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

Docket No. UG-230393 - Vol. I

June 26, 2023



206.287.9066 I 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: audio@buellrealtime.com



		Page 1		Page 3
	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	5	1	INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS
	UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		1 2	INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS
			3	Argument by Mr. Fuller7
	In the Matter of: )		4	Argument by Ms. Barnett 10
	)		5	Argument by Ms. Gafken11
	WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND ) Docket UG-230393		6	Argument by Mr. Roberson14
	TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, )		7	Argument by Ms. Moser14
	Complainant, ) vs. )		8	Oral Ruling 14
	PUGET SOUND ENERGY, )		9	
	Respondent. )		10	
			11 12	
			13	
	PREHEARING CONFERENCE		14	
	The Honorable Samantha Doyle Presiding		15	
	June 26, 2023		16	
			17	
			18	
			19	
			20	
			21	
			22	
	TRANSCRIBED BY: Debra M. Moore, CCR		23	
			24 25	
			25	
		Page 2		Page 4
1	APPEARANCES	Page 2	1	
1 2 3	APPEARANCES On Behalf of Complainant:	Page 2	1 2	-000-
	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General	Page 2		
2	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division	Page 2	2	-000-
2 3 4 5	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504	Page 2	2	-00o- June 26, 2023
2 3 4	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128	Page 2	2 3 4	-o0o- June 26, 2023 THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the
2 3 4 5 6 7	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation
2 3 4 5 6	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30
2 3 4 5 6 7	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians: ANDREW SETH FULLER	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter along with the commissioners. Today we'll do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians: ANDREW SETH FULLER Ogden Murphy Wallace, P.L.L.C.	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians:  ANDREW SETH FULLER Ogden Murphy Wallace, P.L.L.C. 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3500 Seattle, Washington 98164	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter along with the commissioners. Today we'll do appearances, address the motions for intervention and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians:  ANDREW SETH FULLER Ogden Murphy Wallace, P.L.L.C. 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3500	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	-o0o- June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter along with the commissioners. Today we'll do appearances, address the motions for intervention and then discovery. We will then also address the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians:  ANDREW SETH FULLER Ogden Murphy Wallace, P.L.L.C. 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3500 Seattle, Washington 98164 LISA ANDERSON Puyallup Tribe of Indians Legal Office	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter along with the commissioners. Today we'll do appearances, address the motions for intervention and then discovery. We will then also address the procedural schedule, and I will close this conference regarding the filing requirements.  On May 25th, 2023, Puget Sound Energy filed its new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians:  ANDREW SETH FULLER Ogden Murphy Wallace, P.L.L.C. 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3500 Seattle, Washington 98164 LISA ANDERSON Puyallup Tribe of Indians Legal Office 3009 East Portland Avenue Tacoma, Washington 98404	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter along with the commissioners. Today we'll do appearances, address the motions for intervention and then discovery. We will then also address the procedural schedule, and I will close this conference regarding the filling requirements.  On May 25th, 2023, Puget Sound Energy filed its new tariff schedule, 141 LNG, liquefied natural gas, rate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians:  ANDREW SETH FULLER Ogden Murphy Wallace, P.L.L.C. 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3500 Seattle, Washington 98164 LISA ANDERSON Puyallup Tribe of Indians Legal Office 3009 East Portland Avenue	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter along with the commissioners. Today we'll do appearances, address the motions for intervention and then discovery. We will then also address the procedural schedule, and I will close this conference regarding the filing requirements.  On May 25th, 2023, Puget Sound Energy filed its new tariff schedule, 141 LNG, liquefied natural gas, rate adjustment to recover Tacoma LNG facility costs that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians:  ANDREW SETH FULLER Ogden Murphy Wallace, P.L.L.C. 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3500 Seattle, Washington 98164 LISA ANDERSON Puyallup Tribe of Indians Legal Office 3009 East Portland Avenue Tacoma, Washington 98404 On Behalf of Aliance of Western Energy Consumers: SOMMER MOSER PUC Staff - Department of Justice	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter along with the commissioners. Today we'll do appearances, address the motions for intervention and then discovery. We will then also address the procedural schedule, and I will close this conference regarding the filing requirements.  On May 25th, 2023, Puget Sound Energy filed its new tariff schedule, 141 LNG, liquefied natural gas, rate adjustment to recover Tacoma LNG facility costs that the company placed in a tracker, according to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians:  ANDREW SETH FULLER Ogden Murphy Wallace, P.L.L.C. 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3500 Seattle, Washington 98164 LISA ANDERSON Puyallup Tribe of Indians Legal Office 3009 East Portland Avenue Tacoma, Washington 98404 On Behalf of Alliance of Western Energy Consumers: SOMMER MOSER PUC Staff - Department of Justice Business Activities Section 1162 Court Street NE	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter along with the commissioners. Today we'll do appearances, address the motions for intervention and then discovery. We will then also address the procedural schedule, and I will close this conference regarding the filing requirements.  On May 25th, 2023, Puget Sound Energy filed its new tariff schedule, 141 LNG, liquefied natural gas, rate adjustment to recover Tacoma LNG facility costs that the company placed in a tracker, according to the Commission, approved 2022 to an all rate case, the LNG
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	On Behalf of Complainant: JEFFREY K. ROBERSON Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 On Behalf of Respondent: DONNA LEE BARNETT BYRON STARKEY Perkins Coie LLP 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 Public Counsel: LISA WATSON GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 On Behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians:  ANDREW SETH FULLER Ogden Murphy Wallace, P.L.L.C. 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3500 Seattle, Washington 98164 LISA ANDERSON Puyallup Tribe of Indians Legal Office 3009 East Portland Avenue Tacoma, Washington 98404 On Behalf of Alliance of Western Energy Consumers: SOMMER MOSER PUC Staff - Department of Justice Business Activities Section	Page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	June 26, 2023  THE COURT: Okay. And with that, let's be on the record. Good afternoon. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Docket UG-230393, which is captioned as the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission vs. Puget Sound Energy. Today is Monday, June 26th, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:30 p.m.  My name is Samantha Doyle. My pronouns are she/her or they/them. I'm an administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presenting this matter along with the commissioners. Today we'll do appearances, address the motions for intervention and then discovery. We will then also address the procedural schedule, and I will close this conference regarding the filing requirements.  On May 25th, 2023, Puget Sound Energy filed its new tariff schedule, 141 LNG, liquefied natural gas, rate adjustment to recover Tacoma LNG facility costs that the company placed in a tracker, according to the

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

	Page 5		Page 7
1	tariff provision.	1	Does any party object to the petition filed by AWEC?
2	This pre-hearing conference is going to be a chance	2	Okay. Hearing none, the petition for AWEC to intervene
3	for the parties to discuss a procedural schedule and	3	is granted.
4	any other housekeeping matters. And after today's	4	Next we'll discuss the petition to intervene filed by
5	conference, I will enter an order setting out the	5	the Puyallup Tribe. I will give each chance each
6	procedural schedule and setting the date for the	6	party a chance to respond here to the Tribe's petition
7	evidentiary hearing.	7	to intervene, but first I would like to ask Mr. Fuller
8	And let's start our short appearances. And for PSE?	8	if the Tribe wants to make a brief argument here in
9	MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Judge Doyle, and good	9	support of its petition?
10	afternoon. Donna Barnett for from Perkins Coie,	10	MR. FULLER: Yes, please, Your Honor. Just very
11	representing Puget Sound Energy. And with me today is	11	quickly, as as noted in the petition for
12	Byron Starkey, also with Perkins Coie. And just to	12	intervention, the Tribe's intervention in this case
13	note, I am here just for today appearing in in lieu	13	is is based on its substantial interest in this
14	of Pamela Anderson, who's already filed a notice of	14	matter, and its participation is in the public
15	appearance in this case. She just couldn't be here for	15	interest.
16	the pre-hearing conference, so I am filling in on her	16	First, as laid out in the petition, the Tribe has a
17	behalf.	17	substantial interest in this tariff due to its impact
18	THE COURT: Okay.	18	on the tribal government and tribal members. As a
19	MS. BARNETT: But she will be lead she will be	19	government entity, the Tribe owns and operates lands
20	lead attorney. I'm the (inaudible).	20	and facilities that are on those lands that utilize
21	THE COURT: Okay. Great. Thank you. And Commission	21	PSE's utility services, and the Tribe pays PSE for
22	Staff?	22	those services and will be directly impacted by the new
23	MR. ROBERSON: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. Jeff	23	tariff schedule.
24	Roberson, AGO, on behalf of Commission Staff. With me	24	Additionally, tribal members are are PSE
25	virtually at counsel table are Staff analysts Crystal	25	customers, and those members may from time to time be
	Page 6		Page 8
1	Oliver and Jackie Hawkins-Jones.	1	eligible for for a needs-based utility assistance
2	THE COURT: Okay. Great. And Public Counsel?	2	from the Tribe, and there's an additional interest
3	MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. Lisa Gafken, assistant		•
4	, , , , , , ,	3	there.
	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public	3 4	•
5	·		there.
5 6	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public	4	there. And, further, the the Tribe's participation in
	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.	4 5	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was
6	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?	4 5 6	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case.
6 7	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser	4 5 6 7	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case.  The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the
6 7 8	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.	4 5 6 7 8	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case.  The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the
6 7 8 9	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of	4 5 6 7 8 9	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case.  The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the
6 7 8 9 10	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?	4 5 6 7 8 9	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.
6 7 8 9 10	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case.  The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we
6 7 8 9 10 11	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup's legal office here on the line. Nick Thomas	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design of the Tacoma LNG project and decisions that were made
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup's legal office here on the line. Nick Thomas from Ogden Murphy Wallace will also be appearing in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design of the Tacoma LNG project and decisions that were made after September 2016 and evidence as to whether those
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup's legal office here on the line. Nick Thomas from Ogden Murphy Wallace will also be appearing in this case. He's not available today, though.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design of the Tacoma LNG project and decisions that were made after September 2016 and evidence as to whether those costs are beneficial to the public or if they were just
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup's legal office here on the line. Nick Thomas from Ogden Murphy Wallace will also be appearing in this case. He's not available today, though.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And just to make sure	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design of the Tacoma LNG project and decisions that were made after September 2016 and evidence as to whether those costs are beneficial to the public or if they were just necessary to advance the for-profit operations of the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup's legal office here on the line. Nick Thomas from Ogden Murphy Wallace will also be appearing in this case. He's not available today, though.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And just to make sure I also cover everything, are there any other parties	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design of the Tacoma LNG project and decisions that were made after September 2016 and evidence as to whether those costs are beneficial to the public or if they were just necessary to advance the for-profit operations of the LNG facility.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup's legal office here on the line. Nick Thomas from Ogden Murphy Wallace will also be appearing in this case. He's not available today, though.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And just to make sure I also cover everything, are there any other parties that wish to enter an appearance? Okay. Great.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design of the Tacoma LNG project and decisions that were made after September 2016 and evidence as to whether those costs are beneficial to the public or if they were just necessary to advance the for-profit operations of the LNG facility.  We note that PSE, in its response, has has agreed
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup's legal office here on the line. Nick Thomas from Ogden Murphy Wallace will also be appearing in this case. He's not available today, though.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And just to make sure I also cover everything, are there any other parties that wish to enter an appearance? Okay. Great. Hearing nothing, let's move on.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design of the Tacoma LNG project and decisions that were made after September 2016 and evidence as to whether those costs are beneficial to the public or if they were just necessary to advance the for-profit operations of the LNG facility.  We note that PSE, in its response, has has agreed that the Tribe should participate and asks that we be
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup's legal office here on the line. Nick Thomas from Ogden Murphy Wallace will also be appearing in this case. He's not available today, though.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And just to make sure I also cover everything, are there any other parties that wish to enter an appearance? Okay. Great. Hearing nothing, let's move on.  We'll now address the petitions to intervene. AWEC and the Puyallup Tribe have each filed a petition to intervene in advance. And just double-checking, is	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design of the Tacoma LNG project and decisions that were made after September 2016 and evidence as to whether those costs are beneficial to the public or if they were just necessary to advance the for-profit operations of the LNG facility.  We note that PSE, in its response, has has agreed that the Tribe should participate and asks that we be limited to the appropriate scope. I don't think the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	attorney general, appearing on behalf of Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sommer Moser on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.  THE COURT: Thank you. And the Puyallup Tribe of Indians?  MR. FULLER: Good afternoon, Judge Doyle. This is Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe. We also have Lisa Anderson from the Puyallup's legal office here on the line. Nick Thomas from Ogden Murphy Wallace will also be appearing in this case. He's not available today, though.  THE COURT: Great. Thank you. And just to make sure I also cover everything, are there any other parties that wish to enter an appearance? Okay. Great. Hearing nothing, let's move on.  We'll now address the petitions to intervene. AWEC and the Puyallup Tribe have each filed a petition to	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there.  And, further, the the Tribe's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest, as it was found to be in the prior proceeding on this rate case. The Tribe holds unique and distinct evidence as to the nature of the costs that were incurred by PSE for the construction and permitting of the LNG plant and the and the four-mile line.  This evidence is particularly relevant to we believe to the Commission's analysis, because it bears on the prudence of the decisions regarding the design of the Tacoma LNG project and decisions that were made after September 2016 and evidence as to whether those costs are beneficial to the public or if they were just necessary to advance the for-profit operations of the LNG facility.  We note that PSE, in its response, has has agreed that the Tribe should participate and asks that we be limited to the appropriate scope. I don't think the Tribe objects to to limiting its its intervention

	Page 9		Page 11
1	of the broad-ranging nature of that proceeding.	1	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Counsel. And we can go
2	Here, where we're dealing with the deferred pieces of	2	next to Public Counsel, Ms. Gafken. I saw that your
3	the prior proceeding that really are squarely within	3	hand was up for a moment.
4	the Tribe's interests in the area that it was allowed	4	MS. GAFKEN: Yes. I wasn't sure if you wanted us to
5	in in the prior proceeding, we see it's entirely	5	go before the company so they could respond to us as
6	appropriate for the Tribe to be allowed in, and we do	6	well, but I think it will all sort itself out.
7	not see that it would be appropriate to limit the	7	With respect to the final order in PSE's last rate
8	Tribe's intervention in any respect, because, as we	8	case, which was from Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067,
9	understand it, this proceeding is going to be you	9	the Commission limited its ruling to the September 2016
10	know, fall within the subset of the interests that we	10	decision to build. And the Commission construed the
11	represented in the prior proceeding.	11	settlement to ask for a decision that the board's
12	We I'll also just finally note that in the prior	12	decision on September 22, 2016, was to build the
13	proceeding, we don't believe that the Tribe's	13	facility was prudent, but that the settlement allows
14	intervention impaired, delayed, or otherwise was a	14	the parties to refute prudency and reasonableness of
15	burden on the proceedings. And we feel that the	15	costs incurred after that point. You can refer to
16	information and the evidence that we can present speak	16	paragraph 393 from that final order with respect to
17	to the tenets of energy equity that the Commission	17	that.
18	has has adopted and and is following.	18	In paragraph 360, the Commission summarized staff
19	So we would appreciate to be allowed in. We don't	19	witness who was talking about why the settlement was in
20	we do not feel that any limitation will be necessary.	20	the public interest from their point of view, and they
21	However, we will say that to the extent that that	21	pointed out that the settlement preserved the right to
22	there are limits on the scope of this overall case, we	22	challenge prudency of LNG costs in the future.
23	are more than happy to stay within those limits and	23	So this is the docket that is the future case that
24	and not overbroaden the issues inappropriately. Thank	24	was contemplated in the GRC order. So this is the case
25	you.	25	in which prudence of the post-2016 decision's costs and
23	you.		III IIIII productioo di allo pool 2010 decessione coccio di d
	Page 10		D 10
	3		Page 12
1	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would	1	operations are at issue.
1 2		1 2	
	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would		operations are at issue.
2	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And	2	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on
2	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE	2 3	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September
2 3 4	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?	2 3 4	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence
2 3 4 5	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I	2 3 4 5	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that
2 3 4 5 6	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've	2 3 4 5 6	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light	2 3 4 5 6 7	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and what was still being, I guess, deferred for decision in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016 decisions on the LNG project. So I did want to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and what was still being, I guess, deferred for decision in this case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016 decisions on the LNG project. So I did want to be clear about that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and what was still being, I guess, deferred for decision in this case.  So it shouldn't be difficult to to determine what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016 decisions on the LNG project. So I did want to be clear about that.  I would like to address the issue of the scope of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and what was still being, I guess, deferred for decision in this case.  So it shouldn't be difficult to to determine what is what is relitigated or what is opening up old	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016 decisions on the LNG project. So I did want to be clear about that.  I would like to address the issue of the scope of the Tribe's intervention. In the GRC, as Mr. Fuller
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and what was still being, I guess, deferred for decision in this case.  So it shouldn't be difficult to to determine what is what is relitigated or what is opening up old issues in this case. So but I do think, given the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016 decisions on the LNG project. So I did want to be clear about that.  I would like to address the issue of the scope of the Tribe's intervention. In the GRC, as Mr. Fuller mentioned, the Tribe's intervention was limited to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and what was still being, I guess, deferred for decision in this case.  So it shouldn't be difficult to to determine what is what is relitigated or what is opening up old issues in this case. So but I do think, given the broad and slightly vague petition, language in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016 decisions on the LNG project. So I did want to be clear about that.  I would like to address the issue of the scope of the Tribe's intervention. In the GRC, as Mr. Fuller mentioned, the Tribe's intervention was limited to the LNG issue, and that was appropriate in that case
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and what was still being, I guess, deferred for decision in this case.  So it shouldn't be difficult to to determine what is what is relitigated or what is opening up old issues in this case. So but I do think, given the broad and slightly vague petition, language in the petition, that it would be good to expressly state that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016 decisions on the LNG project. So I did want to be clear about that.  I would like to address the issue of the scope of the Tribe's intervention. In the GRC, as Mr. Fuller mentioned, the Tribe's intervention was limited to the LNG issue, and that was appropriate in that case because there were several non-LNG issues. I mean, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and what was still being, I guess, deferred for decision in this case.  So it shouldn't be difficult to to determine what is what is relitigated or what is opening up old issues in this case. So but I do think, given the broad and slightly vague petition, language in the petition, that it would be good to expressly state that in an order, that we that that this proceeding is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	operations are at issue.  In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016 decisions on the LNG project. So I did want to be clear about that.  I would like to address the issue of the scope of the Tribe's intervention. In the GRC, as Mr. Fuller mentioned, the Tribe's intervention was limited to the LNG issue, and that was appropriate in that case because there were several non-LNG issues. I mean, it was a wide-ranging GRC with lots and lots of issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. So I would like to hear each of the other parties' position. And I have read the company's filed response. Would PSE like to give a brief summary of its position?  MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Judge Doyle. And I won't don't want to repeat anything that we've already said in our written response, but just in light of the broad language that the Puyallup Tribe used in its petition to intervene, it was unclear whether the Tribe was going to be raising issues that were already determined and litigated in the in the 2022 GRC. So I'm hearing that that is not the intent, and so I do think the final order in that rate case did a very good job about laying out exactly what was determined and what was still being, I guess, deferred for decision in this case.  So it shouldn't be difficult to to determine what is what is relitigated or what is opening up old issues in this case. So but I do think, given the broad and slightly vague petition, language in the petition, that it would be good to expressly state that in an order, that we that that this proceeding is limited to the issues as ordered in the final order	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	In the context of the GRC decision, which focused on that prudency, the threshold prudency and the September 2016 board decision, the Commission did weigh evidence and argument and made various rulings vis-a-vis that 2016 board decision. However, in the context of post-2016 decision's costs and operations, the parties have the ability and due process right to present their cases either in support of or in opposition to the facility.  The Public Counsel is not viewing this as a simple pro forma compliant filing of placing costs already determined to be prudent into a tracker, but, rather, this is a prudence review of the post-September 2016 decisions on the LNG project. So I did want to be clear about that.  I would like to address the issue of the scope of the Tribe's intervention. In the GRC, as Mr. Fuller mentioned, the Tribe's intervention was limited to the LNG issue, and that was appropriate in that case because there were several non-LNG issues. I mean, it was a wide-ranging GRC with lots and lots of issues. In this case, it is only the LNG issue. As the Tribe

	Page 13		Page 15
1	specific and specialized knowledge about this facility.	1	Order 1. During proceedings of the Commission, parties
2	And this is the case in which the Commission will rule	2	often issue a first data request asking that any
3	on whether the facility is prudent.	3	subsequent data requests and responses are shared with
4	Not only does the Tribe have a longstanding interest	4	every other party. It would make it easier on the
5	in LNG, but they possess a unique voice that is lacking	5	parties if I included this requirement in the
6	among the other parties, and the Tribe is the exact	6	pre-hearing conference order. Are there any objections
7	type of new participant that the participant funding	7	to my including that requirement?
8	system is designed to draw into UTC proceedings.	8	MS. GAFKEN: No objections from Public Counsel, and
9	Moreover, they are squarely within the definition of a	9	we do support that. And I apologize if either you're
10	highly impacted community in both CETA, which I know	10	going to address this next or if I've missed it, but I
11	applies to electric only, but also to the new	11	wanted to ask about, in conjunction with discovery,
12	participation funding statute. For reference, that's	12	also the whether there's going to be a protective
13	RCW 19.405.020, Sub-Section 23, and RCW 80.28.430.	13	order issued?
14	As to the issue of delay, I think we'll talk a little	14	THE COURT: We have I have not addressed that yet,
15	bit more about this when we get to the schedule, but to	15	and it had not been requested yet at this time. So we
16	the extent that we do need to extend this proceeding	16	can we can identify that next after
17	beyond a November 1 effective date, that's because this	17	MS. GAFKEN: I will hold my horses. Thank you.
18	is an adjudication, not because there's any undue delay	18	THE COURT: No problem. Did anyone else have any
19	caused by any one party, and certainly not by the	19	comments or objections to the discovery requirement?
20	Tribe.	20	MS. BARNETT: No objection from the company, Your
21	So to that end, Public Counsel does support the	21	Honor.
22	Puyallup Tribe's request for intervention, and we see	22	MR. ROBERSON: Or from Staff.
23	no limit to to limit their intervention in this	23	MS. MOSER: No objection from AWEC.
24	case. Thus, we would request that the Tribe be granted	24	THE COURT: And I'm hearing none from Mr. Fuller, so
25	full intervention status. Thank you.	25	I'm assuming
	Page 14		Page 16
1			5
_	THE COURT: Thank you. And can we hear from Staff?	1	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no
2	THE COURT: Thank you. And can we hear from Staff?  MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry.	1 2	
			MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no
2	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry.	2	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.
2	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.	2 3	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise
2 3 4	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there. Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.	2 3 4	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural
2 3 4 5	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry.  Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the	2 3 4 5	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there. Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention. Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at	2 3 4 5 6	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there. Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention. Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there. Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention. Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry.  Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there. Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention. Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?  MS. GAFKEN: No objection. The only issue that I was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move on.  THE COURT: Thank you. And, finally, AWEC?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?  MS. GAFKEN: No objection. The only issue that I was raising that for is so we have an outside expert who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move on.  THE COURT: Thank you. And, finally, AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. Sommer Moser for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?  MS. GAFKEN: No objection. The only issue that I was raising that for is so we have an outside expert who will help us with the case, and in order to get access
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move on.  THE COURT: Thank you. And, finally, AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. Sommer Moser for AWEC. We do not oppose the Tribe's petition for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?  MS. GAFKEN: No objection. The only issue that I was raising that for is so we have an outside expert who will help us with the case, and in order to get access to confidential information in the filing, a protective
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention. Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move on.  THE COURT: Thank you. And, finally, AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. Sommer Moser for AWEC. We do not oppose the Tribe's petition for intervention in this case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?  MS. GAFKEN: No objection. The only issue that I was raising that for is so we have an outside expert who will help us with the case, and in order to get access to confidential information in the filing, a protective order is very helpful in that regard.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move on.  THE COURT: Thank you. And, finally, AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. Sommer Moser for AWEC. We do not oppose the Tribe's petition for intervention in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all for your comments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?  MS. GAFKEN: No objection. The only issue that I was raising that for is so we have an outside expert who will help us with the case, and in order to get access to confidential information in the filling, a protective order is very helpful in that regard.  MR. ROBERSON: No objection from Staff.  MR. FULLER: No objection from the Tribe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move on.  THE COURT: Thank you. And, finally, AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. Sommer Moser for AWEC. We do not oppose the Tribe's petition for intervention in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all for your comments. At this point I am granting the Puyallup Tribe's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?  MS. GAFKEN: No objection. The only issue that I was raising that for is so we have an outside expert who will help us with the case, and in order to get access to confidential information in the filing, a protective order is very helpful in that regard.  MR. ROBERSON: No objection from Staff.  MR. FULLER: No objection from the Tribe.  MS. MOSER: No objection from AWEC.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move on.  THE COURT: Thank you. And, finally, AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. Sommer Moser for AWEC. We do not oppose the Tribe's petition for intervention in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all for your comments. At this point I am granting the Puyallup Tribe's petition for intervention. As with any of the parties,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?  MS. GAFKEN: No objection. The only issue that I was raising that for is so we have an outside expert who will help us with the case, and in order to get access to confidential information in the filing, a protective order is very helpful in that regard.  MR. ROBERSON: No objection from Staff.  MR. FULLER: No objection from the Tribe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ROBERSON: Can you be hear me now? Okay. Sorry. Lag there.  Staff has no objection to the Tribe's intervention.  Like Public Counsel, Staff sees no reason to limit the Tribe's intervention. It's a very there's a lot at stake, but the issues are very limited. The Tribe is represented. It has no interest in expanding the proceeding beyond what's been filed. And if there are issues, the Commission can deal with them down the road.  So I think from Staff's perspective, the Commission should just probably just grant that petition and move on.  THE COURT: Thank you. And, finally, AWEC?  MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. Sommer Moser for AWEC. We do not oppose the Tribe's petition for intervention in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all for your comments. At this point I am granting the Puyallup Tribe's petition for intervention. As with any of the parties, this does not broaden the scope of the proceedings	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. FULLER: Sorry. It's a button problem. Yes, no objections from the Tribe. Thank you.  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Discovery will otherwise be conducted according to the Commission's procedural rules.  And, next, since it was just brought up, there had not been a request for a protective order. Did somebody want to motion for that?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. The PSE would like to move for the standard protective order in this case.  THE COURT: Okay. And do any parties have an objection to the protective order? Specifically Public Counsel, did you have a comment on that?  MS. GAFKEN: No objection. The only issue that I was raising that for is so we have an outside expert who will help us with the case, and in order to get access to confidential information in the filing, a protective order is very helpful in that regard.  MR. ROBERSON: No objection from Staff.  MR. FULLER: No objection from the Tribe.  MS. MOSER: No objection from AWEC.  THE COURT: Okay. With that, I will include a

	Page 17		Page 19
1	preliminary matter, I want to address the proposed	1	errata would be August 16th, 2023. Then the hearing,
2	November 1st effective date. The Commission reviewed	2	August 23rd, which is a Wednesday. Post-hearing briefs
3	PSE's explanation for the proposed November 1st	3	after that would be September 8th, which is a Friday,
4	effective date, and it regards that as merely a	4	and that is two and a half weeks after the hearing.
5	proposal and not a term of the settlement agreement.	5	Then we have a date for reply briefs, September 15th,
6	As it was not explicitly stated, we, therefore, did not	6	which is a Friday, which allows only a week after that,
7	specifically approve this as a term.	7	the I'm sorry, a week from the post-hearing briefs.
8	With this understanding, I'll go around in a moment	8	And then requested final order date would be October
9	and allow each party to state its proposed schedule.	9	26, which is a Thursday, 2023. That's six weeks from
10	However, first were there any agreements between the	10	the date of the reply brief. And then the requested
11	parties regarding a schedule?	11	effective date, November 1st.
12	MS. BARNETT: No, Your Honor. I don't think we have	12	THE COURT: Okay. I think I might have missed a
13	a any agreement. PSE sent a proposal around several	13	couple dates, so if you can also put that in the chat,
14	weeks ago, and and, sorry, Public Counsel responded	14	that would be great.
15	with an alternative, and that was also unacceptable to	15	MS. BARNETT: Yes.
16	PSE. PSE has adjusted its proposed schedule to	16	THE COURT: Okay.
17	accommodate some of the dates that Public Counsel	17	MS. BARNETT: And I also do want to acknowledge that
18	requested and felt were important. So we have one that	18	usually we reduce the data request time after
19	we haven't shared with anyone yet that we're proposing	19	from from ten business days to seven business days
20	today that is hopefully a compromise but does still	20	and then again to five business days at each interim
21	allow for a November 1st effective date.	21	for response and rebuttal testimony. I put that in
22	THE COURT: Okay. Well, Ms. Barnett, why don't you	22	here too, but I didn't specify it when I was reading it
23	go ahead and start with the company's current proposal.	23	out. I apologize.
24	MS. BARNETT: Thank you. Would it be preferable to	24	THE COURT: Okay. And then let's hear from Staff
25	just read it out, or would you like me to share my	25	next.
	Page 18		Page 20
1	Page 18 screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I	1	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear
1 2	<u> </u>	1 2	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you
	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I		MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear
2	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.	2	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.
2 3	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.	2 3	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in
2 3 4	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.
2 3 4 5	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.  Then the next date would be the company rebuttal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is accelerated, but it does go beyond the November 1 timeline.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.  Then the next date would be the company rebuttal testimony and cross-answering testimony on August 4th,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is accelerated, but it does go beyond the November 1 timeline.  But having said that, I'm going to start with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.  Then the next date would be the company rebuttal testimony and cross-answering testimony on August 4th, 2023. That's a Friday, and that allows for three weeks	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is accelerated, but it does go beyond the November 1 timeline.  But having said that, I'm going to start with the testimony response filing date, the Staff, Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.  Then the next date would be the company rebuttal testimony and cross-answering testimony on August 4th, 2023. That's a Friday, and that allows for three weeks from Staff, Public Counsel and other parties' response	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is accelerated, but it does go beyond the November 1 timeline.  But having said that, I'm going to start with the testimony response filing date, the Staff, Public Counsel, et cetera, response testimony. I apologize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.  Then the next date would be the company rebuttal testimony and cross-answering testimony on August 4th, 2023. That's a Friday, and that allows for three weeks from Staff, Public Counsel and other parties' response testimony. A public comment date, to be determined	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is accelerated, but it does go beyond the November 1 timeline.  But having said that, I'm going to start with the testimony response filing date, the Staff, Public Counsel, et cetera, response testimony. I apologize for the barking dog in the background. I had that at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.  Then the next date would be the company rebuttal testimony and cross-answering testimony on August 4th, 2023. That's a Friday, and that allows for three weeks from Staff, Public Counsel and other parties' response testimony. A public comment date, to be determined here for I mean, a public comment hearing date.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is accelerated, but it does go beyond the November 1 timeline.  But having said that, I'm going to start with the testimony response filing date, the Staff, Public Counsel, et cetera, response testimony. I apologize for the barking dog in the background. I had that at September 8th. And then I did also put in a public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.  Then the next date would be the company rebuttal testimony and cross-answering testimony on August 4th, 2023. That's a Friday, and that allows for three weeks from Staff, Public Counsel and other parties' response testimony. A public comment date, to be determined here for I mean, a public comment hearing date.  We're open to that but did not place a date in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is accelerated, but it does go beyond the November 1 timeline.  But having said that, I'm going to start with the testimony response filing date, the Staff, Public Counsel, et cetera, response testimony. I apologize for the barking dog in the background. I had that at September 8th. And then I did also put in a public comment hearing. It doesn't sound like that is is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.  Then the next date would be the company rebuttal testimony and cross-answering testimony on August 4th, 2023. That's a Friday, and that allows for three weeks from Staff, Public Counsel and other parties' response testimony. A public comment date, to be determined here for I mean, a public comment hearing date.  We're open to that but did not place a date in.  Discovery cut-off would be August 11th, which is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is accelerated, but it does go beyond the November 1 timeline.  But having said that, I'm going to start with the testimony response filing date, the Staff, Public Counsel, et cetera, response testimony. I apologize for the barking dog in the background. I had that at September 8th. And then I did also put in a public comment hearing. It doesn't sound like that is is objected to, but we've we feel that public comment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	screen? I don't know if it's even set up where I could, but I can just read it out.  THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, you could read it out or place it and also place it in the chat.  MS. BARNETT: Sure.  THE COURT: But I do need you to read it out. Thank you.  MS. BARNETT: Okay. I'll start with that, because I can't do two things at once. Let's see.  So the company filed its tariff and testimony on May 21st, 2023. And the next date I have on here is a suspension and commencement of discovery, which was June 28th. Then pre-hearing conference today, June 26th. The next date is Staff, Public Counsel and parties' testimony proposed for July 14th, which is a Friday. That is seven weeks from the filing date.  Then the next date would be the company rebuttal testimony and cross-answering testimony on August 4th, 2023. That's a Friday, and that allows for three weeks from Staff, Public Counsel and other parties' response testimony. A public comment date, to be determined here for I mean, a public comment hearing date.  We're open to that but did not place a date in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. ROBERSON: So it might actually be easier to hear from Public Counsel. They have, I think, what you might think of the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of timing.  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead. Let's hear from Public Counsel.  MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I had put together an alternative schedule, as Ms. Barnett had indicated. And I will preface this by saying this was really the minimum time frame that that I could really see this case functioning under. And that's that is because, you know, we do have an outside expert. They are going to have to work on the case. They haven't seen the confidential portions of the filing yet. And so taking all of that into consideration, the the schedule is accelerated, but it does go beyond the November 1 timeline.  But having said that, I'm going to start with the testimony response filing date, the Staff, Public Counsel, et cetera, response testimony. I apologize for the barking dog in the background. I had that at September 8th. And then I did also put in a public comment hearing. It doesn't sound like that is is

	Page 21		Page 23
1	case.	1	schedule or comment?
2	The next deadline is the rebuttal and cross-answering	2	MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. We do not have a
3	testimony, which I have as October 6. Discovery	3	proposed schedule. We can make the dates of either
4	cut-off, October 20th. Cross-examination, exhibits,	4	schedule work. As signatories to the stipulation, you
5	witness lists and errata, October 31. For the hearing,	5	know, we feel a little beholden to supporting the
6	I had that placed on the week of November 6.	6	November 1st rate effective date. But just in terms of
7	Post-hearing briefs, I put that at December 8th, and	7	conflicts, I'm not seeing any.
8	reply briefs December 21.	8	I will say the the PSE proposal for the August
9	I did not request a date for final order or effective	9	23rd hearing date, this is just the first that I'm
10	date, because I think that those things just flow from	10	hearing it, and I'm not able to confirm with my witness
11	where the end of the process happens. And, you know, I	11	in realtime availability. But I could do that quickly
12	don't I don't want to dictate what the Commission	12	and follow up as appropriate if that's the schedule
13	does under what timeline there.	13	that the Commission ultimately goes with.
14	I will also note that that I'm not the only one	14	THE COURT: Sorry. One moment here. I'm going to
15	with this issue. There are parties that are also	15	make sure I received all of these.
16	involved in the PacifiCorp docket, and so these dates	16	Okay. Well, after hearing all of the party positions
17	also take into consideration how the cases are	17	and taking a moment to to look at the schedule and
18	sandwiched upon each other. My witness in this case is	18	confirm, we will adopt the November 6th hearing date
19	also a witness in the PacifiCorp general rate case, so	19	and take the rest under consideration. And I think
20	I'm balancing that as well.	20	with that
21	THE COURT: Okay. And thank you. Ms. Gafken,	21	MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, may I add one to the
22	could you also well, I think maybe I had had the	22	extent I understand the issue with falling right on
23	company put it in the chat, but maybe what we should be	23	certain dates, so certainly those are you know,
24	doing is emailing each other, all the parties. So	24	there's enough wiggle room in PSE's schedule to
25	sorry to have you be redundant, but I want to have an	25	accommodate when they're falling on right on certain
	Page 22		Page 24
1	appropriate record to make sure we're all looking at	1	other dates.
2	the same dates, so	2	And and as far as the reply brief, that is one
3	MS. GAFKEN: Sure. I can I can forward that		
4		3	
	email.	4	thing that is often taken off the table or off the
5			thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be
5 6	email. THE COURT: Great. Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the	4	thing that is often taken off the table or off the
	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the	4 5	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.
6	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.	4 5 6	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under
6 7	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms.	4 5 6 7	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?
6 7 8	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.	4 5 6 7 8	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my
6 7 8 9	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms.  Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.	4 5 6 7 8 9	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have
6 7 8 9 10	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms.  Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go	4 5 6 7 8 9	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the
6 7 8 9 10	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms.  Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have
6 7 8 9 10 11	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum. Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum. Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the choice between those two schedules, Staff very much	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff and conducting an adjudication. The Commission still
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the choice between those two schedules, Staff very much supports Public Counsel's.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff and conducting an adjudication. The Commission still has the duty to evaluate the the filing to ensure
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the choice between those two schedules, Staff very much supports Public Counsel's.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Next let's go to the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff and conducting an adjudication. The Commission still has the duty to evaluate the the filing to ensure that the resulting rates are fair, just, reasonable and
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the choice between those two schedules, Staff very much supports Public Counsel's.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Next let's go to the Puyallup Tribe, if you are ready with your proposed	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff and conducting an adjudication. The Commission still has the duty to evaluate the the filling to ensure that the resulting rates are fair, just, reasonable and sufficient and that projects included in rates are
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the choice between those two schedules, Staff very much supports Public Counsel's.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Next let's go to the Puyallup Tribe, if you are ready with your proposed schedule?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff and conducting an adjudication. The Commission still has the duty to evaluate the the filing to ensure that the resulting rates are fair, just, reasonable and sufficient and that projects included in rates are prudent. There's simply not enough time between now
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the choice between those two schedules, Staff very much supports Public Counsel's.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Next let's go to the Puyallup Tribe, if you are ready with your proposed schedule?  MR. FULLER: We don't have a schedule to propose	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff and conducting an adjudication. The Commission still has the duty to evaluate the the filing to ensure that the resulting rates are fair, just, reasonable and sufficient and that projects included in rates are prudent. There's simply not enough time between now and November 1 to conduct an adjudication with rates
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the choice between those two schedules, Staff very much supports Public Counsel's.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Next let's go to the Puyallup Tribe, if you are ready with your proposed schedule?  MR. FULLER: We don't have a schedule to propose ourselves. We have taken a look at Public Counsel's	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff and conducting an adjudication. The Commission still has the duty to evaluate the the filing to ensure that the resulting rates are fair, just, reasonable and sufficient and that projects included in rates are prudent. There's simply not enough time between now and November 1 to conduct an adjudication with rates effective by November 1.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the choice between those two schedules, Staff very much supports Public Counsel's.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Next let's go to the Puyallup Tribe, if you are ready with your proposed schedule?  MR. FULLER: We don't have a schedule to propose ourselves. We have taken a look at Public Counsel's schedule, and we would be willing to work with the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff and conducting an adjudication. The Commission still has the duty to evaluate the the filing to ensure that the resulting rates are fair, just, reasonable and sufficient and that projects included in rates are prudent. There's simply not enough time between now and November 1 to conduct an adjudication with rates effective by November 1.  There is a due process issue. While we do anticipate
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE COURT: Great. Thank you.  MS. GAFKEN: I'll forward the one that I sent to the parties earlier.  THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. And then I'll have Ms. Barnett maybe reply to that. And with that, let's go back to Staff and their proposed schedule.  MR. ROBERSON: So Staff is Public Counsel's schedule is acceptable to Staff if that's the minimum.  Staff also is having trouble with many of the dates, if not falling right on top of dates in the PacifiCorp GRC, kind of running up against them. And so given the choice between those two schedules, Staff very much supports Public Counsel's.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Next let's go to the Puyallup Tribe, if you are ready with your proposed schedule?  MR. FULLER: We don't have a schedule to propose ourselves. We have taken a look at Public Counsel's	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	thing that is often taken off the table or off the schedule to to facilitate schedules, so PSE would be open to waiving its right to a reply brief in that case.  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll take that under consideration as well. Ms. Gafken?  MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. I just wanted to place my argument on the record on the schedule just so we have it. You know, I heard Ms. Moser reference the the agreement in the last GRC, and, of course, Public Counsel was not a signatory to that that agreement.  But I I do want to note that the agreement does not preclude the Commission from suspending the tariff and conducting an adjudication. The Commission still has the duty to evaluate the the filing to ensure that the resulting rates are fair, just, reasonable and sufficient and that projects included in rates are prudent. There's simply not enough time between now and November 1 to conduct an adjudication with rates effective by November 1.

	Page 25		Page 27
1	engage in discovery, analyze the case, and prepare a	1	other electronically. If you have any corrections or
2	case in this docket. It's not just a matter of copy	2	updates to our master service list in this docket,
3	and pasting what we did before and placing it into this	3	please file a written notice of appearance or email us
4	docket. We have to make a new record.	4	at samantha.doyle@utc.wa.gov.
5	So as I mentioned before, the the schedule that I	5	And with that, is there anything else we need to
6	proposed, that Public Counsel is proposing, is the	6	address today?
7	minimum timeline for which we can address the case	7	MR. FULLER: Your Honor, if I can just ask a quick
8	under. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that the	8	housekeeping question. Does does the Tribe's
9	record was made.	9	petition to intervene, which lists all of us and our
10	THE COURT: Thank you. Oh, go right ahead.	10	notice information, does that serve as a notice of
11	MR. ROBERSON: Just put this on the record. The	11	appearance, or should we be filing a separate notice of
12	Commission, as I understood it, announced at the start	12	appearance? I just want to make sure we're dotting our
13	of this hearing that it had looked at the terms of the	13	I's and crossing our T's.
14	settlement and concluded that the November 1 rate	14	THE COURT: I believe that serves, but why don't you
15	effective date was not a term of the settlement. So	15	also update me with a list just to to guarantee
16	Staff took that into account in supporting Public	16	that.
17	Counsel's proposed schedule.	17	MR. FULLER: Absolutely. Will do. Thank you.
18	THE COURT: Understood. Thank you. So with that, I	18	THE COURT: Thank you. Is there anything else from
19	want to reiterate we accept the November 6th hearing	19	any of the parties?
20	date at this point, and we will make minor changes for	20	Okay. We will issue an order shortly containing the
21	policy and the commissioners and will take the take	21	procedural schedule, other guidelines for the
22	into consideration the company's waiver of reply briefs	22	disposition of the case, and a standard protective
23	as well. So with that, I will put the put the	23	order. We are adjourned. Thank you, everyone, for
24	schedule take the rest into consideration and	24	coming today.
25	include the procedural schedule in the pre-hearing	25	MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.
	Page 26		Page 28
1	conference order.	1	MS. MOSER: Thank you.
2	I also want to address electronic filing and	2	MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	electronic service before we conclude. Oh, thought?	3	MR. FULLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	Hold on that. Ms. Gafken?	4	(Conclusion of hearing)
5	MS. GAFKEN: I apologize. I just wanted to make sure	5	
6	that so in in reducing the response time for	6	
7	discovery request to seven days after response	7	
8	testimony and five days after reply testimony or	8	
9	cross-answering testimony, that is something that	9	
	<u> </u>		
10	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would	10	
11	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I	10 11	
11 12	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was	10 11 12	
11 12 13	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.	10 11 12 13	
11 12 13 14	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to	10 11 12 13 14	
11 12 13 14 15	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed	10 11 12 13 14 15	
11 12 13 14 15	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	
11 12 13 14 15 16	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the Commission's web page. If the parties intend to submit	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the Commission's web page. If the parties intend to submit exhibits, there will be requirements for filing	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the Commission's web page. If the parties intend to submit exhibits, there will be requirements for filing exhibits and an exhibit list in advance of the hearing,	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the Commission's web page. If the parties intend to submit exhibits, there will be requirements for filing exhibits and an exhibit list in advance of the hearing, which will also be done only electronically. We will	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the Commission's web page. If the parties intend to submit exhibits, there will be requirements for filing exhibits and an exhibit list in advance of the hearing,	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the Commission's web page. If the parties intend to submit exhibits, there will be requirements for filing exhibits and an exhibit list in advance of the hearing, which will also be done only electronically. We will	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the Commission's web page. If the parties intend to submit exhibits, there will be requirements for filing exhibits and an exhibit list in advance of the hearing, which will also be done only electronically. We will include these details in the pre-hearing conference order.  Also, the Commission's rules provide for electronic	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that we incorporated as well in our schedule and would support. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on that, because I'm not sure that I was earlier.  THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying. So I want to remind the parties that documents should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the Commission's web page. If the parties intend to submit exhibits, there will be requirements for filing exhibits and an exhibit list in advance of the hearing, which will also be done only electronically. We will include these details in the pre-hearing conference order.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	

	Page 29
1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF WASHINGTON )
3	) ss
4	COUNTY OF KING )
5	I, the undersigned, do hereby certify under penalty
6	of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal
7	recordings were transcribed under my direction as a certified
8	transcriptionist; and that the transcript is true and accurate
9	to the best of my knowledge and ability, including changes, if
10	any, made by the trial judge reviewing the transcript; that I
11	received the electronic recording in the proprietary court
12	format; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney
13	or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially
14	interested in its outcome.
15	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
16	this 10th day of July, 2023.
17	***
18	HOTCH CO.
19	
20	- Ocha M. Moore
21	Debra M. Moore, CCR
22	
l	

	<b>allows</b> 11:13 18:19	<b>Avenue</b> 2:12,15,18		11:18 12:4 13:2
A 1200200	19:6	AWEC 6:6,21 7:1,2	<u>C</u>	14:10,12 15:1
ability 12:8 29:9	alternative 17:15	14:15,17 15:23	C 2:1 3:1 29:1,1	17:2 21:12 23:13
able 23:10	20:7	16:21 22:25	call 6:24	24:15,16 25:12
Absolutely 27:17	analysis 8:12	10.21 22.23	captioned 4:7	26:24
accelerated 20:16	analysts 5:25	В	case 4:23 5:15 6:16	Commission's 8:12
accept 25:19	analyze 25:1	back 22:10	7:12 8:6 9:22	16:4 26:17,23
acceptable 22:12	Anderson 2:17	background 20:21	10:13,16,19 11:8	commissioners
access 16:16	5:14 6:13	balancing 21:20	11:23,24 12:20,23	4:14 25:21
accommodate	<b>Andrew</b> 2:14 6:12	barking 20:21	13:2,24 14:18	community 13:10
17:17 23:25	announced 25:12	<b>Barnett</b> 2:7 3:4 5:9	16:10,16 20:10,13	company 4:22 11:5
account 25:16 accurate 29:8	anticipate 24:23	5:10,19 10:5	21:1,18,19 24:6	15:20 18:10,17
	apologize 15:9	15:20 16:9 17:12	24:25 25:1,2,7 27:22	21:23
acknowledge 19:17 Activities 2:22	19:23 20:20 26:5	17:22,24 18:5,8	cases 12:9 21:17	company's 10:3
add 23:21	appearance 5:15	19:15,17 20:8	caused 13:19	17:23 25:22
additional 8:2	6:19 27:3,11,12	22:9 23:21 27:25	CCR 1:24 29:21	Complainant 1:8
Additionally 7:24	appearances 4:15	<b>based</b> 7:13	certain 23:23,25	2:2
address 4:15,16	5:8	<b>bears</b> 8:12	certain 23.23,23 certainly 13:19	compliant 12:12
6:21 12:17 15:10	appearing 5:13 6:4	<b>behalf</b> 2:2,6,13,20	23:23	compromise 17:20
17:1 25:7 26:2	6:15	5:17,24 6:4,8,12	certified 29:7	conclude 26:3
27:6	applies 13:11	beholden 23:5	certify 29:5	concluded 25:14
addressed 15:14	appreciate 9:19	<b>believe</b> 8:12 9:13	<b>CETA</b> 13:10	Conclusion 28:4
adjourned 27:23	appropriate 8:21	27:14	cetera 20:20	conduct 24:21
adjudication 13:18	8:24 9:6,7 12:20	Bellevue 2:9	challenge 11:22	conducted 16:4
24:16,21	20:25 22:1 23:12	beneficial 8:16	chance 5:2 7:5,6	conducting 24:16
adjusted 17:16	approve 17:7	<b>best</b> 29:9	<b>changes</b> 25:20 29:9	<b>conference</b> 1:14 4:6
adjustment 4:21	approved 4:23	<b>beyond</b> 13:17 14:9	chat 18:4 19:13	4:17 5:2,5,16 15:6
administrative	approximately 4:9	20:16	21:23	16:24 18:13 26:1
4:12	area 9:4	bit 13:15	choice 22:16	26:21
adopt 23:18	<b>argument</b> 3:3,4,5,6	<b>board</b> 12:4,6	clarifying 26:14	confidential 16:17
adopted 9:18	3:7 7:8 12:5	board's 11:11	<b>clear</b> 12:16 26:12	20:14
<b>advance</b> 6:23 8:17	24:10	Box 2:4	<b>close</b> 4:17	<b>confirm</b> 23:10,18
26:19	asking 15:2	<b>brief</b> 7:8 10:4 19:10	co-presenting 4:13	conflicts 23:7
afternoon 4:5 5:10	asks 8:20	24:2,5	Coie 2:8 5:10,12	conjunction 15:11
5:23 6:3,7,11	assistance 8:1	<b>briefs</b> 19:2,5,7 21:7 21:8 25:22	<b>coming</b> 27:24	consideration
ago 5:24 17:14	assistant 2:11 6:3	<b>broad</b> 10:8,20	commencement	20:15 21:17 23:19
agreed 8:19	assuming 15:25	broad-ranging 9:1	18:12	24:8 25:22,24
agreement 17:5,13	attempt 10:24	broaden 14:22	comment 16:13	construction 8:9
24:12,13,14	attorney 2:3,11	brought 16:6	18:21,22 20:23,24	construed 11:10
agreements 17:10	5:20 6:4 29:12	<b>build</b> 11:10,12	23:1	Consumers 2:20
<b>ahead</b> 17:23 20:5	August 18:18,24	<b>burden</b> 9:15	comments 14:19	6:8
25:10	19:1,2 23:8	business 2:22 19:19	15:19	containing 27:20
Alliance 2:20 6:8	availability 23:11 available 6:16	19:19,20	Commission 1:2,7	contemplated 11:24
allow 17:9,21	14:25	<b>button</b> 16:1	4:8,13,23,24 5:21	context 12:2,6
<b>allowed</b> 9:4,6,19	14.43	<b>Byron</b> 2:7 5:12	5:24 9:17 11:9,10	Context 12.2,0
	<u> </u>			

<b>copy</b> 25:2	18:16,17,21,22,23	Division 2:4	<b>enter</b> 5:5 6:19	<b>filing</b> 4:18 12:12
corrections 27:1	19:5,8,10,11	<b>docket</b> 1:6 4:6	entirely 9:5	14:23 16:17 18:16
costs 4:21 8:8,16	20:19 21:9,10	11:23 21:16 25:2	entity 7:19	20:14,19 24:17,25
11:15,22,25 12:7	23:6,9,18 25:15	25:4 27:2	equity 9:17	26:2,16,18 27:11
12:12	25:20	Dockets 11:8	errata 19:1 21:5	filling 5:16
counsel 2:10 5:25	dates 17:17 19:13	documents 26:15	et 20:20	<b>final</b> 10:13,23 11:7
6:2,5 11:1,2 12:11	21:16 22:2,13,14	26:24	evaluate 24:17,25	11:16 19:8 21:9
13:21 14:5 15:8	23:3,23 24:1	dog 20:21	evidence 8:7,11,15	<b>finally</b> 9:12 14:15
16:13 17:14,17	day 29:16	doing 21:24	9:16 12:4	financially 29:13
18:14,20 20:2,6	days 19:19,19,20	<b>Donna</b> 2:7 5:10	evidentiary 5:7	fine 20:5
20:20 22:24 24:13	26:7,8	dotting 27:12	exact 13:6	<b>first</b> 7:7,16 15:2
25:6 29:13	deadline 21:2	double-checking	exactly 10:14	17:10 23:9
Counsel's 22:11,17	<b>deal</b> 14:10	6:23	Excellent 6:25	five 19:20 26:8
22:22 25:17	dealing 9:2	<b>Doyle</b> 1:15 4:11 5:9	exhibit 26:19	<b>flow</b> 21:10
COUNTY 29:4	<b>Debra</b> 1:24 29:21	5:23 6:11 10:5	exhibits 18:25 21:4	focused 12:2
couple 19:13	<b>December</b> 21:7,8	draw 13:8	26:18,19	follow 23:12
course 24:12	decision 10:15	due 7:17 12:8 24:23	<b>expand</b> 10:24	following 9:18
court 2:22 4:4 5:18	11:10,11,12 12:2	duty 24:17	expanding 14:8	for-profit 8:17
5:21 6:2,6,9,17	12:4,6		expert 16:15 20:12	foregoing 29:6
10:1 11:1 14:1,15	decision's 11:25	E	explanation 17:3	forma 12:12
14:19 15:14,18,24	12:7	<b>E</b> 2:1,1 3:1,1,1 29:1	explicitly 17:6	<b>format</b> 29:12
16:3,11,22 17:22	decisions 8:13,14	29:1	expressly 10:21	<b>forward</b> 22:3,6
18:3,6 19:12,16	12:15	earlier 22:7 26:13	extend 13:16	<b>found</b> 8:6
19:24 20:5 21:21	<b>deferred</b> 9:2 10:15	easier 15:4 20:1	extent 9:21 13:16	four-mile 8:10
22:5,8,18,25	definition 13:9	<b>East</b> 2:18	23:22	Fourth 2:8
23:14 24:7 25:10	delay 13:14,18	<b>effective</b> 13:17 17:2		frame 20:10
25:18 26:14 27:14	delayed 9:14	17:4,21 19:11	<b>F</b>	Friday 18:16,19,25
27:18 29:6,11	Department 2:21	21:9 23:6 24:22	<b>F</b> 3:1 29:1	19:3,6
cover 6:18	design 8:13	25:15	facilitate 24:4	full 13:25
cross-answering	designed 13:8	either 12:9 15:9	facilities 7:20	Fuller 2:14 3:3 6:11
18:18 21:2 26:9	details 26:21	23:3	facility 4:21 8:18	6:12 7:7,10 12:18
cross-exam 18:25	determine 10:17	electric 13:11	11:13 12:10 13:1	15:24 16:1,20
Cross-examination	determined 10:11	<b>electronic</b> 26:2,3,16	13:3	22:21 27:7,17
21:4	10:14 12:13 18:21	26:23 29:11	<b>fair</b> 24:18	28:3
crossing 27:13	dictate 21:12	electronically 26:20	<b>fall</b> 9:10	functioning 20:11
Crystal 2:25 5:25	difficult 10:17	26:25 27:1	<b>falling</b> 22:14 23:22	<b>funding</b> 13:7,12
current 14:23	direction 29:7	eligible 8:1	23:25	further 8:4
17:23	directly 7:22	email 22:4 27:3	<b>far</b> 24:2	future 11:22,23
customers 7:25	discovery 4:16	emailing 21:24	<b>feel</b> 9:15,20 20:24	
cut-off 18:24 21:4	14:24,25 15:11,19	employed 29:13	23:5	G
	16:3 18:12,24	employee 29:12	<b>felt</b> 17:18	<b>G</b> 3:1
D	21:3 25:1 26:7	energy 1:10 2:20	<b>Fifth</b> 2:12,15	<b>Gafken</b> 2:11 3:5
<b>D</b> 3:1,1	discuss 5:3 7:4	4:8,19 5:11 6:8	<b>file</b> 27:3	6:3,3 11:2,4 15:8
data 15:2,3 19:18	disposition 27:22	9:17	<b>filed</b> 4:19 5:14 6:22	15:17 16:14 20:7
date 5:6 13:17 17:2	distinct 8:7	engage 25:1	7:1,4 10:3 14:9	21:21 22:3,6 24:8
17:4,21 18:11,14		<b>ensure</b> 24:17	18:10 26:15	24:9 26:4,5 28:2
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

	I		I	I
gas 4:20	<b>help</b> 16:16	8:2,5 11:20 12:24	lacking 13:5	master 27:2
general 2:3,11 6:4	<b>helpful</b> 16:18	13:4 14:8	<b>Lag</b> 14:3	matter 1:4 4:13
21:19 24:24	<b>hereto</b> 29:13	interested 29:14	<b>laid</b> 7:16	7:14 17:1 25:2
give 7:5 10:4	hereunto 29:15	interests 9:4,10	lands 7:19,20	matters 5:4
given 10:19 22:15	<b>highly</b> 13:10	interim 19:20	language 10:8,20	mean 12:21 18:22
<b>go</b> 11:1,5 14:24	hold 15:17 26:4	intervene 6:21,23	large 24:24	members 7:18,24
17:8,23 20:5,16	holds 8:7	7:2,4,7 10:9 27:9	law 4:12	7:25
22:9,18 25:10	<b>Honor</b> 6:7 7:10	intervention 4:15	laying 10:14	mentioned 12:19
goes 23:13	14:16 15:21 16:9	6:25 7:12,12 8:22	lead 5:19,20	12:24 25:5
going 5:2 9:9 10:10	17:12 23:2,21	8:24 9:8,14 12:18	<b>LEE</b> 2:7	merely 17:4
15:10,12 18:3	27:7,25 28:2,3	12:19 13:22,23,25	legal 2:18 6:14 29:6	minimum 20:9
20:12,18 23:14	Honorable 1:15	14:4,6,18,21	let's 4:4 5:8 6:20	22:12 25:7
24:24	hopefully 17:20	involved 21:16	14:24 18:9 19:24	minor 25:20
good 4:5 5:9,23 6:3	horses 15:17	issue 12:1,17,20,23	20:5 22:9,18	missed 15:10 19:12
6:7,11 10:13,21	housekeeping 5:4	13:14 15:2 16:14	lieu 5:13	moment 11:3 17:8
government 7:18	27:8	21:15 23:22 24:23	light 10:7	23:14,17
7:19		27:20	limit 9:7 13:23,23	Monday 4:8
grant 14:13	I	issued 4:25 15:13	14:5	<b>Moore</b> 1:24 29:21
granted 7:3 13:24	<b>I's</b> 27:13	issues 8:25 9:24	limitation 9:20	Moser 2:21 3:7 6:7
granting 14:20	identify 15:16	10:10,19,23 12:21	limited 8:21,25	6:7 14:16,16
GRC 10:11,24	impact 7:17	12:22 14:7,10	10:23 11:9 12:19	15:23 16:21 23:2
11:24 12:2,18,22	impacted 7:22	24:25	14:7	24:11 28:1
22:15 24:12	13:10		limiting 8:22	<b>motion</b> 16:8
great 5:21 6:2,6,17	impaired 9:14	J	limits 9:22,23	motions 4:15
6:19 16:3 19:14	important 17:18	Jackie 6:1	line 6:14 8:10	move 6:20 14:13
22:5	20:25	<b>Jeff</b> 5:23	link 26:16	16:10
guarantee 27:15	inappropriate	<b>JEFFREY</b> 2:3	liquefied 4:20	Murphy 2:15 6:12
guess 10:15	10:25	<b>job</b> 10:14	Lisa 2:11,17 6:3,13	6:15
guidelines 27:21	inappropriately	judge 4:12 5:9,23	list 18:25 26:19	
	9:24	6:11 10:5 29:10	27:2,15	N
H	inaudible 5:20	<b>July</b> 18:15 29:16	lists 21:5 27:9	<b>N</b> 2:1 3:1,1
<b>half</b> 19:4	<b>include</b> 16:22 25:25	<b>June</b> 1:16 4:2,9,24	litigated 10:11	name 4:11
hand 11:3 29:15	26:21	18:13,13	little 13:14 23:5	natural 4:20
happens 21:11	included 15:5	Justice 2:21	LLP 2:8	<b>nature</b> 8:8 9:1
<b>happy</b> 9:23	24:19		LNG 4:20,21,23	<b>NE</b> 2:8,22
Hawkins-Jones 6:1	<b>including</b> 15:7 29:9	K	8:9,14,18 11:22	necessary 8:17 9:20
hear 10:2 14:1,2	incorporated 26:10	<b>K</b> 2:3	12:15,20,23 13:5	need 13:16 18:6
19:24 20:1,6	<b>incurred</b> 8:8 11:15	kind 22:15	longstanding 13:4	27:5
<b>heard</b> 24:11	<b>Indians</b> 2:13,17	KING 29:4	look 22:22 23:17	needs-based 8:1
hearing 5:7 6:20,25	6:10	<b>know</b> 9:10 13:10	looked 25:13	new 4:19 7:22 13:7
7:2 10:12 15:24	indicated 20:8	18:1 20:12 21:11	looking 22:1	13:11 25:4
18:22 19:1,4	information 9:16	23:5,23 24:11	lot 14:6	Nick 6:14
20:23,25 21:5	16:17 27:10	knowledge 13:1	lots 12:22,22	non-LNG 12:21
23:9,10,16,18	<b>intend</b> 26:17	29:9		<b>note</b> 5:13 8:19,23
25:13,19 26:19	<b>intent</b> 10:12		M	9:12 21:14 24:14
28:4	<b>interest</b> 7:13,15,17	L	<b>M</b> 1:24 29:21	<b>noted</b> 7:11
	l	I	I	I

<b>notice</b> 5:14 27:3,10	order 4:25 5:5	pays 7:21	12:8	<b>PSE</b> 5:8 7:21,24 8:8
27:10,11	10:13,22,23 11:7	penalty 29:5	preserved 11:21	8:19 10:3 16:9
November 13:17	11:16,24 15:1,6	Perfect 22:8	Presiding 1:15	17:13,16,16 23:8
17:2,3,21 19:11	15:13 16:7,10,12	perjury 29:6	<b>prior</b> 8:6,25 9:3,5	24:4
20:16 21:6 23:6	16:16,18,23,24	<b>Perkins</b> 2:8 5:10,12	9:11,12	<b>PSE's</b> 7:21 11:7
23:18 24:21,22	19:8 21:9 26:1,22	permitting 8:9	<b>pro</b> 12:12	17:3 23:24
25:14,19	27:20,23	perspective 14:12	probably 14:13	<b>public</b> 2:10 6:2,4
	ordered 4:25 10:23	<b>petition</b> 6:22 7:1,2	<b>problem</b> 15:18 16:1	7:14 8:5,16 11:2
0	Oregon 2:23	7:4,6,9,11,16 10:9	procedural 4:17	11:20 12:11 13:21
<b>O</b> 3:1,1	outcome 29:14	10:20,21 14:13,17	5:3,6 16:4,25	14:5 15:8 16:12
<b>o0o-</b> 4:1	outside 14:23 16:15	14:21 27:9	25:25 27:21	17:14,17 18:14,20
object 7:1	20:12	petitions 6:21	proceeding 8:5,6	18:21,22 20:2,6
objected 20:24	overall 9:22	pieces 9:2	8:25 9:1,3,5,9,11	20:19,22,24 22:11
objection 14:4	overbroaden 9:24	<b>place</b> 18:4,4,23	9:13 10:22 12:25	22:17,22,24 24:12
15:20,23 16:12,14	overlap 24:24	24:9	13:16 14:9	25:6,16
16:19,20,21	owns 7:19	<b>placed</b> 4:22 21:6	proceedings 8:23	<b>PUC</b> 2:21
objections 15:6,8		<b>placing</b> 12:12 25:3	9:15 13:8 14:22	<b>Puget</b> 1:10 4:8,19
15:19 16:2	P	plant 8:9	15:1 29:6	5:11
objects 8:22	<b>P</b> 2:1,1 3:1	<b>please</b> 7:10 27:3	process 12:8 21:11	<b>put</b> 19:13,21 20:7
<b>October</b> 19:8 21:3	<b>P.L.L.C</b> 2:15	<b>point</b> 11:15,20	24:23	20:22 21:7,23
21:4,5	<b>p.m</b> 4:10	14:20 25:20	prohibited 10:25	25:11,23,23
office 2:3,18 6:14	<b>P.O</b> 2:4	pointed 11:21	<b>project</b> 8:14 12:15	<b>Puyallup</b> 2:13,17
<b>Ogden</b> 2:15 6:12,15	PacifiCorp 21:16	<b>policy</b> 25:21	projects 24:19	6:9,13,22 7:5 10:8
<b>Oh</b> 25:10 26:3	21:19 22:14	portions 20:14	<b>pronouns</b> 4:11 6:5	13:22 14:20 22:19
Okay 4:4 5:18,21	page 26:17	Portland 2:18	<b>proposal</b> 17:5,13	Puyallup's 6:14
6:2,19,25 7:2 10:1	Pamela 5:14	position 10:2,4	17:23 23:8	
11:1 14:2,19 16:3	paragraph 11:16	positions 23:16	propose 22:21	Q
16:11,22 17:22	11:18	possess 13:5	<b>proposed</b> 4:25 17:1	question 27:8
18:8 19:12,16,24	participant 13:7,7	post-2016 11:25	17:3,9,16 18:15	quick 27:7
20:5,7 21:21 22:8	participate 8:20	12:7	22:10,19,24,25	quickly 7:11 23:11
22:18,25 23:16	participation 7:14	post-hearing 19:2,7	23:3 25:6,17	R
24:7 27:20	8:4 13:12	21:7	proposing 17:19	<b>R</b> 2:1 3:1 29:1
old 10:18	particularly 8:11	post-September	25:6	raising 10:10 16:15
Oliver 2:25 6:1	parties 5:3 6:18	12:14	proprietary 29:11	rate 4:20,23 8:6
Olympia 2:5	11:14 12:7 13:6	pre-hearing 4:6 5:2	protective 15:12	10:13 11:7 12:25
once 18:9	14:21,25 15:1,5	5:16 15:6 16:23	16:7,10,12,17,23	21:19 23:6 24:25
online 26:16	16:11 17:11 21:15	18:13 25:25 26:21	27:22	25:14
open 18:23 24:5	21:24 22:7 26:15	preclude 24:15	provide 26:23	rates 24:18,19,21
opening 10:18	26:17,25,25 27:19	preface 20:9	provision 5:1	RCW 13:13,13
operates 7:19	29:13	preferable 17:24	prudence 8:13	read 10:3 17:25
operations 8:17	<b>parties'</b> 10:2 18:15 18:20	PREHEARING	11:25 12:14	18:2,3,6
12:1,7		1:14	<b>prudency</b> 11:14,22	reading 19:22
oppose 14:17 opposite 20:3	<b>party</b> 7:1,6 13:19 15:4 17:9 23:16	preliminary 17:1	12:3,3	ready 22:19
opposition 12:9	pasting 25:3	prepare 25:1	prudent 11:13	really 9:3 20:9,10
oral 3:8 6:24	pasting 25.5 payer 12:25	<b>present</b> 2:24 9:16	12:13 13:3 24:20	realtime 23:11
UI aI 3.0 U.24	payti 12.23			

	I	I	I	ı
reason 14:5	26:18	23:1,3,4,12,17,24	six 19:9	substantial 7:13,17
reasonable 24:18	respect 9:8 11:7,16	24:4,10 25:5,17	slightly 10:20	12:24
reasonableness	respond 7:6 11:5	25:24,25 26:10	somebody 16:8	sufficient 24:19
11:14	responded 17:14	27:21	<b>Sommer</b> 2:21 6:7	<b>Suite</b> 2:8,12,15
rebuttal 18:17	Respondent 1:11	schedules 22:16	14:16	summarized 11:18
19:21 21:2	2:6	24:4	<b>sorry</b> 14:2 16:1	summary 10:4
received 23:15	<b>response</b> 8:19 10:3	scope 8:21,23 9:22	17:14 19:7 21:25	<b>support</b> 7:9 12:9
29:11	10:7 18:20 19:21	10:25 12:17 14:22	23:14	13:21 15:9 26:11
record 4:5 22:1	20:19,20 26:6,7	screen 18:1	<b>sort</b> 11:6	supporting 23:5
24:10 25:4,9,11	responses 15:3	<b>Seattle</b> 2:12,16	<b>sound</b> 1:10 4:8,19	25:16
recording 29:11	rest 23:19 25:24	Section 2:22	5:11 20:23	supports 22:17
recordings 29:7	resulting 24:18	see 9:5,7 13:22 18:9	<b>speak</b> 9:16	<b>sure</b> 6:17 11:4 18:5
recover 4:21	review 12:14	20:10	specialized 13:1	22:1,3 23:15 25:8
reduce 19:18	reviewed 17:2	seeing 23:7	specific 13:1	26:5,11,12 27:12
reducing 26:6	reviewing 29:10	seek 6:24	specifically 16:12	suspending 4:25
redundant 21:25	<b>right</b> 10:1 11:21	seen 20:13	17:7	24:15
<b>refer</b> 11:15	12:8 22:14 23:22	sees 14:5	specify 19:22	suspension 18:12
reference 13:12	23:25 24:5 25:10	sent 17:13 22:6	spectrum 20:3	system 13:8
24:11	road 14:11	separate 27:11	<b>squarely</b> 9:3 13:9	
refute 11:14	Roberson 2:3 3:6	September 8:15	ss 29:3	
regard 16:18	5:23,24 14:2	11:9,12 12:3 19:3	staff 2:21 5:22,24	T 29:1,1
regarding 4:18	15:22 16:19 20:1	19:5 20:22	5:25 11:18 14:1,4	<b>T's</b> 27:13
8:13 17:11	22:11 25:11	serve 26:24,25	14:5 15:22 16:19	table 5:25 24:3
regards 17:4	room 23:24	27:10	18:14,20 19:24	<b>Tacoma</b> 2:19 4:21
reiterate 25:19	<b>rule</b> 13:2	serves 27:14	20:19 22:10,11,12	8:14
relative 29:12	rules 14:25 16:5	<b>service</b> 26:3,24	22:13,16 25:16	take 21:17 23:19
relevant 8:11	26:23	27:2	<b>Staff's</b> 14:12	24:7 25:21,21,24
relitigated 10:18	<b>ruling</b> 3:8 11:9	<b>services</b> 7:21,22	stake 14:7	taken 22:22 24:3
<b>remind</b> 26:15	rulings 12:5	set 18:1 29:15	<b>standard</b> 16:10,23	talk 13:14
repeat 10:6	running 22:15	<b>SETH</b> 2:14	27:22	talking 11:19
reply 19:5,10 21:8	<u> </u>	setting 5:5,6	<b>Starkey</b> 2:7 5:12	tariff 4:20 5:1 7:17 7:23 18:10 24:15
22:9 24:2,5 25:22		settlement 4:24	start 5:8 17:23 18:8	
26:8	S 2:1 3:1	11:11,13,19,21	20:18 25:12	ten 19:19
represented 9:11	Salem 2:23	17:5 25:14,15	state 10:21 17:9	tenets 9:17
14:8	Samantha 1:15 4:11	seven 18:16 19:19	29:2	term 17:5,7 25:15
representing 5:11		26:7	stated 17:6	terms 20:4 23:6
request 13:22,24	samantha.doyle 27:4	share 17:25	status 13:25	25:13
15:2 16:7 19:18	sandwiched 21:18	shared 15:3 17:19	statute 13:12	testimony 18:10,15
21:9 26:7	sandwiched 21:18 saw 11:2	she/her 4:11 6:5	stay 9:23	18:18,18,21 19:21
requested 15:15		short 5:8	stipulation 23:4	20:19,20 21:3 26:8,8,9
17:18 19:8,10	saying 20:9 schedule 4:17,20	shortly 27:20	Street 2:8,22	thank 5:9,21 6:6,9
requests 15:3	5:3,6 7:23 13:15	signatories 23:4	<b>Sub-Section</b> 13:13	6:17 9:24 10:1,5
requirement 15:5,7	16:25 17:9,11,16	signatory 24:13	submit 26:17	11:1 13:25 14:1
15:19	20:8,15 22:10,12	simple 12:11	subsequent 15:3	14:15,16,19 15:17
requirements 4:18	22:20,21,23,24	<b>simply</b> 24:20	subset 9:10	16:2 17:24 18:6
	22.20,21,23,24			10.2 17.24 10.0

				. 1 age 00
21:21 22:5,18	16:20 22:19	— w	Y	3
23:2 24:7,9 25:8	<b>Tribe's</b> 7:6,12 8:4	waiver 25:22	<b>Yeah</b> 18:3	<b>3009</b> 2:18
25:10,18 26:11,14	8:24 9:4,8,13	waiving 24:5		<b>31</b> 21:5
27:17,18,23,25	12:18,19 13:22	Wallace 2:15 6:12	$\overline{\mathbf{Z}}$	<b>3500</b> 2:15
28:1,2,3	14:4,6,17,20 27:8	6:15		<b>360</b> 11:18
they/them 4:12	<b>trouble</b> 22:13	want 10:6 12:15	0	<b>393</b> 11:16
thing 24:3	true 29:8	16:8 17:1 19:17		393 11.10
things 18:9 21:10	two 18:9 19:4 22:16		1	4
think 8:21 10:13,19	type 13:7	21:12,25 24:14	<b>1</b> 4:25 13:17 15:1	<b>40128</b> 2:4
11:6 13:14 14:12		25:19 26:2,14	20:16 24:21,22	4th 18:18
17:12 19:12 20:2	U	27:12	25:14	<b>4th</b> 10.10
20:3 21:10,22	<b>UE-220066</b> 11:8	wanted 11:4 15:11	<b>1:30</b> 4:9	5
23:19	UG-220067 11:8	24:9 25:8 26:5,11	<b>10</b> 3:4	
<b>Thomas</b> 6:14	UG-230393 1:6 4:6	wants 7:8	<b>10885</b> 2:8	6
thought 26:3	ultimately 23:13	<b>Washington</b> 1:1,6	<b>10th</b> 29:16	<b>6</b> 21:3,6
three 18:19	unacceptable 17:15	2:5,9,12,16,19 4:7	<b>11</b> 3:5	<b>6th</b> 23:18 25:19
threshold 12:3	unclear 10:9	29:2	<b>1162</b> 2:22	
Thursday 19:9	undersigned 29:5	wasn't 11:4	<b>11th</b> 18:24	7
time 4:9 7:25,25	understand 9:9	WATSON 2:11	<b>14</b> 3:6,7,8	<b>7</b> 3:3
15:15 19:18 20:9	23:22	we'll 4:14 6:21 7:4	<b>141</b> 4:20	<b>700</b> 2:8
24:20 26:6	understanding	13:14 24:7	<b>14th</b> 18:15	
timeline 20:17	17:8	we're 9:2 17:19	<b>15th</b> 19:5	8
21:13 25:7	understood 25:12	18:23 22:1 27:12	<b>16th</b> 19:1	<b>80.28.430</b> 13:13
	25:18	we've 10:6 20:24	<b>19.405.020</b> 13:13	<b>800</b> 2:12
timing 20:4 today 4:5,8,14 5:11	undue 13:18	web 26:17	<b>1st</b> 17:2,3,21 19:11	8th 4:24 19:3 20:22
5:13 6:16 17:20	unique 8:7 13:5	Wednesday 19:2	23:6	21:7
	unique 3.7 13.3 update 27:15	week 19:6,7 21:6		9
18:13 27:6,24	updates 27:2	weeks 17:14 18:16	2	
today's 5:4	use 6:5	18:19 19:4,9	<b>2000</b> 2:12	901 2:15
top 22:14	usually 19:18	weigh 12:4	<b>2016</b> 8:15 11:9,12	<b>97301</b> 2:23
tracker 4:22 12:13	UTC 13:8	Western 2:20 6:8	12:4,6,14	98004 2:9
transcribed 1:24	<b>Utilities</b> 1:2,6 2:4	<b>WHEREOF</b> 29:15	<b>2022</b> 4:23 10:11,24	<b>98104</b> 2:12
29:7	4:7	wide-ranging 12:22	<b>2023</b> 1:16 4:2,9,19	<b>98164</b> 2:16
transcript 29:8,10	utility 7:21 8:1	wiggle 23:24	4:24 18:11,19	<b>98404</b> 2:19
transcriptionist	utilize 7:20	willing 22:23	19:1,9 29:16	<b>98504</b> 2:5
29:8		<b>wish</b> 6:19	<b>20th</b> 21:4	
Transportation 1:2	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	wishes 6:24	<b>21</b> 21:8	
1:7 2:4 4:7	vague 10:20	witness 11:19 18:25	<b>21st</b> 18:11	
trial 29:10	various 12:5	21:5,18,19 23:10	<b>22</b> 11:12	
tribal 7:18,18,24	view 11:20	29:15	<b>23</b> 13:13	
<b>Tribe</b> 2:13,17 6:9	viewing 12:11	work 20:13 22:23	<b>23rd</b> 19:2 23:9	
6:13,22 7:5,8,16	virtually 5:25	23:4	<b>25th</b> 4:19	
7:19,21 8:2,7,20	vis-a-vis 12:5	written 10:7 27:3	<b>26</b> 1:16 4:2 19:9	
8:22 9:6 10:8,10	voice 13:5		<b>26th</b> 4:9 18:14	
12:23 13:4,6,20	vs 1:9 4:8	X X	<b>28th</b> 18:13	
13:24 14:7 16:2	2.,	<b>X</b> 3:1		