Docket No. UW-170924 - Vol. II

Hand v. Rainier View Water Company, Inc.

June 25, 2018



206.287.9066 I 800.846.6989

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

email: <u>info@buellrealtime.com</u>



	Page 24		Page 26
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION Sarah Hand,) Complainant,) vs.) Docket No. UW-170924) Rainier View Water Company, Inc.,) Respondent.) HEARING, VOLUME II Pages 24 - 46 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KOPTA 9:31 A.M. JUNE 25, 2018 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest Olympia, Washington 98504-7250 REPORTED BY: SHERRILYN SMITH, CCR# 2097 Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue Suite 1840 Seattle, Washington 98101 206.287.9066 Seattle 360.534.9066 Olympia 800.846.6989 National www.buellrealtime.com	rage 21	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued) FOR RAINIER VIEW WATER COMPANY, INC.: DANIEL W. RANKIN Preg O'Donnell & Gillett 901 Fifth Avenue Suite 3400 Seattle, WA 98164 206.287.1775 drankin@pregodonnell.com ALSO PRESENT: SARAH HAND (via bridge line)
A P P E A R A N C E S ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: GREGORY J. KOPTA Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW P.O. Box 47250 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.664.1136 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorney General 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive SW PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.664.1188 jroberso@utc.wa.gov FOR COMPLAINANT: NIGEL S. MALDEN Nigel Malden Law, PLLC 711 Court A Suite 200 Tacoma, Washington 98402 253.627.0393 nm@niglemaldenlaw.com	Page 25	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 27 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; JUNE 25, 2018 9:31 A.M000- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be on the record in Docket UW-170924 captioned Sarah Hand versus Rainier View Water Company, Inc. I am Gregory J. Kopta, the administrative law judge who is assigned to preside over this proceeding. We are here today on cross-motions to compel responses to the discovery requests. Let's begin by taking appearances, beginning with counsel for Ms. Hand. MR. MALDEN: Nigel Malden appearing for Sarah Hand, Complainant. JUDGE KOPTA: And for the Company? MR. RANKIN: Daniel Rankin appearing for Rainier View Water Company. JUDGE KOPTA: And for Staff? MR. ROBERSON: Jeff Roberson, AAG, for Staff. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MS. HAND: Sarah Hand is on the phone.

1 (Pages 24 to 27)

Page 28

JUDGE KOPTA: I'm sorry, who was that? MS. HAND: Sarah Hand is on the phone. JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, okay. Thank you, Ms. Hand.

2.5

We are here, as I said, to discuss the motions to compel. I have read the motions and the responses, and am prepared to discuss them. My anticipation is that I will rule from the bench on the requests, I will not issue a written order. To the extent that you need something in writing, then it will come via the transcript.

All right. Let's begin with the Company's motion to compel, since that was the first one that came in. Mr. Rankin, did you have anything further to add to what you have filed in response to Ms. Hand's response?

MR. RANKIN: I believe the only thing that I would add in reply to Ms. Hand's response is that to the extent Ms. Hand is claiming the attorney-client privilege or work product protection, I believe they should produce a privilege log so that the Company can inquire and test the sufficiency of those claims. To date they have not done that. I believe we just -- the first -- the first instance of a claim of privilege or protection was in Ms. Hand's

Page 30

I am essentially trying to make sure there is nothing new coming up. So as these claims are proceeding through this process as well, there is no information available about appraisals, ongoing concerns about water quality, any other types of damages she is claiming. For all I know, the remedies that she seeks could be moot if there are no longer any problems, but we don't know that without discovery.

JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.

And that reminds me to clarify that damages is not something the Commission can award. Anything that goes to calculating damages is not something that I am going to require the Company to provide because it is not anything the Commission can do anything about, that's up to the court. But as I understand it, the issue is the quality of the water that is being provided to Ms. Hand, both historically and presently.

So I take your point, that anything that she has with respect to the current state of water quality or the quality since she has filed her complaint or her testimony is fair game for you to inquire into.

So with that, I will go through these requests one by one and we will allow each of you to say anything more than what is already in the record.

Page 29

reply, which came in late last week.

I believe that to the extent Ms. Hand is not compelled to answer those requests for production, a privilege log should be ordered.

JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.

And let's make sure that we speak into the microphone since we have somebody on the bridge line --

MR. RANKIN: Sorry.

JUDGE KOPTA: -- and it's hard to hear.

And that the red light is on the microphone. Sometimes you just have to basically swallow it to make sure you can be heard.

All right. One question that I have as I look at Mr. Malden's response is that he refers several times to documents that have been produced in the Pierce County Superior Court case. Are those not responsive to your request?

MR. RANKIN: Essentially, these requests ask for everything from the period when the superior court proceeding ended through the present, and so inherently, no, those are not responsive to these requests. Through the superior court matter, Ms. Hand had a continuing obligation to supplement discovery. That ended when her case was dismissed.

Page 31

With respect to Document Request No. 1, which I am paraphrasing and don't mean to make any substantive changes, essentially anything written or graphically that relates to -- it refers to the incident alleged in the complaint. Is it just anything having to do with her complaint?

MR. RANKIN: Yeah, I guess I would consider her complaint to be an ongoing incident.

JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.

Mr. Malden, is there anything more than what you have provided to the Pierce County Superior Court action, in terms of support from Ms. Hand's complaint, that has happened since that court action ended?

MR. MALDEN: Well, that request is so broad and general I don't know how to respond to it. You know, if I may make my central point, which is that I am representing a consumer who made a complaint that Rainier View is selling water with excess levels of manganese in it. The Company does not deny it.

I can't understand why I would be required to spend hours and hours and hours and hours looking for documents like what he is asking for. We haven't yet got to it, but he is asking for statements, anything my client has ever said to anyone about the water. How is that possibly relevant? The time and expense

Page 32

and hassle to my client is enormous and they are doing it purposefully. There is no legitimate reason for any of this, for the hearing, given the scope of the issues.

I was told at the very beginning that there is no way you can award any damages, compensatory damages, you can't order any relief. We can't make a factual determination of a number of issues. So the legal issue in this hearing is very narrow, the scope of review as I understand it is very narrow, and his requests go way, way beyond anything.

I have spent plenty of time, I have answered interrogatories, we went to a deposition, spent hours there, all over a consumer complaint. It's excessive. I don't think we should be required to spend one more minute fooling around with their discovery.

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you Mr. Malden.

I have looked at the prefiled testimony and exhibits that you have filed on Ms. Hand's behalf and there is quite an extensive amount of documentation of what has occurred in her home, allegedly, as a result of the water that she has received, and I think that to the extent that there is anything further that she could have, by way of pictures or something else, that

something that she should have to require -- that she should be required to do, so I am going to deny that one

Page 34

No. 4. It seems like that has been answered, that she is not aware of any others outside of hers, so I think that is moot.

No. 5. As I indicated before, Mr. Malden, I don't know whether you have anything further, but if she has done any water tests on the quality of the water in her home, then I think that is something that the Company is entitled to have access to.

MR. MALDEN: And that's even if I have retained a consultant and had it tested as an undisclosed consultant? I have to give that to him if I have retained someone?

JUDGE KOPTA: The Commission's concern is the water quality that Ms. Hand is receiving right now. If there is information that goes to that, then that is something that we want to see.

MR. MALDEN: Okay. There is -- there is a concept called attorney work product privilege in the state of Washington. When I am an attorney and I go hire someone to do something for me, unless that person is disclosed as an expert witness or I waive the privilege, it's protected. I can't understand for

Page 33

substantiates what is currently happening or what has been happening, I think that the Company is entitled to see that.

If you have anything further, then I would require that you provide that to the Company, basically in the form of what you have provided in exhibits to Ms. Hand's testimony. If you have anything to update with respect to that type of information, then I think the Company is entitled to it.

All right. Request No. 2, written or recorded statements from any witnesses. In this case, Mr. Malden, I agree with you. I don't see any benefit to requiring that to be provided, so I will deny that request.

MR. RANKIN: If I may, Judge Kopta. In our motion we mentioned that we already previously agreed to withdraw Nos. 2, 7, and 11.

JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. And remind me if I get to those and start talking about them.

No. 3, I am not sure that I see how this is going to be beneficial. Inspection -- there is a difference on testing the water quality, but inspections of the home are -- if we are not dealing with damages, I don't really see that that is

Page 35

the life of me, why would Rainier View have the right, unlike any other litigant in the state of Washington, to obtain work product privileged information?

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, I am familiar with the work product privilege doctrine. I hope that you are familiar that this is quasi-judicial litigation and it's not your normal superior court litigation.

Here the Commission tries to build the best record it can to make -- have the information that it needs to make a determination as to what is fair, just, reasonable and sufficient when it comes to the quality of, in this case, water service that is provided to your client. So what we want to do is to help you help us to make that determination.

What I want is to be able to know all the information that is available in terms of what the quality of the water is. If you have information that is relevant to that inquiry, then I believe that the Company is entitled to see it and I would like to see it.

MR. MALDEN: All right.

And do I get reimbursed the cost then? If I paid for a test by a third party and they want it, should they not be required to pay for it?

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, this is discovery.

Page 36 Page 38 1 1 This is something that you have paid for, if you have that you have asked for. 2 2 paid for it, and I don't know. We are not here to Do you disagree with that, Mr. Malden? 3 3 decide who gets to pay for what. Right now, if you MR. MALDEN: Well, yes, I disagree with have this in your possession, then this is something 4 it on a number of levels, including, they have 4 5 5 that the Company should be able to have. indicated they don't have any complaints beyond a 6 MR. MALDEN: So you are making that 6 certain date, and they come up with their own 7 7 ruling. You are saying that that -- you are definition of complaint. No, I don't -- I don't trust 8 eliminating the work product privilege. In a sense, 8 that they have honestly or accurately answered those 9 you are saying that Rainier View's right to get a test 9 questions or produced the complaints they have. 10 10 report outweighs the attorney work product privilege. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, I don't know how I 11 JUDGE KOPTA: I am saying that the 11 can assess that. I have to take the Company's 12 Commission's need for that information outweighs the 12 representation for what it is. They said they have 13 13 work product privilege, and through Rainier View, I am provided the information, they have explained the 14 assuming, if it has any relevance, that it will come 14 information that they have provided. Unless you can 15 15 before us, it just won't happen indirectly. I could demonstrate that -- give me some indication that you 16 issue a bench request for that if you would prefer. 16 have reason to believe otherwise, that you have 17 One way or the other I want to see it, if you have 17 documents that they have said -- that they didn't 18 18 provide to you, or somehow have some other way of something. 19 Does that make sense? 19 knowing that they are not telling the truth, then I 20 20 MR. MALDEN: Yes. I think it is have no reasonable alternative but to accept their 21 21 completely contrary to the law, but yes, I understand representation. 22 MR. MALDEN: Yes, I do understand that 22 your ruling. 23 23 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. we all have to just believe what they say and trust 24 No. 6 also appears to be moot, since Ms. Hand 24 whatever they say. I think that what they have 2.5 said that she knows of no such responses. 25 testified to in front of the Commission is false. I Page 37 Page 39 1 No. 7 you have withdrawn. 1 think I have already established that. I understand 2 2 No. 8. Again, this goes to damages or that there may be nothing further you are able to do. 3 3 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. I think that's appraisals or assessments. I am not going to require 4 4 where we are, so I will deny that motion based on the those to be provided. 5 5 No. 9. Again, I think this goes to damages, Company's representations. 6 which is not something that we are here to address, so 6 While we are here there are a couple of things 7 I will deny that one. 7 that I wanted to address. One of them is that under 8 8 No. 10. Ms. Hand has not put forward any our procedural schedule Ms. Hand was due to file any 9 reply testimony on June 3rd and we did not receive 9 experts as witnesses and therefore I will not require 10 10 any. Did you not prepare any testimony for her in her response to No. 10. No. 11, I believe you said you withdrew. 11 11 response to the Company's testimony? 12 MR. RANKIN: Correct. 12 MR. MALDEN: I actually wasn't sure 13 13 JUDGE KOPTA: And No. 12. Again, that whether I was going to need to do that. I was looking goes to damages, and no, I am not going to require 14 14 at a couple things, including the potential testimony 15 15 of the UTC representative. 16 16 So are we clear, Mr. Malden, on what you are If I may take the opportunity to ask for seven 17 17 required to provide, or the Company, as a result of days, since I don't believe we are going to go forward 18 our discussion this morning? 18 with the deposition of the UTC. If I may request 19 MR. MALDEN: Yes. 19 seven days from today to submit supplemental or reply 20 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will 20 testimony by Ms. Hand, I would like to request that. 21 turn to your motion, which is essentially to require 21 JUDGE KOPTA: And why would you need to 22 the Company to provide information about complaints 22 do that when it was almost month ago -- well, three 23 that it has received. I have reviewed the response, 23 weeks ago that you were supposed to have filed it 24 24 which seems to explain what the Company's terminology under the schedule? 25 25 means, and that they have provided the information MR. MALDEN: I am doing the best that

Page 40

I -- I am doing the best that I can to pursue this case with the resources that we have. That's the best I could do. I have been looking at a number of different issues involving discovery with both parties, trying to figure out can I get by without doing discovery, can I get by trying to be as efficient as possible. That's just how it worked out.

2.2

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, the issue that I have is that if you were to file additional testimony, which would amount to essentially one month after the procedural schedule required you to file it, then I am assuming that the Company, and potentially Commission Staff would want to file responsive testimony, which would necessitate extending the schedule in this case. Is that acceptable to you?

MR. MALDEN: Extending the schedule how? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, the hearing date would have to move, number one, because if you file testimony next week, then we would need to give the Company two or three weeks to respond, and that's when the hearing date is.

MR. MALDEN: Well, the problem that I -- well, the question that I have in regard to this is, I am unclear on what scope of testimony people are going to be permitted to testify to. If the idea is that my

supplemental declaration on Ms. Hand's behalf, so long as in fact the rule to be enforced is that she will not be permitted to testify to anything unless it is on that written testimony, which is what I understand the rule to be.

Page 42

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, first, your understanding is correct. All direct examination comes through prefiled testimony. The only additional testimony that we allow is in response to cross-examination. That is our process.

With respect to your request, I agree with you, that the Commission shares your desire to have a complete record. If we need to extend the schedule, then I would be inclined to do that so that we can have a complete record. We want to give her a full opportunity to present the information that she has to us so that we can make a fully informed decision.

But with that, I need to ask the other parties what your position is on Mr. Malden's request.

Mr. Rankin?

MR. RANKIN: I don't inherently have a problem with allowing Ms. Hand more time to file rebuttal testimony, but I absolutely agree with you, that we would want a two- or three-week extension beyond that to file whatever reply we would see fit.

Page 41

client cannot say anything unless it is in writing, unless it is in cross-examination to something Mr. Rankin asks, then yes, I am in a position where I do want to supplement the record because I don't see how a consumer can have their case properly presented in that manner.

If the -- so I guess I need to clarify the rule, which is, the way I currently understand it, that you will not accept direct exam from any witness for any purpose, the written testimony is it.

Mr. Rankin will be permitted to cross-examine Ms. Hand and that is it, there will be no other questions taken. And if that is the standard, then yes, I would ask to supplement the record in a reply.

I actually can't image that Rainier View would need a large amount of time to respond. The issues here again are very narrow, they are very limited, and I don't think it should be necessary to continue the hearing. If that's something that Rainier View thought was necessary, to continue it for a few weeks, I guess that wouldn't really make any difference to me.

My interest is in having the record such as it is, complete. I think in light of things that have developed, I need to ask to supplement or file a

Page 43

JUDGE KOPTA: Staff, do you have anything?

MR. ROBERSON: Staff has no obje

MR. ROBERSON: Staff has no objection.
I don't -- I am fairly sure we won't be filing
response -- surrebuttal testimony. I think Mr. Malden
is correct, the issues are fairly narrow. I think at
most Rainier View would need two weeks. I am not even
sure we have to push out the schedule, I guess is what
I am saying.

JUDGE KOPTA: All right.

MR. RANKIN: We do need more time, at least to keep an option open, to see what Ms. Hand presents. I don't want to commitment to a short time frame not knowing what that will be. For all I know, there may be something that we want to ask, additional interrogatories or document requests. We need time to allow for that as well.

JUDGE KOPTA: Well, I think that's reasonable. So this is what I will do: I will grant your request, Mr. Malden, for a one-week time period in which to determine whether you are going to file additional testimony on behalf of Ms. Hand. That testimony would be due a week from today, Monday, July 2nd.

After that testimony comes in, then I would

	Page 44		Page 46
1	ask the Company to let me know, file a or by letter	1	CERTIFICATE
2	inform the Commission how much time you would need. I	2	
3	would prefer, actually, that you consult with the	3	STATE OF WASHINGTON
4	other parties and come up with an agreed time by which	4	COUNTY OF KING
5	you would provide additional response. If necessary,	5	
6	we can move the hearing, but we will keep it where it	6	I, Sherrilyn Smith, a Certified
7	is for right now.	7	Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington,
8	MR. RANKIN: Understood.	8	do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is
9	JUDGE KOPTA: All right.	9	true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill
10	And the only other thing is the additional	10	and ability.
11	in the prehearing conference order, or actually the	11	
12	scheduling order, we did not include a date for filing	12	
13	cross-examination exhibits, which is another thing,	13	
14	Mr. Malden, I am sure that is unusual for you, and	14	
15	probably for you, too, Mr. Rankin. That is one of the	15	
16	Commission's requirements, is to file	16	Sherrilyn Smith, CCR# 2097
17	cross-examination exhibits in advance of the hearing,	17	SHERRILYN SMITH, CCR# 2097
18	usually three or four days.	18	
19	I will wait to issue a notice of the deadline	19	
20	of that filing until we find out whether we are going	20	
21	to have the hearing on the 25th of July or we need to	21	
22	push it out.	22	
23	I am just giving you some advanced warning,	23	
24	since I am sure neither of you are terribly familiar	24	
25	with Commission process, not doing too much before	25	
	Page 45		
1	this Commission, just so that you know what's coming.		
2	MR. RANKIN: I appreciate that.		
3	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Is there		
4	anything further that we need to discuss?		
5	MR. ROBERSON: No.		
6	MR. MALDEN: No.		
7	MR. RANKIN: No.		
8	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we are		
9	adjourned. We are off the record. Thank you.		
10	(Adjourned at 9:59 a.m.)		
11	, ,		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

				İ
A	appreciate 45:2	46:1,1	28:13	currently 33:1 41:8
a.m 24:14 27:2	asked 38:1	calculating 30:13	compelled 29:3	
45:10	asking 31:22,23	called 34:21	compensatory 32:6	D D
AAG 27:22	asks 41:3	captioned 27:8	Complainant 24:5	D 27:5
ability 46:10	assess 38:11	case 29:17,25 33:12	25:14 27:17	damages 30:6,11
able 35:15 36:5	assessments 37:3	35:12 40:2,14	complaint 30:21	30:13 32:6,7
39:2	assigned 27:10	41:5	31:5,6,8,12,17	33:25 37:2,5,14
absolutely 42:23	Assistant 25:9	CCR 24:20 46:17	32:14 38:7	Daniel 26:3 27:19
accept 38:20 41:9	assuming 36:14	central 31:16	complaints 37:22	date 28:23 38:6
acceptable 40:15	40:12	certain 38:6	38:5,9	40:17,21 44:12
access 34:11	attorney 25:9 34:21	Certified 46:6	complete 41:24	days 39:17,19
accurate 46:9	34:22 36:10	certify 46:8	42:13,15	44:18
accurately 38:8	attorney-client	changes 31:3	completely 36:21	deadline 44:19
action 31:12,13	28:20	claim 28:25	concept 34:21	dealing 33:24
add 28:15,18	available 30:4	claiming 28:19	concern 34:16	decide 36:3
additional 40:9	35:16	30:6	concerns 30:5	decision 42:17
42:8 43:15,22	Avenue 24:21 26:4	claims 28:23 30:2	conference 44:11	declaration 42:1
44:5,10	award 30:12 32:6	clarify 30:11 41:7	consider 31:8	definition 38:7
address 37:6 39:7	aware 34:5	clear 37:16	consult 44:3	demonstrate 38:15
adjourned 45:9,10		client 31:24 32:1	consultant 34:13	deny 31:19 33:14
administrative	B	35:13 41:1	34:14	34:2 37:7 39:4
24:12 25:2 27:10	based 39:4	come 28:10 36:14	consumer 31:17	deposition 32:13
advance 44:17	basically 29:12	38:6 44:4	32:14 41:5	39:18
advanced 44:23	33:6	comes 35:11 42:8	continue 41:18,20	desire 42:12
ago 39:22,23	beginning 27:14	43:25	Continued 26:1	determination 32:8
agree 33:13 42:11	32:5	coming 30:2 45:1	continuing 29:24	35:10,14
42:23	behalf 32:20 42:1	Commission 24:2	contrary 36:21	determine 43:21
agreed 33:18 44:4	43:22	24:16 25:4,8	correct 37:12 42:7	developed 41:25
alleged 31:5	believe 28:17,21,24	30:12,15 35:8	43:6	difference 33:23
allegedly 32:22	29:2 35:18 37:11	38:25 40:12 42:12	cost 35:22	41:21
allow 30:24 42:9	38:16,23 39:17	44:2,25 45:1	counsel 27:15	different 40:4
43:17	bench 28:8 36:16	Commission's	County 29:17	direct 41:9 42:7
allowing 42:22	beneficial 33:22	34:16 36:12 44:16	31:11 46:4	disagree 38:2,3
alternative 38:20	benefit 33:13	commitment 43:13	couple 39:6,14	disclosed 34:24
amount 32:21	best 35:8 39:25	Company 24:7	court 25:16 29:17	discovery 27:12
40:10 41:16	40:1,2 46:9	26:2 27:9,18,20	29:21,23 30:16	29:24 30:9 32:16
answer 29:3	beyond 32:11 38:5	28:22 30:14 31:19	31:11,13 35:7	35:25 40:4,6
answered 32:12	42:25	33:2,5,9 34:11	cross-examination	discuss 28:5,7 45:4
34:4 38:8	Box 25:5,10	35:19 36:5 37:17	41:2 42:10 44:13	discussion 37:18
anticipation 28:7	bridge 26:8 29:7	37:22 40:12,20	44:17	dismissed 29:25
appearances 27:14	broad 31:15	44:1	cross-examine	Docket 24:6 27:8
appearing 27:16,19	Buell 24:21	Company's 28:12	41:11	doctrine 35:5
appears 36:24	build 35:8	37:24 38:11 39:5	cross-motions	document 31:1
appraisals 30:4		39:11	27:12	43:16
37:3	C 25:1 26:1 27:5	compel 27:12 28:6	current 30:20	documentation
	C 23.1 20.1 27.3			32:21
	1	1	•	<u> </u>

_				.,
documents 29:16	fact 42:2	37:2,5,14	incident 31:5,8	44:9 45:3,8
31:22 38:17	factual 32:8	going 30:14 33:22	inclined 42:14	July 43:24 44:21
doing 32:1 39:25	fair 30:22 35:10	34:2 37:3,14	include 44:12	June 24:15 27:1
40:1,6 44:25	fairly 43:4,6	39:13,17 40:24	including 38:4	39:9
drankin@pregod	false 38:25	43:21 44:20	39:14	
26:6	familiar 35:4,6	grant 43:19	indicated 34:7 38:5	<u>K</u>
Drive 24:17 25:4,10	44:24	graphically 31:4	indication 38:15	keep 43:12 44:6
due 39:8 43:23	Fifth 26:4	Gregory 25:3 27:9	indirectly 36:15	KING 46:4
	figure 40:5	guess 31:7 41:7,21	inform 44:2	know 30:6,8 31:15
E	file 39:8 40:9,11,13	43:8	information 30:4	31:16 34:8 35:15
E 25:1,1 26:1,1	40:18 41:25 42:22		33:9 34:18 35:3,9	36:2 38:10 43:14
27:5,5 46:1,1	42:25 43:21 44:1	H	35:16,17 36:12	44:1 45:1
efficient 40:7	44:16	Hand 24:4 26:8	37:22,25 38:13,14	knowing 38:19
eliminating 36:8	filed 28:15 30:21	27:8,15,17,25,25	42:16	43:14
ended 29:21,25	32:20 39:23	28:2,2,4,19 29:2	informed 42:17	knowledge 46:9
31:13	filing 43:4 44:12,20	29:23 30:18 34:17	inherently 29:22	knows 36:25
enforced 42:2	find 44:20	36:24 37:8 39:8	42:21	Kopta 24:12 25:3
enormous 32:1	first 28:13,24,24	39:20 41:11 42:22	inquire 28:22 30:22	27:7,9,18,21,24
entitled 33:2,9	42:6	43:12,22	inquiry 35:18	28:1,3 29:5,10
34:11 35:19	fit 42:25	Hand's 28:15,18,25	Inspection 33:22	30:10 31:9 32:17
essentially 29:19	fooling 32:16	31:12 32:20 33:7	inspections 33:24	33:16,19 34:16
30:1 31:3 37:21	foregoing 46:8	42:1	instance 28:24	35:4,25 36:11,23
40:10	form 33:6	happen 36:15	interest 41:23	37:13,20 38:10
established 39:1	forward 37:8 39:17	happened 31:13	interrogatories	39:3,21 40:8,17
Evergreen 24:17	four 44:18	happening 33:1,2	32:13 43:16	42:6 43:1,10,18
25:4,10	Fourth 24:21	hard 29:10	involving 40:4	44:9 45:3,8
exam 41:9	frame 43:14	hassle 32:1	issue 28:9 30:17	
examination 42:7	front 38:25	hear 29:10	32:9 36:16 40:8	L
excess 31:18	full 42:15	heard 29:13	44:19	large 41:16
excessive 32:14	fully 42:17	hearing 24:10 32:3	issues 32:4,8 40:4	late 29:1
exhibits 32:20 33:7	further 28:14 32:24	32:9 40:17,21	41:16 43:6	law 24:12 25:2,15
44:13,17	33:4 34:8 39:2	41:19 44:6,17,21		27:10 36:21
expense 31:25	45:4	help 35:14,14	J	legal 32:9
expert 34:24		hire 34:23	J 25:3 27:9	legitimate 32:2
experts 37:9	G	historically 30:18	Jeff 25:9 27:22	let's 27:7,14 28:12
explain 37:24	G 27:5	home 32:22 33:24	jroberso@utc.wa	29:6
explained 38:13	game 30:22	34:10	25:12	letter 44:1
extend 42:13	general 25:9 31:15	honestly 38:8	judge 24:12 25:2	levels 31:18 38:4
extending 40:14,16	Gillett 26:3	hope 35:5	27:7,10,18,21,24	life 35:1
extension 42:24	give 34:14 38:15	hours 31:21,21,21	28:1,3 29:5,10	light 29:11 41:24
extensive 32:21	40:19 42:15	31:21 32:13	30:10 31:9 32:17	limited 41:17
extent 28:9,19 29:2	given 32:3		33:16,19 34:16	line 26:8 29:8
32:24	giving 44:23	1	35:4,25 36:11,23	litigant 35:2
	go 30:23 32:11	idea 40:25	37:13,20 38:10	litigation 35:6,7
<u>F</u>	34:23 39:17	II 24:10	39:3,21 40:8,17	LLC 24:21
F 46:1	goes 30:13 34:18	image 41:15	42:6 43:1,10,18	log 28:21 29:4
	l		l	l

				i age 40
long 42:1	necessitate 40:14	P 25:1,1 26:1,1	36:10,13	R
longer 30:7	need 28:10 36:12	27:5	privileged 35:3	R 25:1 26:1 27:5
look 29:14	39:13,21 40:19	P.O 25:5	probably 44:15	46:1
looked 32:19	41:7,16,25 42:13	Pages 24:11	problem 40:22	Rainier 24:7 26:2
looking 31:21	42:18 43:7,11,16	paid 35:23 36:1,2	42:22	27:8,20 31:18
39:13 40:3	44:2,21 45:4	paraphrasing 31:2	problems 30:8	35:1 36:9,13
	needs 35:10	Park 24:17 25:4,10	procedural 39:8	41:15,19 43:7
M	neither 44:24	parties 40:5 42:18	40:11	Rankin 26:3 27:19
making 36:6	new 30:2	44:4	proceeding 27:11	27:19 28:14,17
Malden 25:15,15	Nigel 25:15,15	party 35:23	29:21 30:3	29:9,19 31:7
27:16,16 31:10,14	27:16	pay 35:24 36:3	process 30:3 42:10	33:16 37:12 41:3
32:18 33:13 34:7	nm@niglemalde	people 40:24	44:25	41:11 42:20,21
34:12,20 35:21	25:18	period 29:20 43:20	produce 28:21	43:11 44:8,15
36:6,20 37:16,19	normal 35:7	permitted 40:25	produced 29:16	45:2,7
38:2,3,22 39:12	Nos 33:18	41:11 42:3	38:9	read 28:6
39:25 40:16,22	notice 44:19	person 34:24	product 28:20	really 33:25 41:21
43:5,20 44:14	number 32:8 38:4	phone 27:25 28:2	34:21 35:3,5 36:8	Realtime 24:21
45:6	40:3,18	pictures 32:25	36:10,13	reason 32:2 38:16
Malden's 29:15		Pierce 29:17 31:11	production 29:3	reasonable 35:11
42:19	0	plenty 32:12	properly 41:5	38:20 43:19
manganese 31:19	O 27:5	PLLC 25:15	protected 34:25	rebuttal 42:23
manner 41:6	O'Donnell 26:3	PO 25:10	protection 28:20,25	receive 39:9
matter 29:23	o0o- 26:20 27:3	point 30:19 31:16	provide 30:14 33:5	received 32:23
mean 31:2	objection 43:3	position 41:3 42:19	37:17,22 38:18	37:23
means 37:25	obligation 29:24	possession 36:4	44:5	receiving 34:17
mentioned 33:17	obtain 35:3	possible 40:7	provided 30:18	record 27:7 30:25
microphone 29:7	occurred 32:22	possibly 31:25	31:11 33:6,14	35:9 41:4,14,23
29:11	Oh 28:3	potential 39:14	35:13 37:4,25	42:13,15 45:9
minute 32:16	okay 27:24 28:3	potentially 40:12	38:13,14	recorded 33:11
Monday 43:23	29:5 30:10 31:9	prefer 36:16 44:3	purpose 41:10	red 29:11
month 39:22 40:10	33:19 34:20 36:23	prefiled 32:19 42:8	purposefully 32:2	refers 29:15 31:4
moot 30:7 34:6	Olympia 24:17,23	Preg 26:3	pursue 40:1	regard 40:23
36:24	25:5,11 27:1	prehearing 44:11	push 43:8 44:22	reimbursed 35:22
morning 37:18	one-week 43:20	prepare 39:10	put 37:8	relates 31:4
motion 28:13 33:17	ongoing 30:4 31:8	prepared 28:7		relevance 36:14
37:21 39:4	open 43:12	present 26:8 29:21	Q	relevant 31:25
motions 28:5,6	opportunity 39:16	42:16	quality 30:5,17,20	35:18
move 40:18 44:6	42:16	presented 41:5	30:21 33:23 34:9	relief 32:7
	option 43:12	presently 30:18	34:17 35:12,17	remedies 30:6
N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	order 28:9 32:7	presents 43:13	quasi-judicial 35:6	remind 33:19
N 25:1 26:1 27:5	44:11,12	preside 27:10	question 29:14	reminds 30:11
narrow 32:9,10	ordered 29:4	previously 33:17	40:23	reply 28:18 29:1
41:17 43:6	outside 34:5	privilege 28:20,21	questions 38:9	39:9,19 41:14
National 24:24	outweighs 36:10,12	28:25 29:4 34:21	41:12	42:25
necessary 41:18,20	P	34:25 35:5 36:8	quite 32:21	report 36:10
44:5				
			1	1

REPORTED 24:20	37:20 39:3 43:10	spent 32:12,13	testify 40:25 42:3	type 33:8
Reporter 46:7	44:7,9 45:3,8	Staff 25:8 27:21,23	testimony 30:22	types 30:5
Reporting 24:21	Roberson 25:9	40:13 43:1,3	32:19 33:7 39:9	
representation	27:22,22 43:3	standard 41:13	39:10,11,14,20	U
38:12,21	45:5	start 33:20	40:9,13,19,24	unclear 40:24
representations	rule 28:8 41:8 42:2	state 30:20 34:22	41:10 42:4,8,9,23	understand 30:16
39:5	42:5	35:2 46:3,7	43:5,22,23,25	31:20 32:10 34:25
representative	ruling 36:7,22	statements 31:23	testing 33:23	36:21 38:22 39:1
39:15		33:12	tests 34:9	41:8 42:4
representing 31:17	S	submit 39:19	thank 28:3 32:17	understanding
request 29:18 31:1	S 25:1,15 26:1 27:5	substantiates 33:1	45:9	42:7
31:14 33:11,15	Sarah 24:4 26:8	substantive 31:3	thing 28:17 44:10	Understood 44:8
36:16 39:18,20	27:8,17,25 28:2	sufficiency 28:22	44:13	undisclosed 34:14
42:11,19 43:20	saying 36:7,9,11	sufficient 35:11	things 39:6,14	unusual 44:14
requests 27:13 28:8	43:9	Suite 24:22 25:16	41:24	update 33:8
29:3,19,23 30:23	schedule 39:8,24	26:4	think 32:15,23 33:2	usually 44:18
32:11 43:16	40:11,14,16 42:13	superior 29:17,20	33:9 34:6,10	UTC 39:15,18
require 30:14 33:5	43:8	29:23 31:11 35:7	36:20 37:5 38:24	Utilities 24:2,16
34:1 37:3,9,14,21	scheduling 44:12	supplement 29:24	39:1,3 41:18,24	25:3
required 31:20	scope 32:3,9 40:24	41:4,14,25	43:5,6,18	UW-170924 24:6
32:15 34:2 35:24	Seattle 24:22,23	supplemental	third 35:23	27:8
37:17 40:11	26:5	39:19 42:1	thought 41:20	$ \overline{\mathbf{v}} $
requirements 44:16	see 33:3,13,21,25	support 31:12	three 39:22 40:20	versus 27:8
requiring 33:14	34:19 35:19,19	supposed 39:23	44:18	View 24:7 26:2
resources 40:2	36:17 41:4 42:25 43:12	sure 29:6,13 30:1	three-week 42:24	27:9,20 31:18
respect 30:20 31:1	seeks 30:7	33:21 39:12 43:4	time 31:25 32:12	35:1 36:13 41:15
33:8 42:11	selling 31:18	43:8 44:14,24	41:16 42:22 43:11	41:19 43:7
respond 31:15	sense 36:8,19	surrebuttal 43:5	43:13,16,20 44:2	View's 36:9
40:20 41:16	service 35:12	SW 25:4,10	44:4	VOLUME 24:10
Respondent 24:9	seven 39:16,19	swallow 29:12	times 29:16	vs 24:6
response 28:15,16 28:18 29:15 37:10	shares 42:12	T	today 27:11 39:19 43:23	
37:23 39:11 42:9	Sherrilyn 24:20	T 46:1,1	told 32:5	
43:5 44:5	46:6,17	Tacoma 25:17	transcript 28:11	W 26:3
responses 27:12	short 43:13	take 30:19 38:11	46:8	WA 26:5
28:6 36:25	Shorthand 46:7	39:16	Transportation	wait 44:19
responsive 29:18	skill 46:9	taken 41:13	24:2,16 25:4	waive 34:24
29:22 40:13	Smith 24:20 46:6	talking 33:20	tries 35:8	want 34:19 35:13
result 32:22 37:17	46:17	telling 38:19	true 46:9	35:15,23 36:17
retained 34:13,15	somebody 29:7	terminology 37:24	trust 38:7,23	40:13 41:4 42:15
review 32:10	sorry 28:1 29:9	terms 31:12 35:16	truth 38:19	42:24 43:13,15
reviewed 37:23	South 24:17 25:4	terribly 44:24	trying 30:1 40:5,6	wanted 39:7
right 28:12 29:14	25:10	test 28:22 35:23	turn 37:21	warning 44:23
33:11 34:17 35:1	Southwest 24:17	36:9	two 40:20 43:7	Washington 24:1
35:21 36:3,9	speak 29:6	tested 34:13	two- 42:24	24:16,17,22 25:3
7-	spend 31:21 32:15	testified 38:25		25:5,11,17 27:1
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

			Page 51
24.00 25.0 46.2 7	1400 25.10	0.50 45.10	
34:22 35:2 46:3,7	1400 25:10	9:59 45:10	
wasn't 39:12	1840 24:22	901 26:4	
water 24:7 26:2	2	98101 24:22	
27:9,20 30:5,17		98164 26:5	
30:20 31:18,24	233:11,18	98402 25:17	
32:23 33:23 34:9	200 25:16	98504 25:5,11	
34:10,17 35:12,17	2018 24:15 27:1	98504-7250 24:17	
way 32:6,11,11,25	206.287.1775 26:5		
36:17 38:18 41:8	206.287.9066 24:23		
week 29:1 40:19	2097 24:20 46:17		
43:23	24 24:11		
weeks 39:23 40:20	25 24:15 27:1		
41:20 43:7	253.627.0393 25:17		
went 32:13	25th 44:21		
withdraw 33:18	2nd 43:24		
withdrawn 37:1			
withdrew 37:11	3		
witness 34:24 41:9	3 33:21		
witnesses 33:12	3400 26:4		
37:9	360.534.9066 24:23		
work 28:20 34:21	360.664.1136 25:6		
	360.664.1188 25:11		
35:3,5 36:8,10,13	3rd 39:9		
worked 40:7			
wouldn't 41:21	4		
writing 28:10 41:1	4 34:4		
written 28:9 31:3	40128 25:10		
33:11 41:10 42:4	46 24:11		
www.buellrealti	47250 25:5		
24:25	4725025.5		
	5		
X	5 34:7		
T 7			
Y Y 1 21 7	6		
Yeah 31:7	6 36:24		
$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$			
	7		
0	7 33:18 37:1		
	711 25:16		
1			
131:1	8		
10 37:8,10	8 37:2		
11 33:18 37:11	800.846.6989 24:24		
12 37:13	9		
1300 24:17 25:4	9 37:5		
1325 24:21	9:31 24:14 27:2		