 138:7	Blair 118:7 120:3	137:17,18 138:2	concede 128:8
140:20	apply 119:20 136:4	123:24	close 122:2	135:8
administrative	appropriate 125:6	bookend 125:23	co-presiding	concern 124:16
116:13 118:2	approximately	brief 126:1	119:12	129:5,6,21 133:22
110.13 110.2	119:7 122:9 126:3	briefing 123:12	collaborate 119:22	134:13 137:11
advisement 124:18	April 126:5,7	briefs 121:6 123:15	132:20	concerns 135:25
133:25	argument 128:12	123:18 124:22	college 133:6,8	136:5 139:2
agree 126:10	131:11,19 132:2	127:17,18,19	come 125:10 126:8	concur 136:24
127:20 129:21	arguments 131:21	129:10 131:22	133:17	confer 130:23
127.20 129.21	131:23	bring 134:11	comes 127:16	conference 116:11
agreeable 132:21	assume 138:3	brought 129:19	130:4	119:15,18 121:6
133:20	assumption 139:5	139:19	coming 130:20	126:6 140:6
agreeing 122:3	attempt 121:25	Buell 116:21	Commission 116:2	confidential 135:16
agreement 119:23	attorney 138:7	built 124:5,25	116:18 119:12	136:1,2,10,25
123:3 128:22	attorneys 138:1,21	bump 126:15	120:21 121:4,8	138:8,9,12 139:14
134:16 138:7,10	August 132:8,15	bumping 131:8	122:14 124:2,17	139:16
138:14,16,23	133:8 134:2	business 135:17	124:20 125:3,7	confirm 134:1
ahead 121:19	authority 123:10		126:11,14 128:3	135:14
125:13 127:9	availability 125:3,9	$\frac{C}{C}$	128:25 129:7	confirmed 132:11
137:8	128:4 130:13,24	C 118:1 119:4	130:5 131:10	confirming 128:2
akenefick@wm.c	132:5,12,14	141:1,1	132:1,14,17,22	conflict 130:16
118:16	133:22 134:1,8	calendar 129:17	133:15 134:1,6	conflicts 130:19,22
allotted 124:16	available 128:1,1	131:7	135:23,25 136:7	131:2 134:10
allow 127:2	132:22 133:4	calendars 127:25	139:17,18	confusion 139:19
allowed 132:1	138:20	Caption 116:9	Commission's	consider 120:16,21
allowing 131:20	Avenue 116:22	career 131:25	121:1 127:25	121:4 129:7
alternative 127:16	118:15,20	case 121:4 122:15	129:17 130:12	consideration
amount 123:12	avoid 122:18	128:12 137:1	132:5 133:22	128:21 134:10,12
125:25 130:18	aware 131:2	139:15	134:8 138:6	considered 130:19

Page 143

				1 490 1 10
consolidated 116:4	121:21 122:17,22	129:11,15,23	entering 135:4	126:9 128:15
119:15,17 139:25	122:23 123:4,25	130:14 132:18	estimates 127:13	129:10,11 130:13
containing 125:6	122:25 125:4,25	133:16 134:7	event 122:13	132:18 133:16
contains 135:25	125:15,23 126:22	disadvantage	events 119:19,23	132:10 133:10
contemplated	127:1,5,25 130:7	137:20	exactly 121:20	fill 121:21 122:22
124:4 126:6,13	130:15,18,20,24	disclosed 137:14	EXCAVATION	find 125:19 128:13
continue 129:16	130:25 132:15	disclosing 137:14	117:5	fine 137:10 138:3
Continued 116:9	133:24 134:16,18	discovery 122:8	exhibit 126:24	140:8
CONTRACTING	140:3	126:1,21 132:6	exhibits 120:23,24	first 119:25 126:1
116:8	Dave 118:7 120:3	135:4,5,15	126:24	flag 123:7
contractual 139:8	121:15 131:24	discovery's 140:1	expect 132:7	floating 125:15
conventional 137:3	136:22	discuss 119:16	135:15	followed 120:18
correct 126:10				121:6
	day 133:20	124:19,19 130:11	expectation 121:2 131:18	
135:17,18	days 127:17,19,21 127:22 132:13	133:25 134:21 140:5		forego 129:1
correctly 136:11			expectations	foregoing 141:8
counsel 120:11	139:25	discussed 120:25	120:15 127:10	form 137:3
COUNTY 141:4	deadline 126:2,5,8	121:11 123:5,20 140:2	expecting 135:4 expense 129:2	forms 136:7
couple 134:3 course 121:24	126:20,23 128:15		L	forward 119:20,25
	deadlines 125:17 126:16	discussing 123:25 discussions 128:9	experience 132:2	121:7 122:11
court 123:8,10			expert 136:8	123:4 131:17
create 125:21 128:24	decades-plus 132:1 decides 132:17	Disposal 116:4,7	explain 138:6	134:18 140:3,4
		117:1,4 118:6	extend 130:17	four 123:14,18,18
creates 125:20	133:15 134:6	120:1,5 121:10	F	126:13,15 131:25
cross 121:5,13	decision 124:17,20	dispositive 122:20	F 141:1	Fourth 116:22
123:8,21 126:2	129:1,1,9	dispute 122:4,5,14	facts 122:4,5	118:15
129:8	definitely 122:10	dockets 116:4	factual 122:14	frankly 129:24
cross-examination	delay 122:18	119:15,17 139:25	familiar 135:8,22	Friday 125:18,20
120:19 126:24	depending 125:5 132:17 133:15	document 137:23	139:17	G
cross-exhibits		documents 136:18 137:15	Fassburg 118:7	G 119:4
127:8,12	describing 119:19		120:2,3 121:11,15	Garlinghouse
crunch 125:20,21	determination	drive 133:13	120.2,3 121.11,13	116:20 141:6,14
customers 137:19	121:3,5,8,14	due 126:19 127:13	127:7,11 128:10	general 120:15
cutoff 126:21	122:1,6,9,16,24	dwiley@williams	128:23 129:15,18	generally 123:2
D	123:21,22 124:3 124:10 128:11,16	118:10	129:20 130:21	131:8
D 119:4	124:10 128:11,10	E	132:24,25 134:22	give 124:23 125:1,8
DANIEL 117:5	determine 119:22	E 118:1,1 119:4,4	135:13,21 136:6	127:3,9 133:12
data 126:20	121:7 122:19	141:1,1	140:12	given 123:12
date 121:13 122:17	132:14,20	early 132:15	feedback 125:8	125:25 131:20
122:21 126:18,23	determined 133:21	effectively 123:9	feel 124:7	132:6,10 133:10
126:25 128:16	determines 122:14	efficient 120:21	Fifth 118:20	gives 136:20
130:25 132:6,12	different 125:21	either 122:14	fighting 137:24	giving 126:3 134:5
130:23 132:0,12	133:1 135:22	123:17 124:8	file 122:8 123:7,13	go 121:16 125:10
132:19,21	135:1 155:22	125:1,24 138:15	126:17 129:13	125:13 127:9,22
dates 119:19,23	direct 120:17 126:9	email 121:17,18	filed 120:23	137:8
120:16 121:4,19	128:17,20 129:2	126:5 134:14	filing 120:17 126:2	going 119:20 121:7
	120.17,20 127.2			
	1	1	1	1

Page	1	4	4
------	---	---	---

		•		
122:11 123:4	helpful 129:5	J	139:2	132:7,9
124:13,14,17,18	highly 136:2,10,25	January 116:15	knowledge 141:9	mind 121:17
124:20,24 125:11	139:14,16	119:1,8		129:14
127:23 128:22	hold 131:11	,	L	minds 126:23
129:13 131:5,17	Honor 120:2,8	Jessica 118:19	Lacey 116:19 119:1	minute 127:24
133:9,13,21 134:5	123:7 124:10	120:9 128:23	late 132:8,15 134:2	MJ 116:8
134:18 137:21,24	125:14 128:5	jessicag@summi	134:3	moment 119:24
140:1,3	131:5,24 133:6	118:22	law 116:13 118:2	129:16
Goldman 118:19	134:25 137:4	judge 116:13 118:2	118:20 119:11	Monday 125:18,21
120:8,9 121:16	139:21 140:8,11	119:6,11 120:6,13	120:9	money 129:24
122:25 123:2,23	140:16	122:25 123:19	lawyers 139:6	month 126:17
125:15 126:10,16	hope 125:25 129:1	124:13 127:6,9,23	let's 119:6,25 120:1	128:17 129:10
127:7,14 131:3,4	hoping 130:3 133:7	129:4 130:10	125:9,10 139:9	morning 119:7,8
131:12,16 133:5,6	house 133:8	131:3,10,13,17	lists 126:24,25	120:2,8
134:11,24 140:7,8	House 155.6	132:4 133:5,14	127:13	motion 122:8
good 119:7 120:2,8	Ι	135:12,19,21	little 125:22 128:24	123:14 124:3
127:22	idea 123:13 133:8	137:5,8 138:5	130:7 133:1	126:4
grant 121:8 123:11	ideally 122:16	139:1,9,23 140:10	live 122:12	motions 121:5,13
123:17	ideas 121:22 127:1	140:14,17	LLC 116:21 117:5	122:20,23 123:8
Group 118:20	III 116:11	judging 132:5	long 124:24	122:20,22 123:8
120:9	imagine 136:9,15	judgment 123:8,10	look 129:17 130:12	126:2 128:11,16
guess 124:5	137:2	123:11,17 129:8	looking 132:7	120:2 128:11,10
guess 124.5	in-house 120:11	131:6	Loop 116:18	129.8 151.15,21
H	include 134:16	July 126:21 132:7	lost 140:12	move 119:25 121:2
hand 137:21	135:15 136:16,18	June 126:19,19,20	lot 132:25	123:9 130:14,15
handful 132:14	included 120:16	K		139:13 140:3
happen 133:9	121:1	Kastner 118:8	M	moving 124:3
hard 122:22	information 134:15	120:4	major 137:11	140:4
haulers 137:13	135:6,6,11,16	keep 129:14	Management	Multiple 137:6
heads-up 131:5	136:1,2,10,12,16	Keep 129.14 Kenefick 118:14	118:13,14 120:11	Murrey's 116:4
hear 120:18,20	136:17,19 137:13	120:11 128:5,6	128:6 135:2	117:1 118:6 120:1
121:10 124:25	137:14,22,25	120:11 128:3,0	137:12	120:4 121:10
129:18 135:12	138:8,19,24 139:7	129.19 135.1,1,18	March 126:3	137:12 138:1,2
heard 139:10,15	initial 125:1	137:7,8,9 138:21	marked 138:9,11	137:12 138:1,2
hearing 120:14,18	inquiring 135:5	137.7,8,9 138.21	material 122:5	157.0
120:22 121:20	insist 137:14	138.23 139.4,21 140:11	matter 130:2	Ν
122:12,17,21	insisting 139:6	kids 133:2	matters 119:13	N 118:1 119:4
124:4,14 125:9	insists 137:12	Kirkland 118:15	means 122:5	name 119:10
126:23,25 127:3	insufficient 139:13	know 126:16 127:1	memorialize	National 116:24
127:14,18,21	issue 119:18 125:4	127:7,10,14,25	134:17	nature 135:17
129:9 130:1,24,25	129:8 130:5		merits 124:10	necessary 130:9
131:6,18 132:8,12	136:12 138:18	128:2,19 130:8,22 132:16 133:10,17	message 120:14	133:14
132:21 133:17	139:11,24	,	MGMT 116:7,7	need 123:7 124:20
134:8 135:14	issued 137:1	134:1 135:9,10 137:18 138:2	117:4,4	129:13 130:5
136:3	issues 123:6 135:24	137:18 138:2	mid 132:8	136:9,13 137:16
help 130:3	137:3,4		middle 125:17	needed 133:12
	10/10,1	knowing 121:19		
	I	I	I	1

		_	_		
needs 126:10 130:5	134:13	positive 129:7	132:13	receive 124:21	
nondisclosure	oral 128:12 131:11	post-hearing	proposed 122:23	record 119:6 122:3	
138:10,14,15,23	131:19 132:1	127:17	126:14 133:24	-	
nonmoving 123:11	order 119:18	potential 121:17,21	140:3 redacted 137:15,2		
notice 119:19 125:5	122:17 125:5	122:18 132:8	proposing 126:7,19	redaction 138:3	
128:19	129:22 130:5	precisely 131:7	proprietary 135:5		
noting 128:24	134:17 135:3,7,9	preclude 137:16	136:17,18	regular 138:3	
hoting 120.21	135:11,24 136:5	prefer 121:25	protecting 136:10	relationships 139:8	
0	136:14,14,20	123:18 125:17	protecting 136:3	REPORTED	
O 119:4	137:1,3,11,16	preference 133:9	136:20	116:20	
O'Connell 116:13	138:4,7,18 139:11	133:10	protective 135:3,7	Reporter 141:7	
118:3 119:6,10	139:13,14,17,24	preferred 121:18	135:9,10,23,24	Reporting 116:21	
120:6,13 122:25	orders 135:23	prefiled 122:11	136:5,14,14,19	representatives	
123:19 124:13	136:7	126:9	137:1,11,16 138:4	132:11 133:19	
127:6,9,23 129:4	outline 134:18	prehearing 124:9	138:6,18 139:11	representing 120:4	
130:10 131:3,10	outlined 138:17	preliminary 119:21	139:12,14,16,24	138:1	
131:13,17 132:4		prepare 127:3	protects 138:14	request 133:13	
133:5,14 135:12	Р	129:22	protract 130:8	requested 137:23	
135:19,21 137:5,8	P 118:1,1 119:4	prepared 122:8	protracted 130:2	requesting 128:12	
138:5 139:1,9,23	Pages 116:12	preparing 122:11	provisions 136:1	requests 126:20	
140:10,14,17	part 122:2 124:1	126:1	push 130:13 133:11	resolve 121:25	
000 119:3	participants	present 125:12	pushed 134:3	122:15 124:2	
object 138:15,22	118:24	preserve 123:16	pushing 130:7	136:5	
observation 128:8	particular 130:20	preserve 123.10 pretty 122:6	pushing 130.7 put 127:15 128:20	respect 135:11	
observations 128:7	parties 119:22	pricing 137:13,18	135:3 137:19	respond 123:14	
obviously 126:15	120:15,16,20,25	137:22,25 139:7	putting 129:2	126:4 131:22	
128:18 130:25	121:2,9 123:5	primary 133:22	putting 129.2	respondents 116:9	
133:1 135:7	124:8,8 125:10	prior 120:14,23	0	117:6 118:18	
137:18	128:18 129:12	probably 128:13	question 128:10	120:7,10,12	
occurs 122:18	130:17,19 131:21	128:24 129:12	quickly 127:24	120.7,10,12 121:12,24 126:17	
offered 137:19	132:6,10,19,20	128.24 129.12	quickly 127.21	134:24 135:13	
okay 120:13 122:25	132:18,20,24		R	134.24 135.15	
123:19,23 124:6	134:5,11,14,15	problem 131:9	R 118:1 119:4		
127:23 129:4,18	139:10 140:5	procedural 119:19 119:23 121:12	141:1	responding 123:9	
131:12,16 132:4	parties' 131:23		raise 124:12,14	response 120:17 121:6 124:21	
135:19 138:25	132:12,23	125:5 134:17 140:4	reached 119:24		
139:9,23,24 140:2	party 123:9,11,17		read 139:15	126:5,18 127:19 129:10 131:22	
140:10,17,17	period 122:7	procedure 119:16	really 124:11		
Olympia 116:23	126:21 128:14	121:7 123:3 138:17	126:22,25 128:10	responses 122:24	
once 131:25	personally 130:21	procedures 135:9	130:5	responsive 128:15	
opening 127:18	phase 122:24 135:4	1	Realtime 116:21	return 133:7 review 127:24	
operating 139:5	place 135:3	proceeding 131:15 134:19 136:13	reason 122:13		
opportunity 122:10	planned 131:14		reasonable 129:6	reviewed 132:4	
opposing 126:4	pleadings 128:15	produce 137:25	rebuttal 120:17	right 124:23	
options 120:24	plus 140:2	producing 120:24	126:19	127:11 136:7	
132:19,21 134:6	point 121:3 125:14	proposals 127:16	recall 135:2	139:5	
152.17,21 154.0	Point 121.3 123.14	propose 125:4		ripe 122:6	
	I	I	I	I	

room 133:12	shared 138:1	137:10	133:16 134:7	transportation
rule 126:11	sharing 136:1	subject 128:2	TG-200650 116:4	116:2,18 119:12
run 123:24	137:17	submitted 138:16	119:15	137:1 139:15
running 130:16	short 122:7	subsequent 130:15	TG-200651 116:4	TRUCKING 116:8
	Shorthand 141:6	130:18	119:16	117:5
<u> </u>	shortly 139:25	subsequently	thank 120:6,13	true 141:8
S 118:1 119:4	side 123:22 126:4	130:14	129:4 134:11,25	try 133:17
satisfy 135:25	127:3	successful 122:20	138:25 139:21,23	trying 135:2
139:2	sides 121:23,24	sufficient 124:24	140:9,17,18	Tuesday 119:8
schedule 120:16	127:20	136:15	thing 124:14	125:24
121:12,17,18,22	signed 138:16,22	suggesting 126:2	125:14	turn 121:9 129:15
122:19 124:4,25	significant 137:20	suggestion 124:15	things 122:19	turns 129:25
125:10 128:25	simply 120:22	Suite 116:22 118:8	124:11 138:11	139:12
130:2 140:4	139:7	118:15,20	think 121:24 122:7	two 123:6,15
scheduled 121:20	simultaneous 121:5	summary 121:3,5,8	122:16 123:2	127:14,15,21,22
122:17	127:18	121:14,25 122:6,9	124:7 127:20	128:6,19 129:6
schedules 133:2	single 120:22	122:15,23 123:8,9	128:7,18 130:7	130:6,14,16 131:8
scheduling 128:3	six 122:9	123:11,17,20,21	131:17,19,25	132:12,16 138:7
school 133:3	skill 141:9	123:22 124:3	132:25 136:10,20	types 135:22
Seattle 116:22,23	sorry 132:10	128:11,16 129:8	139:11	typical 125:19
118:9,21	sort 122:22	131:6,13	thinks 129:16	typically 131:10
second 133:11	sounds 139:4	Summit 118:20	thought 127:12	135:23 137:4
138:10	South 118:20	120:9	thoughts 119:21	
secondly 128:14	Southeast 116:18	sure 121:15 122:3	121:13 123:1	U
see 123:21 125:11	spaced 127:2	123:15 124:1,6	125:1 129:19	ultimately 130:4
127:25 129:16	speak 121:23	133:3 135:22	132:23	unable 121:8
seeing 139:3,6	speakers 137:6		three 126:3 130:6	understand 129:5
seeking 135:10	specific 127:1,4	T	THURSTON 141:4	133:16 135:14
136:16,18	spending 129:23	T 141:1,1	tie 126:25	136:11 139:8
seen 136:25 139:15	spoke 121:16	take 124:18 125:2	tied 126:23	140:1
send 132:19 134:13	Square 116:18	127:24 132:13	time 119:7 124:2,5	understanding
sense 129:22 133:1	stage 140:16	133:24 134:10,12	124:7,16,19	134:20
sensitive 135:16	standard 135:24	talking 138:19	125:25 126:11,14	Understood 130:10
sent 119:21 120:14	136:4,14,19 138:6	Tayler 116:20	127:2,8,13 128:13	Union 118:8
September 132:9	139:12	141:6,14	128:14,25 129:1,2	unknown 131:1
132:16 133:11	start 124:9	Teams 118:24	129:7,20,22,23	unnecessary
134:2,4	starting 121:10	ten 119:7	130:1,4,18 132:13	129:25
service 126:20	State 141:3,7	tend 125:16	140:9	upset 128:22
SERVICES 116:7	status 116:11	terms 136:6	timeframe 134:2,9	use 134:14
117:4	119:14	testify 120:22	timeline 132:15	usually 139:16
set 121:19 129:10	step 126:12 138:5	testimony 120:18	timing 127:4,10	UTC's 123:16
133:21	steps 124:9	120:24 122:11	today 119:14 120:3	Utilities 116:2,18
setting 121:4,13	stipulated 122:3	126:9,18,19	134:21 140:18	119:11
124:15	Street 118:8	128:17,20 129:3	topic 136:8	V
settled 123:23 settlement 126:6	strong 133:9 student 133:7	129:11,15,23 130:14 132:18	totally 132:2	vacation 133:2

view 138:8,11	weeks 120:23 122:9	10:10 116:16 119:2	7th 126:5	
virtual 116:11	126:3,13,15	10:41 140:20		
119:14	127:15 128:19	1000 118:20	8	
VOLUME 116:11	129:6 130:6,6	116-141 116:12	800 116:24	
vs 116:6 117:3	134:3	13 126:21	825-2003 118:16	
	went 121:19	1325 116:22	846-6989 116:24	
W	wholeheartedly	14th 126:7		
wait 122:18	129:21	16th 126:3	9	
want 120:20 121:2	wiggle 133:12	1840 116:22	98033 118:15	
122:15 123:21	Wiley 118:7 120:3	1st 126:19	98101 116:22 118:9	
124:1,6 128:18,22	121:15 125:16		98104 118:21	
129:22 130:6,8,13	130:22 131:24,24	2	98503 116:19	
131:5 134:7	135:9,13 136:8,24	20 127:19		
135:10,14 136:4	137:5 140:13,14	2020 119:8		
138:20 139:7	140:15	2021 116:15 119:1		
wanted 123:6,15	Williams 118:8	119:8		
124:12 126:17	120:4	206 116:23 118:9		
127:7,14,15	witness 126:24	118:21		
136:22	127:13 138:11	22nd 126:20		
wants 121:4 124:8	witnesses 120:22	26 116:15 119:1		
126:14	133:3 138:20	26th 119:8		
warning 129:13	Woodland 116:18	287-9066 116:23		
WASH 116:7 117:4	work 121:22 123:5	29th 126:21		
Washington 116:1	125:6,22	3		
116:18,19,22	worked 121:22			
118:9,15,21 119:1	works 133:18	30 127:17		
119:11 141:3,7	wouldn't 136:9	315 118:20		
Waste 116:7,7	138:20	3358 116:20 141:14		
117:4,4 118:13,14	writing 131:20	360 116:23		
120:11 128:6	written 120:17	4		
135:1 137:12	www.buellrealti	400 118:15		
way 139:10	116:25	4100 118:13		
we'll 119:24 125:11		425 118:16		
133:17	X	425 118.10 4th 126:14,16		
we're 119:14 126:6	Y	401 120.14,10		
129:23 130:2	Yeah 123:2 131:4	5		
131:1,20,20 132:7		534-9066 116:23		
133:21 136:16	year 133:1			
137:21 140:8,19	yesterday 121:16	6		
we've 123:20	125:15 128:9	601 118:8		
137:18		621 116:18		
Wednesday 125:24		628-6600 118:9		
week 125:17	0	676-7000 118:21		
127:13 130:14,16				
131:8 132:16	1	7		
133:11	10:00 119:7	720 118:15		
	l	l	l	l