Docket Nos. UE-200900 and UG-2900901 (Consolidated) - Vol. I

WUTC v. Avista Corporation d/b/a Avista Utilities

December 14, 2020



COURT REPORTING AND LEGAL VIDEO

206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 www.buellrealtime.com email: info@buellrealtime.com



	Page 1		Page 3
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		1	A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont.)
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND DOCKETS UE-200900 and			FOR AWEC:
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, JUG-200901 (Consolidated)		3	CORINNE MILINOVICH
) Complainant,)		4	Davison Van Cleve, PC
) vs.)		5	1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450 Portland, Oregon 97201
)´ AVISTA CORPORATION, d/b/a)		6	(503) 241-7242 com@dvclaw.com
AVISTA UTILITIES,		6 7	com@dvclaw.com
)		8	FOR INLAND EMPIRE PAPER COMPANY:
Respondent.)		9	
		10	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve, PC
TELEPHONIC PREHEARING CONFERENCE, VOLUME I			1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450
Pages 1-24		11	Portland, Oregon 97201 (503) 241-7242
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ANDREW J. O'CONNELL		12	tcp@dvclaw.com
		13	FOR THE SIERRA CLUB:
December 14, 2020		14	
1:35 p.m.		15	JESSICA YARNALL-LOARIE 2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission		16	Oakland, California 94612 jessica.yarnall@sierraclub.org
621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast Lacey, Washington 98503		17	
REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358		18	* * * *
		19	
Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 - 4th Avenue, Suite 1840		20 21	
Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 287-9066 Seattle		22	
(360) 534-9066 Olympia		23 24	
(800) 846-6989 National www.buellrealtime.com		25	
	Page 2		Page 4
1 APPEARANCES 2		1	LACEY, WASHINGTON; DECEMBER 14, 2020
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:		2	1:35 P.M.
3 ANDREW J. O'CONNELL		3	000
4 5		4	PROCEEDINGS
FOR COMMISSION STAFF:		5	
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI		6	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's go on the record.
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorneys General		6 7	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m.
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250		6 7 8	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 8 PO Box 47250 0 Olympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186		6 7 8 9	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 Olympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov		6 7 8 9 10	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 Olympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov		6 7 8 9 10 11	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 Olympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:		6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners.
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 0lympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 Olympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 7 Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 9 (360) 664-1186 9 (360) 664-1186 9 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 8 PO Box 47250 0 Olympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055 15 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov 16 FOR AVISTA:		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing.
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 7 Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 9 (360) 664-1186 9 (360) 664-1186 9 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 (206) 389-2055 15 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov 16 FOR AVISTA: 17 DAVID MEYER, ESQ.		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing. Staff has also filed a motion to consolidate
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 8 PO Box 47250 0 Olympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055 15 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov 16 FOR AVISTA: 17 DAVID MEYER, ESO. Avista Corporation 18		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing. Staff has also filed a motion to consolidate Docket UE-200894 concerning the deferred accounting
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 7 Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 9 (360) 664-1186 9 (360) 664-1186 9 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055 15 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov 16 FOR AVISTA: 17 DAVID MEYER, ESQ. Avista Corporation		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing. Staff has also filed a motion to consolidate Docket UE-200894 concerning the deferred accounting petition filed by Avista. We will address the timeline
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 Olympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 0 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov 16 FOR AVISTA: 17 DAVID MEYER, ESQ. Avista Corporation 18 18 PO Box 3727 Spokane, Washington 99220 19 19 (509) 495-4316 david.meyer@avistacorp.com		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing. Staff has also filed a motion to consolidate Docket UE-200894 concerning the deferred accounting petition filed by Avista. We will address the timeline for any responses to that motion later in this
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 7 Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 0lympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055 15 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov 16 FOR AVISTA: 17 DAVID MEYER, ESQ. Avista Corporation 18 18 PO Box 3727 Spokane, Washington 99220 19 9 (509) 495-4316 19 (509) 495-4316 10 HOR Gavid.meyer@avistacorp.com 20 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT:		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing. Staff has also filed a motion to consolidate Docket UE-200894 concerning the deferred accounting petition filed by Avista. We will address the timeline for any responses to that motion later in this prehearing conference.
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 7 Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 0)/mpia, Washington 98504 9 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055 15 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov 16 FOR AVISTA: 17 DAVID MEYER, ESQ. Avista Corporation 18 PO Box 3727 Spokane, Washington 99220 19 (509) 495-4316 13 Gavid.meyer@avistacorp.com 20 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT: 21 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT: 22 SIMON FFITCH Attorney at Law		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing. Staff has also filed a motion to consolidate Docket UE-200894 concerning the deferred accounting petition filed by Avista. We will address the timeline for any responses to that motion later in this prehearing conference. We are conducting this prehearing conference
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 7 Assistant Attorneys General 8 PO Box 47250 0lympia, Washington 98504 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 (206) 389-2055 15 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov 16 FOR AVISTA: 17 DAVID MEYER, ESQ. Avista Corporation Avista Corporation 18 PO Box 3727 Spokane, Washington 99220 19 9 (509) 495-4316 17 DAVID MEYER, ESQ. Avista Corporation 18 18 PO Box 3727 Spokane, Washington 99220 19 19 (509) 495-4316 10 david.meyer@avistacorp.com 20 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT: 22 SIMON FFITCH Attorney at Law 3 </td <td></td> <td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23</td> <td>Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing. Staff has also filed a motion to consolidate Docket UE-200894 concerning the deferred accounting petition filed by Avista. We will address the timeline for any responses to that motion later in this prehearing conference. We are conducting this prehearing conference virtually with audio and video through computer software</td>		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing. Staff has also filed a motion to consolidate Docket UE-200894 concerning the deferred accounting petition filed by Avista. We will address the timeline for any responses to that motion later in this prehearing conference. We are conducting this prehearing conference virtually with audio and video through computer software
6 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 7 JEFF ROBERSON 8 PO Box 47250 0)/ympia, Washington 98504 9 9 (360) 664-1186 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 10 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov 11 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 12 NINA SUETAKE 13 Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055 15 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov 16 FOR AVISTA: 17 DAVID MEYER, ESQ. Avista Corporation Avista Corporation 18 PO Box 3727 Spokane, Washington 99220 Spokane, Washington 99220 19 (509) 495-4316 17 DAVID MEYER, ESQ. Avista Corporation Box 3727 Spokane, Washington 99220 Spokane, Washington 99220 19 (509) 495-4316 13 Atorney @ avistacorp.com 20 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT: 21 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT: 22 SIMON FFITCH Attorn		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Good afternoon. The time is approximately 1:35 p.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding in these consolidated matters along with the Commissioners. We're here today for a virtual prehearing conference in consolidated Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901, which is Avista's 2020 general rate case filing. Staff has also filed a motion to consolidate Docket UE-200894 concerning the deferred accounting petition filed by Avista. We will address the timeline for any responses to that motion later in this prehearing conference. We are conducting this prehearing conference

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

	Page 5	Page
1	hear each other even though we are not physically in the	1 Are there any objections to any of these petitions to
2	Commission's hearing room.	2 intervene?
3	Okay. Let's move forward with short	3 MR. MEYER: Your Honor, this is David Meyer
4	appearances. Let's begin with Avista.	4 with Avista. And while we don't object to any of the
5	MR. MEYER: Thank you, Your Honor. This is	5 interventions, I just wanted to to stress that with
6	David Meyer on behalf of Avista.	6 respect to the Sierra Club intervention, that it's our
7	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Meyer.	7 understanding that their intervention will relate
8	And for Staff?	8 primarily to the expenditures surrounding Colstrip. And
9	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Good afternoon.	⁹ if that is the extent of their participation, we have
10	This is Jennifer Cameron-Rulkowski, Assistant Attorney	10 no no objection.
11	General, appearing on behalf of Commission Staff. And	11 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me turn to
12	with me also appearing in this proceeding are other AAGs	12 Ms. Yarnall-Loarie. Would you please like to clarify if
13	from our office and they are all they have all filed	13 that is an accurate understanding?
14	a notice of appearance.	14 MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Yes, that's an accurate
15	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, thank you.	15 understanding. I'm not sure if there's another issue
16	And for Public Counsel?	16 with which Avista was concerned about our participation
17	MS. SUETAKE: Thank you. This is Nina	17 I mean, certainly a case can take different turns, but
18	Suetake on behalf of Public Counsel.	18 primarily speaking, as we've done in the past, Sierra
19	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.	19 Club's interest primarily pertains to Colstrip.
20	For The Energy Project?	20 MR. MEYER: All right. With that, I have no
21	MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.	21 objection.
22	This is Simon ffitch on behalf of The Energy Project.	22 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So then hearing no
23	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.	23 objections, the petitions to intervene are granted, and
24	And for the Alliance of Western Energy	that decision will be memorialized in the prehearing
25	Consumers?	25 conference order.
		Dever
	Page 6	Page 8
1		
1 2	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is	1 So I want to move forward to briefly
	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a
2	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case,
2 3	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case,
2 3 4	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company?	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets.
2 3 4 5	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets.
2 3 4 5 6	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company.	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club,	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please?	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi serve the parties electronically as well. However, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi serve the parties electronically as well. However, in this case, the Commission will also require a filing of
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi serve the parties electronically as well. However, in this case, the Commission will also require a filing of an original and three paper copies for internal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club.	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi serve the parties electronically as well. However, in this case, the Commission will also require a filing of an original and three paper copies for internal distributions at the Commission. If the parties are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission will serve the parties electronically as well. However, in this case, the Commission will also require a filing of an original and three paper copies for internal distributions at the Commission. If the parties are filing anything that includes information designated as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi serve the parties electronically as well. However, in this case, the Commission will also require a filing of an original and three paper copies for internal distributions at the Commission. If the parties are filing anything that includes information designated as confidential, please file the original and three copies
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for intervention. Are there any petitions for intervention	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi serve the parties electronically as well. However, in this case, the Commission will also require a filing of an original and three paper copies for internal distributions at the Commission. If the parties are filing anything that includes information designated as confidential, please file the original and three copies of the fully unredacted version. No paper copy is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for intervention. Are there any petitions for intervention other than the ones that have been filed in writing with	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi serve the parties electronically as well. However, in this case, the Commission will also require a filing of an original and three paper copies for internal distributions at the Commission. If the parties are filing anything that includes information designated as confidential, please file the original and three copies of the fully unredacted version. No paper copy is necessary for any partly redacted or fully redacted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for intervention. Are there any petitions for intervention other than the ones that have been filed in writing with the Commission? So if you are on the line right now on	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi serve the parties electronically as well. However, in this case, the Commission will also require a filing of an original and three paper copies for internal distributions at the Commission. If the parties are filing anything that includes information designated as confidential, please file the original and three copies of the fully unredacted version. No paper copy is necessary for any partly redacted or fully redacted version. Please file those versions only in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for intervention. Are there any petitions for intervention other than the ones that have been filed in writing with the Commission? So if you are on the line right now on telephone or on Teams and you wish to petition to	 So I want to move forward to briefly discussing some other items. The Company requested a protective order when it filed its general rate case, and a protective order has already been issued in these dockets. Additionally, the Commission requires all filing of service to be done electronically now according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi serve the parties electronically as well. However, in this case, the Commission will also require a filing of an original and three paper copies for internal distributions at the Commission. If the parties are filing anything that includes information designated as confidential, please file the original and three copies of the fully unredacted version. No paper copy is necessary for any partly redacted or fully redacted version. Please file those versions only in the electronic format.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for intervention. Are there any petitions for intervention other than the ones that have been filed in writing with the Commission? So if you are on the line right now on telephone or on Teams and you wish to petition to intervene, now would be your time to speak up unless you	1So I want to move forward to briefly2discussing some other items. The Company requested a3protective order when it filed its general rate case,4and a protective order has already been issued in these5dockets.6Additionally, the Commission requires all7filing of service to be done electronically now8according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi9serve the parties electronically as well. However, in10this case, the Commission will also require a filing of11an original and three paper copies for internal12distributions at the Commission. If the parties are13filing anything that includes information designated as14confidential, please file the original and three copies15of the fully unredacted version. No paper copy is16necessary for any partly redacted or fully redacted17version. Please file those versions only in the18electronic format.19Also, if any party has not yet designated a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for intervention. Are there any petitions for intervention other than the ones that have been filed in writing with the Commission? So if you are on the line right now on telephone or on Teams and you wish to petition to intervene, now would be your time to speak up unless you have already filed a petition to intervene.	1So I want to move forward to briefly2discussing some other items. The Company requested a3protective order when it filed its general rate case,4and a protective order has already been issued in these5dockets.6Additionally, the Commission requires all7filing of service to be done electronically now8according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi9serve the parties electronically as well. However, in10this case, the Commission will also require a filing of11an original and three paper copies for internal12distributions at the Commission. If the parties are13filing anything that includes information designated as14confidential, please file the original and three copies15of the fully unredacted version. No paper copy is16necessary for any partly redacted or fully redacted17version. Please file those versions only in the18electronic format.19Also, if any party has not yet designated a20lead representative for service, please do so via an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for intervention. Are there any petitions for intervention other than the ones that have been filed in writing with the Commission? So if you are on the line right now on telephone or on Teams and you wish to petition to intervene, now would be your time to speak up unless you have already filed a petition to intervene. Okay. Hearing none, let's proceed. I have	1So I want to move forward to briefly2discussing some other items. The Company requested a3protective order when it filed its general rate case,4and a protective order has already been issued in these5dockets.6Additionally, the Commission requires all7filing of service to be done electronically now8according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi9serve the parties electronically as well. However, in10this case, the Commission will also require a filing of11an original and three paper copies for internal12distributions at the Commission. If the parties are13filing anything that includes information designated as14confidential, please file the original and three copies15of the fully unredacted version. No paper copy is16necessary for any partly redacted or fully redacted17version. Please file those versions only in the18electronic format.19Also, if any party has not yet designated a20lead representative for service, please do so via an21email to me as soon as possible. In addition, if anyone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for intervention. Are there any petitions for intervention other than the ones that have been filed in writing with the Commission? So if you are on the line right now on telephone or on Teams and you wish to petition to intervene, now would be your time to speak up unless you have already filed a petition to intervene. Okay. Hearing none, let's proceed. I have read the petitions to intervene on behalf of The Energy	1So I want to move forward to briefly2discussing some other items. The Company requested a3protective order when it filed its general rate case,4and a protective order has already been issued in these5dockets.6Additionally, the Commission requires all7filing of service to be done electronically now8according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi9serve the parties electronically as well. However, in10this case, the Commission will also require a filing of11an original and three paper copies for internal12distributions at the Commission. If the parties are13filing anything that includes information designated as14confidential, please file the original and three copies15of the fully unredacted version. No paper copy is16necessary for any partly redacted or fully redacted17version. Please file those versions only in the18electronic format.19Also, if any party has not yet designated a20lead representative for service, please do so via an21email to me as soon as possible. In addition, if anyone22would like to add names or email addresses of other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. MILINOVICH: Good afternoon. This is Corinne Milinovich on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for the Inland Empire Paper Company? MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler Pepple representing the Inland Empire Paper Company. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Sierra Club, please? MS. YARNALL-LOARIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Jessica Yarnall-Loarie and I'm representing the Sierra Club. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Good afternoon to you all. That brings us to the petitions to for intervention. Are there any petitions for intervention other than the ones that have been filed in writing with the Commission? So if you are on the line right now on telephone or on Teams and you wish to petition to intervene, now would be your time to speak up unless you have already filed a petition to intervene. Okay. Hearing none, let's proceed. I have read the petitions to intervene on behalf of The Energy Project, the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers, the	1So I want to move forward to briefly2discussing some other items. The Company requested a3protective order when it filed its general rate case,4and a protective order has already been issued in these5dockets.6Additionally, the Commission requires all7filing of service to be done electronically now8according to the Commission rule and the Commission wi9serve the parties electronically as well. However, in10this case, the Commission will also require a filing of11an original and three paper copies for internal12distributions at the Commission. If the parties are13filing anything that includes information designated as14confidential, please file the original and three copies15of the fully unredacted version. No paper copy is16necessary for any partly redacted or fully redacted17version. Please file those versions only in the18electronic format.19Also, if any party has not yet designated a20lead representative for service, please do so via an21email to me as soon as possible. In addition, if anyone22would like to add names or email addresses of other23representatives or support staff who should be included

	Page 9		Page 11
1	email address is Andrew.j.oconnell, O-c-o-n-n-e-l-l,	1	would be that would be helpful so that we're not
2	@utc.wa.gov.	2	speculating.
3	So with that, I want to move on to the	3	JUDGE O'CONNELL: I understand.
4	procedural schedule. I've been provided a proposed	4	MR. MEYER: And, Your Honor, this is
5	procedural schedule by the parties, and my understanding	5	that's helpful, thank you. This is David Meyer, and
6	is that there is consensus on that proposal. And before	6	just one other request for information from you, is
7	we we get into that discussion, I want to repeat my	7	is the period July 7th through the 9th available on
8	communication with the parties shortly before the	8	Commission calendars for a hearing date in the event
9	hearing, this prehearing conference, began that in	9	that that becomes an option the parties want to
10	review of the parties' proposed schedule, there is too	10	consider? We haven't discussed that recently or as of
11	short of a time between the final date for filing	11	today, but are those dates available?
12	written testimony, that's cross-answering testimony and	12	JUDGE O'CONNELL: And I'm pausing a moment
13	rebuttal testimony, and the evidentiary hearing. The	13	to take a quick look at the Commission calendars.
14	proposed schedule has the evidentiary hearing beginning	14	MR. MEYER: Would be Wednesday through
15	on June 29th and currently the proposed cross-answering	15	Friday, July 7th through the 9th.
16	and rebuttal deadline is, I believe it's June 9th.	16	JUDGE O'CONNELL: So the week of July 6th
17	The Commission needs more time to prepare	17	through 9, there is some availability, particularly more
18	for the hearing. And so the Commission is	18	on the 6th. There are several tentative items on the
19	not with that proposed evidentiary hearing date, the	19	Commission and the Commissioner's schedules that
20	Commission will not set a cross-answering or rebuttal	20	I'm unsure as to how likely they are to conflict with
21	deadline later than the week of May 17th through 21st.	21	setting a hearing on July 7th through 9. The following
22	I know it was pretty short notice, only	22	week, July 12th through 16, is more open for an
23	about an hour before the prehearing conference, but I	23	evidentiary hearing.
24	would like to hear if the parties have had a chance to	24	So the feedback I'd like to give is that
25	discuss the proposed schedule in light of that feedback	25	it's not a no for July 7, 8, or 9, but it is in my
	Page 10		Page 12
		1	Page 12
1	from the Commission.	1	-
1 2	from the Commission. Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the	1	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up
	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the		head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if
2	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to	2	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for
2 3	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the	2 3	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after
2 3 4	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to	2 3 4	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to
2 3 4 5	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the	2 3 4 5	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so.
2 3 4 5 6	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could	2 3 4 5 6	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to
2 3 4 5 6 7	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go	2 3 4 5 6 7	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to discuss it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, some amount of time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to discuss it. But before we do that, it would be very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, some amount of time around six weeks. I realize that if we have a hearing at the beginning of a week and the testimony deadline is at the end of the you know, week previous, it might
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to discuss it. But before we do that, it would be very helpful to hear from you if you have any conflicts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, some amount of time around six weeks. I realize that if we have a hearing at the beginning of a week and the testimony deadline is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to discuss it. But before we do that, it would be very helpful to hear from you if you have any conflicts around that hearing date. So if we're talking about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, some amount of time around six weeks. I realize that if we have a hearing at the beginning of a week and the testimony deadline is at the end of the you know, week previous, it might
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to discuss it. But before we do that, it would be very helpful to hear from you if you have any conflicts around that hearing date. So if we're talking about pushing the hearing date, that would be very helpful to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, some amount of time around six weeks. I realize that if we have a hearing at the beginning of a week and the testimony deadline is at the end of the you know, week previous, it might be a little bit less than six weeks, but about that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to discuss it. But before we do that, it would be very helpful to hear from you if you have any conflicts around that hearing date. So if we're talking about pushing the hearing date, that would be very helpful to hear. Another thing that could be helpful is I think we I think there is currently seven weeks	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, some amount of time around six weeks. I realize that if we have a hearing at the beginning of a week and the testimony deadline is at the end of the you know, week previous, it might be a little bit less than six weeks, but about that time, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to discuss it. But before we do that, it would be very helpful to hear from you if you have any conflicts around that hearing date. So if we're talking about pushing the hearing date, that would be very helpful to hear. Another thing that could be helpful is I think we I think there is currently seven weeks between the briefing deadline and the order. If if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, some amount of time around six weeks. I realize that if we have a hearing at the beginning of a week and the testimony deadline is at the end of the you know, week previous, it might be a little bit less than six weeks, but about that time, yes. MR. MEYER: Okay. Good. Now, I know that Staff just prior to the start of this session today circulated an email to all parties on an alternative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to discuss it. But before we do that, it would be very helpful to hear from you if you have any conflicts around that hearing date. So if we're talking about pushing the hearing date, that would be very helpful to hear. Another thing that could be helpful is I think we I think there is currently seven weeks between the briefing deadline and the order. If if six weeks would work, that would be helpful to know too.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, some amount of time around six weeks. I realize that if we have a hearing at the beginning of a week and the testimony deadline is at the end of the you know, week previous, it might be a little bit less than six weeks, but about that time, yes. MR. MEYER: Okay. Good. Now, I know that Staff just prior to the start of this session today circulated an email to all parties on an alternative schedule, and we appreciate that. Just moments ago, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Since, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you were the one who sent me the proposed schedule, I would like to ask if you could give me an update on whether the parties have had a chance to speak and whether the parties would like a chance to speak now and I could step off of the Teams meeting for a brief time. Go ahead. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, we have not had a chance to speak, and I know that I received your email over the lunch hour and I'm sure we've all been staring at the schedule trying to figure out where to where to push which dates. So I think it would be helpful certainly to be able to have some opportunity to discuss it. But before we do that, it would be very helpful to hear from you if you have any conflicts around that hearing date. So if we're talking about pushing the hearing date, that would be very helpful to hear. Another thing that could be helpful is I think we I think there is currently seven weeks between the briefing deadline and the order. If if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	head it's a question mark. I would have to follow up more specifically on those dates. And if that is if that's going to be the dates that are going to work for the parties, then I will follow up on that, and if after the fact I have to change the date, I would reach out to the parties before doing so. MR. MEYER: Well, thank you, Your Honor. That's that's good guidance. I just wanted to test this the flexibility on that end of the schedule as well. It's the thirty roughly a 38-, 39-day interval that you're after between the rebuttal, slash, cross-answering testimony and the hearing, and so that's what any schedule we would want to come up with would try and accomplish, correct? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, some amount of time around six weeks. I realize that if we have a hearing at the beginning of a week and the testimony deadline is at the end of the you know, week previous, it might be a little bit less than six weeks, but about that time, yes. MR. MEYER: Okay. Good. Now, I know that Staff just prior to the start of this session today circulated an email to all parties on an alternative

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

	Page 13	Page 1	15
1	might I suggest that that if I moved out that the	1 perhaps there's some way that you can meet in the middle	e
2	parties can agree on that on a schedule that	2 and take some time from the Commission, but also take	
3	accomplishes these objectives. So one option would be	³ some time from the parties for their briefing.	
4	for us to simply report back to you with a new proposed	4 MR. PEPPLE: That sounds reasonable.	
5	schedule perhaps tomorrow, no later than tomorrow, that	5 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: That's helpful. Ar	nd
6	accomplishes what you're after, and rather than try and	6 just to let you know, Your Honor, the extra week there	
7	do this, it's kind of cumbersome, break free on this and	7 was to accommodate the 4th of July week.	
8	restart this prehearing. Would that be a possibility	8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I understand. If we're	
9	that we circulate that revised schedule and then you	⁹ pushing the schedule back so that the hearing is after	
10	just hold the prehearing open until you receive that	10 the 4th of July weekend, then maybe that concern can be	;
11	tomorrow by email?	11 resolved.	
12	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, may I	Let me step off. I will I see the time	
13	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead,	now is almost 1:55. I will plan to come back onto the	
14	Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, please.	14 Teams meeting at 2:25, that's a half hour from now.	
15	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I I have a	However, if the parties don't need that long to	
16	tendency not to want to agree to agree to that unless	determine whether there can be an agreement or whether	
17	we want to hold the prehearing conference over and	17 there can't be an agreement, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski or	
18	reconvene it with you. If it comes to the point that we	18 Mr. Roberson, if you could please send me a message,	
19	can't agree on something, then we we would we	19 I'll get back on sooner.	
20	would need to submit opposing schedules to you in	20 So with that, let's be off the record for	
21	writing. We could do that, but I I think I would	21 now, and I will be back on at 2:25 unless the parties	
22	favor doing the usual thing, which is talking among the	22 let me know that I should come back sooner.	
23	parties today, and if we can't agree, then we tell you	23 (A break was taken from	
24	what we can't agree on and you come up with a decision.	24 1:54 p.m. to 2:26 p.m.)	
25	That's that's my feedback.	25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's go back on the	
	Page 14	Page 1	16
1	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, I happen to agree	1 record. After a short break, we are back at the	
1 2	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, I happen to agree with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated	 record. After a short break, we are back at the prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and 	
2	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated	2 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and	
2 3	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. 	
2 3 4	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the 	
2 3 4 5	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. 	
2 3 4 5 6	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it 	r
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with 	
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record,	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay.	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues 	21.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski's question about whether or not we	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta testimony would be Friday, May 28th; our discovery 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski's question about whether or not we could push the briefing due date out another week or so,	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta testimony would be Friday, May 28th; our discovery deadline would be Friday, June 18; filing the joint 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski's question about whether or not we could push the briefing due date out another week or so, which, you know, pushes up more time against your final	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta testimony would be Friday, May 28th; our discovery deadline would be Friday, June 18; filing the joint issues matrix would be June 30th. Also on June 30th 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski's question about whether or not we could push the briefing due date out another week or so, which, you know, pushes up more time against your final order deadline, but I think that would help to resolve	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta testimony would be Friday, May 28th; our discovery deadline would be Friday, June 18; filing the joint issues matrix would be June 30th. Also on June 30th would be filing the exhibit list and cross-examination 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski's question about whether or not we could push the briefing due date out another week or so, which, you know, pushes up more time against your final order deadline, but I think that would help to resolve some of these questions.	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta testimony would be Friday, June 18; filing the joint issues matrix would be June 30th. Also on June 30th would be filing the exhibit list and cross-examination exhibits and time estimates. The evidentiary hearing 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski's question about whether or not we could push the briefing due date out another week or so, which, you know, pushes up more time against your final order deadline, but I think that would help to resolve some of these questions. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I I have two	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta testimony would be Friday, May 28th; our discovery deadline would be Friday, June 18; filing the joint issues matrix would be June 30th. Also on June 30th would be filing the exhibit list and cross-examination exhibits and time estimates. The evidentiary hearing would be July 7th through 9, and we've retained the 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski's question about whether or not we could push the briefing due date out another week or so, which, you know, pushes up more time against your final order deadline, but I think that would help to resolve some of these questions. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I I have two thoughts on that. First, yes, that date does not need 	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta testimony would be Friday, May 28th; our discovery deadline would be Friday, June 18; filing the joint issues matrix would be June 30th. Also on June 30th would be filing the exhibit list and cross-examination exhibits and time estimates. The evidentiary hearing would be July 7th through 9, and we've retained the briefing date of August 13th. 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski's question about whether or not we could push the briefing due date out another week or so, which, you know, pushes up more time against your final order deadline, but I think that would help to resolve some of these questions. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I I have two thoughts on that. First, yes, that date does not need to be firm, but also I was a bit surprised to see six 	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta testimony would be Friday, May 28th; our discovery deadline would be Friday, June 18; filing the joint issues matrix would be June 30th. Also on June 30th would be filing the exhibit list and cross-examination exhibits and time estimates. The evidentiary hearing would be July 7th through 9, and we've retained the briefing date of August 13th. 	21. d
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 with both of you. It it's certainly more complicated having a virtual prehearing conference for the parties to collaborate and speak about resolving issues of a procedural schedule, but I do think if there are going to be differences of opinion on what the dates should be, I'd like to know sooner rather than later. So what I'd like to do is first hear from any other party that wants to give their opinion on whether they would be opposed to taking a brief amount of time that I would step we would go off the record, I would step off this Teams meeting, and the parties could converse here. Okay. MR. PEPPLE: Your Honor, Tyler Pepple for Inland Empire. We don't oppose that. I just wanted to say I think it would be helpful to hear an answer to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski's question about whether or not we could push the briefing due date out another week or so, which, you know, pushes up more time against your final order deadline, but I think that would help to resolve some of these questions. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I I have two thoughts on that. First, yes, that date does not need 	 prehearing conference in Dockets UE-200900 and UG-200901. The time is just shortly after 2:25 p.m. Before coming on the record, I was informed that the parties have a new proposal for a procedural schedule. We will put that into the record now, and I will turn it over to Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll go ahead and read through the dates in the procedural schedule, and then we'll be following up with sending you a copy of it in writing. So the first date that will change is the response testimony and we propose Wednesday, April 2 And then the next date is circulating the joint issues matrix, that would move a week ahead to April 30th. And we propose a settlement conference on May 6th; rebutta testimony would be Friday, May 28th; our discovery deadline would be Friday, June 18; filing the joint issues matrix would be June 30th. Also on June 30th would be filing the exhibit list and cross-examination exhibits and time estimates. The evidentiary hearing would be July 7th through 9, and we've retained the briefing date of August 13th. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 	21. d

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

	Page 17		Page 19
1	the discovery intervals that were agreed on?	1	
2	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Certainly,	2	of these and the Company can speak to that, but we're also tracking of course all of the parties' discovery.
3	Mr. Meyer. I have actually already changed that in the	3	And so it makes it a lot easier to be able to click open
4	document. We had initially had the the discovery	4	one email and see ah, that is what the subject matter of
5	that would be after that would be occurring after the	5	the discovery is, this is who okay, we know who needs
6	cutoff, the response time will be five days. My	6	to get it. And that should or it has been helping
7	apologies, five I think we have five business days.	7	facilitate the whole discovery processing discovery
8	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	8	and archiving discovery.
9	Preliminarily, I think this proposed schedule will work	9	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. That makes sense to
10	for the Commission, but I'm going to confirm that it	10	me and since the parties are all agreed, I will include
11	does, and when I confirm it does, I will incorporate it	11	that in the prehearing conference order. I assume that
12	into the prehearing conference order.	12	that as well as the the first agreement about sharing
13	I notice that there were two other additions	13	all data requests and responses will also be included
14	in the proposed schedule that I had been sent	14	with the procedural schedule you'll send me
15	previously. The parties had included an agreement to	15	electronically later; is that correct?
16	include every party on each data request and response to	16	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Those portions are
17	the data request as well as certain organizational or	17	unchanged, so yes, they will be included.
18	presentation elements for the data requests and data	18	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
19	responses. Are those two elements still agreed by the	19	One more thing before we
20	parties and is there any objection to me including that	20	MR. MEYER: Your Honor?
21	in the prehearing conference order?	21	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Meyer, go ahead.
22	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, that was	22	MR. MEYER: Oh, yeah. Excuse me for
23	the intention would that is that that they would	23	interrupting. In the past, we have also agreed to
24	be included in the prehearing conference order. And if	24	furnish to the bench a list of names of of those
25	you'd like me to go through that second element, the	25	other in addition to just the attorney and one other
	Page 18		Page 20
1	discovery tracking, I would be happy to answer any	1	representative, in addition to those two, names of
2	questions.	2	people that should be provided copies of discovery. And
3	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, please, go ahead and	3	that it seemed to work well in the past. And and
4	explain that second one because that is relatively new	4	in cases past, we've provided that to the to the
5	to me and I'd like to understand.	5	bench within a few days after the the prehearing was
6	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Certainly, Your	6	held, and then it's compiled and distributed to the
7	Honor. So this was piloted in the Cascade general rate	7	parties. It seems otherwise we're in a quandary about
8	case, which is currently pending, and Staff has had a	8	who should get copies. It's easier if we just send it
9	very good experience with it. And the the purpose of	9	out directly.
10	it is so that the parties can easily identify the	10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. My my question
11	subject matter of data requests.	11	is, are you referring to the parties collectively
12	And so the first thing that we've been	12	sending that out or do you mean from each of the parties
13	working on is to come up with a list of the usual	13	sending to me? Because I would like to have that
14	suspects of discovery topics. Those are not absolutely	14	information also for me to include in the prehearing
15	set in stone, but we're trying to come up with a uniform	15	conference order.
16	list so we have a common understanding of what the	16	MR. MEYER: No, the thought being that we
17	subject matter is. And then for when the discovery	17	would each of the parties would send to you that
18	when a data request gets issued, the idea is to identify	18	information then you, if if you're willing to do
19	each data request with that particular subject, what the	19	that, would compile it into a list to be attached to the
20	subject matter is, and then also in the the in the	20	prehearing order.
21	email that serves the data request and in the cover	21	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. Please send me a
22	letter that accompanies the data request that the topics	22	list via email for everyone from Avista, and every other
23	of those of the data requests would be listed and all	23	party, please send me the same sort of list with
24	the data requests would be grouped by that topic so that	24	everyone who should be receiving courtesy copies. I
25	when we receive we we process literally hundreds	25	will include the names and email address of each person
		<u> </u>	

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

	Page 21		Page 23
1		1	
1	that the parties identify. I will include that in the		I would ex I want to say that the parties can expect
2 3	prehearing conference order, the list in Appendix it's usually I think Appendix A and Appendix B to the	2	that order by the end of this week or the very beginning of next.
	procedural order would be the prehearing conference	4	
4 5	or the procedural schedule, sorry. So yes, please send	5	And with that, if there is nothing else, okay. We will be adjourned. Thank you. And we're off
6	that information to me, Mr. Meyer.	6	the record.
7	MR. MEYER: And the thought being, and this	7	(Adjourned at 2:40 p.m.)
8	is there's no strict limitation of the number, but	8	(Aujoumed at 2.40 p.m.)
9	just all parties should use good judgments so we don't	9	
10	turn in dozens of names when, you know, three, four,	10	
11	five additional names will do it.	11	
12	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, that's my expectation	12	
13	and my experience with the parties in the past, but it's	13	
14	always good to remind us all that we should all be	14	
15	reasonable.	15	
16	Is there any other discussion from the	16	
17	parties on that topic or on the procedural schedule?	17	
18	Because I do plan to switch topics. So let me hear from	18	
19	any other parties.	19	
20	Okay. Hearing none, I want to move forward	20	
21	and address Staff's motion to consolidate. I want to	21	
22	address a timeframe for responses to that motion to	22	
23	consolidate. Staff's motion would consolidate the GRC	23	
24	with Avista's deferred accounting petition in Docket	24	
25	UE-200894. The parties are entitled to file responses	25	
	Page 22		Page 24
1	opposing such a motion, and I intend to set a deadline	1	CERTIFICATE
2	of this Friday, December 18, 2020, for responses	2	
3	opposing Staff's motion to consolidate.	3	STATE OF WASHINGTON
4	I'd like to now give the parties the	4	COUNTY OF THURSTON
5	opportunity to offer any other perspective on a timeline	5	
6	for responses to Staff's motion.	6	I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand
7	MR. MEYER: This is Avista, and I won't give	7	Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
8	the reasons why, but we will be opposing that motion and	8	certify that the foregoing transcript is true and
9	Friday works just fine. We were anticipating that	9	accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
10	timeframe.	10	
11	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	11	States of the second
12	Is there any other party that wants to be	12	
13	heard on that timeline?	13	
14	Okay. Hearing nothing, responses opposing	14	Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358
15	Staff's motion to consolidate will be due by 5:00 p.m.	15	
16	this Friday, December 18, 2020.	16	
17	Is there anything else that we need to	17	
18	address today at this prehearing conference?	18	
19	MR. MEYER: Not from Avista.	19	
20	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Hearing nothing,	20	
21	thank you all and thank you for your fruitful	21	
22	discussions and the proposed schedule that you've agreed	22	
23	to. I will issue the prehearing conference order	23	
24	shortly. It will contain the procedural schedule and	24	
25	the other guidelines for the disposition of this case.	25	
<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

				Page 25
A	14:10	bench 10:25 19:24	clarify 7:12	confirm 17:10,11
AAGs 5:12	Andrew 1:13 2:3	20:5	Cleve 3:4,10	conflict 11:20
ability 4:25 24:9	4:8	benefits 4:24	click 19:3	conflicts 10:17
able 10:14 19:3	Andrew.j.oconnell	best 24:9	Club 3:13 6:8,12	consensus 9:6
absolutely 18:14	9:1	bit 12:19 14:24	6:24 7:6	consider 11:10
accommodate 15:7	answer 14:16 18:1	Box 2:8,18	Club's 7:19	consolidate 4:17
	anticipating 22:9	break 13:7 15:23	collaborate 14:4	21:21,23,23 22:3
accompanies 18:22	apologies 17:7	16:1	collectively 20:11	22:15
accomplish 12:14	appearance 5:14	brief 10:7 14:10	Colstrip 7:8,19	consolidated 1:4
accomplishes 13:3	appearances 5:4	briefing 10:23	com@dvclaw.com	4:11,14
13:6	appearing 5:11,12	14:18,25 15:3	3:6	Consumers 5:25
accounting 4:18	Appendix 21:2,3,3	16:23	come 12:13 13:24	6:3,23
21:24	appreciate 12:24	briefly 8:1	15:13,22 18:13,15	Cont 3:1
accurate 7:13,14	approximately 4:7	brings 6:14	comes 13:18	contain 22:24
24:9	April 16:13,15	Buell 1:21	coming 16:4	converse 14:13
add 8:22 16:25	archiving 19:8	business 17:7	Commission 1:2,4	copies 8:11,14,24
addition 8:21 19:25	Assistant 2:7 5:10	Dusiness 17.7	1:18 2:5 4:10	20:2,8,24
20:1	assume 19:11	C	5:11 6:17 8:6,8,8	
additional 21:11	attached 20:19	C 2:1 3:1 4:4 24:1,1		copy 8:15 16:11 Corinne 3:3 6:2
Additionally 8:6		calendars 11:8,13	8:10,12 9:17,18	
additions 17:13	attorney 2:13,22	California 3:15	9:20 10:1 11:8,13	Corporation 1:7
address 4:19 9:1	5:10 19:25	Cameron-Rulko	11:19 15:2 17:10	2:17
20:25 21:21,22	Attorneys 2:7	2:6 5:9,10 10:2,9	Commission's 5:2	correct 12:14 19:15
22:18	audio 4:23	13:12,14,15 15:5	Commissioner's	Counsel 2:11 5:16
addresses 8:22	August 16:23	15:17 16:7,8 17:2	11:19	5:18
adjourned 23:5,7	availability 11:17	17:22 18:6 19:16	Commissioners	COUNTY 24:4
administrative	available 11:7,11		4:12	course 19:2
1:13 2:2 4:9	Avenue 1:22 2:13	Cameron-Rulko	common 18:16	courtesy 8:24
affect 10:25	Avista 1:7,8 2:16	14:17	communication 9:8	20:24
afternoon 4:7 5:9	2:17 4:19 5:4,6	Cascade 18:7	Company 3:8 6:5,7	cover 18:21
5:21 6:1,6,10,13	7:4,16 20:22 22:7	case 4:15 7:17 8:3	6:24 8:2 19:1	cross-answering
ago 12:24	22:19	8:10 18:8 22:25	compile 20:19	9:12,15,20 12:12
agree 13:2,16,16,19	Avista's 4:15 21:24	cases 20:4	compiled 20:6	cross-examination
13:23,24 14:1	AWEC 3:2	CCR 1:20 24:14	Complainant 1:5	16:20
agreed 17:1,19		certain 17:17	complicated 14:2	cumbersome 13:7
19:10,23 22:22	B	certainly 7:17	computer 4:23	currently 9:15
agreement 15:16	B 21:3	10:14 14:2 17:2	concern 15:10	10:22 18:8
15:17 17:15 19:12	back 13:4 15:9,13	18:6	concerned 7:16	cutoff 17:6
ah 19:4	15:19,21,22,25	Certified 24:6	concerning 4:18	
ahead 10:8 13:13	16:1	certify 24:8	conducting 4:22	D
16:9,15 18:3	Bainbridge 2:23	chance 9:24 10:5,6	conference 1:11	D 4:4
19:21	began 9:9	10:10	4:14,21,22 7:25	d/b/a 1:7
Alliance 5:24 6:2	beginning 9:14	change 12:5 16:12	9:9,23 13:17 14:3	D3 2:23
6:23	12:17 23:2	changed 17:3	16:2,16 17:12,21	data 17:16,17,18
allows 4:24	behalf 5:6,11,18,22	circulate 13:9	17:24 19:11 20:15	17:18 18:11,18,19
alternative 12:23	6:2,22	circulated 12:23,25	21:2,4 22:18,23	18:21,22,23,24
amount 12:15	believe 9:16	circulating 16:14	confidential 8:14	19:13

				1 496 20
date 9:11,19 10:18	due 14:18 22:15	ffitch 2:22 5:21,22	18:9 21:9,14	19:10 20:14,25
10:19 11:8 12:5	uue 14.16 22.13	,	granted 7:23	21:1
	E	figure 10:12	GRC 21:23	included 8:23
14:18,23 16:12,14	E 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:4,4	file 8:14,17 21:25		
16:23	24:1,1	filed 4:17,19 5:13	grouped 18:24	17:15,24 19:13,17
dates 10:13,25	easier 19:3 20:8	6:16,20 8:3,24	guidance 12:8	includes 8:13
11:11 12:2,3 14:6	easily 18:10	filing 4:16 8:7,10	guidelines 22:25	including 17:20
16:9	electronic 8:18,24	8:13 9:11 16:18	<u> </u>	incorporate 17:11
David 2:17 5:6 7:3	,	16:20	half 15:14	information 8:13
11:5	electronically 8:7,9 19:15	final 9:11 14:19		11:6 20:14,18
david.meyer@av		fine 22:9	happen 14:1	21:6
2:19	element 17:25	firm 14:24	happy 18:1	informed 16:4
Davison 3:4,10	elements 17:18,19	first 14:8,23 16:12	Harbor 3:4,10	initially 17:4
days 17:6,7 20:5	email 8:21,22,25	18:12 19:12	head 12:1	Inland 3:8 6:5,7,24
deadline 9:16,21	9:1 10:11 12:23	five 17:6,7,7 21:11	hear 5:1 9:24 10:17	14:15
10:23 12:17 14:20	13:11 18:21 19:4	flexibility 12:9	10:20 14:8,16	intend 22:1
14:25 16:18 22:1	20:22,25	follow 12:1,4	21:18	intention 17:23
December 1:15 4:1	Empire 3:8 6:5,7	following 11:21	heard 22:13	interest 7:19
22:2,16	6:24 14:15	16:10	hearing 5:2 6:21	internal 8:11
decision 7:24 13:24	Energy 2:21 5:20	foregoing 24:8	7:22 9:9,13,14,18	interrupting 19:23
deferred 4:18	5:22,24 6:3,22,23	format 8:18	9:19 10:18,19	interval 12:10
21:24	entitled 21:25	forward 5:3 8:1	11:8,21,23 12:12	intervals 17:1
designated 8:13,19	ESQ 2:17	21:20	12:16 14:25 15:9	intervene 6:19,20
determine 15:16	estimates 16:21	four 21:10	16:21 21:20 22:14	6:22 7:2,23
differences 14:6	event 11:8	free 13:7	22:20	intervenors 4:25
different 7:17	evidentiary 9:13,14	Friday 11:15 16:17	held 20:6	intervention 6:15
12:25	9:19 11:23 16:21	16:18 22:2,9,16	help 14:20	6:15 7:6,7
directly 20:9	ex- 23:1	fruitful 22:21	helpful 10:14,17,19	interventions 7:5
discovery 16:17	Excuse 19:22	fully 8:15,16	10:21,24 11:1,5	Island 2:23
17:1,4 18:1,14,17	exhibit 16:20	furnish 19:24	14:16 15:5	issue 7:15 22:23
19:2,5,7,7,8 20:2	exhibits 16:21		helping 19:6	issued 8:4 18:18
discuss 9:25 10:15	expect 23:1	G	High 2:23	issues 14:4 16:14
discussed 11:10	expectation 21:12	G 4:4	hold 13:10,17	16:19
discussing 8:2	expenditures 7:8	Garlinghouse 1:20	Honor 5:5,21 6:11	items 8:2 11:18
discussion 9:7	experience 18:9	24:6,14	7:3 10:9 11:4	
21:16	21:13	general 2:7 4:15	12:7 13:12 14:14	J
discussions 22:22	explain 18:4	5:11 8:3 18:7	15:6 16:9 17:22	J 1:13 2:3
disposition 22:25	extent 7:9	General's 2:13	18:7 19:20	JEFF 2:7
distributed 20:6	extra 15:6	give 10:4 11:24	hour 9:23 10:11	jeff.roberson@u
distributions 8:12		14:9 22:4,7	15:14	2:10
Docket 4:18 21:24	F	go 4:6 10:7 13:13	hundreds 18:25	Jennifer 2:6 5:10
dockets 1:4 4:14	F 24:1	14:11 15:25 16:9		jennifer.camero
8:5 16:2	facilitate 19:7	17:25 18:3 19:21	<u> </u>	2:9
document 17:4	fact 12:5	going 12:3,3 14:5	idea 18:18	Jessica 3:14 6:11
documents 8:24	favor 13:22	17:10	identify 18:10,18	jessica.yarnall@
doing 12:6 13:22	feedback 9:25	good 4:7 5:9,21 6:1	21:1	3:16
doing 12.0 13.22 dozens 21:10	11:24 13:25	6:6,10,13 12:8,21	include 17:16	joint 16:14,18
uuzens 21.10	-	0.0,10,10 12.0,21	_	Jour 10.1 1,10
	I	1	1	1

				1 age 27
judge 1:13 2:2 4:6	<u> </u>	17:13	17:21,24 19:11	petitions 6:14,15
4:9 5:7,15,19,23		number 21:8	20:15,20 21:2,4	6:22,25 7:1,23
6:4,8,13 7:11,22	mark 12:1	number 21.0	20:13,20 21:2,4	physically 5:1
11:3,12,16 12:15	matrix 16:15,19	0	Oregon 3:5,11	piloted 18:7
13:13 14:1,22	matter 18:11,17,20	04:4	organizational	plan 15:13 21:18
15:8,25 16:24	19:4	O'Connell 1:13 2:3	17:17	please 6:9 7:12
17:8 18:3 19:9,18	matters 4:11	4:6,8 5:7,15,19,23	original 8:11,14	8:14,17,20,25
19:21 20:10,21	mean 7:17 20:12	6:4,8,13 7:11,22	original 0.11,14	13:14 15:18 18:3
21:12 22:11,20	meet 15:1	11:3,12,16 12:15	<u>Р</u>	20:21,23 21:5
judgments 21:9	meeting 10:7 14:12	13:13 14:1,22	P 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:4	PO 2:8,18
July 11:7,15,16,21	15:14	15:8,25 16:24	p.m 1:16 4:2,7	point 13:18
•	memorialized 7:24	17:8 18:3 19:9,18	15:24,24 16:3	portions 19:16
11:22,25 15:7,10 16:22	message 15:18	19:21 20:10,21	22:15 23:7	Portland 3:5,11
	Meyer 2:17 5:5,6,7	21:12 22:11,20	Pages 1:12	,
June 9:15,16 16:18	7:3,3,20 11:4,5,14	O-c-o-n-n-e-l-l 9:1	paper 3:8 6:5,7,24	possibility 13:8
16:19,19	12:7,21 16:25	000 4:3	8:11,15	possible 8:21
K	17:3 19:20,21,22	Oakland 3:15	participation 7:9	prehearing 1:11
kind 13:7	20:16 21:6,7 22:7	object 7:4	7:16	4:13,21,22 7:24
know 9:22 10:10,24	22:19	objection 7:10,21	particular 18:19	9:9,23 13:8,10,17 14:3 16:2 17:12
12:18,21 14:7,19	middle 15:1	17:20	particularly 11:17	
15:6,22 19:5	Milinovich 3:3 6:1	objections 6:25 7:1	parties 4:25 8:9,12	17:21,24 19:11
21:10	6:2	7:23	9:5,8,24 10:5,6	20:5,14,20 21:2,4
knowledge 24:9	moment 11:12	objectives 13:3	11:9 12:4,6,23,25	22:18,23
Kilowicuge 24.7	moments 12:24	occurring 17:5	13:2,23 14:3,12	Preliminarily 17:9
L	motion 4:17,20	offer 22:5	15:3,15,21 16:5	prepare 9:17
Lacey 1:19 4:1	21:21,22,23 22:1	office 2:13 5:13	17:15,20 18:10	presentation 17:18
law 1:13 2:2,22 4:9	22:3,6,8,15	Oh 19:22	19:10 20:7,11,12	presiding 4:10
lead 8:20	move 5:3 8:1 9:3	okay 5:3 6:21 7:22	20:17 21:1,9,13	pretty 9:22
let's 4:6 5:3,4 6:21	16:15 21:20	12:21 14:13 16:24	21:17,19,25 22:4	previous 12:18
15:20,25	moved 13:1	17:8 19:5,9,18	23:1	previously 17:15
letter 18:22		21:20 22:11,14,20	parties' 9:10 19:2	primarily 7:8,18,19
light 9:25	$\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}}$	23:5	partly 8:16	prior 12:22
limitation 21:8	N 2:1 3:1 4:4	Olympia 1:23 2:8	party 8:19 14:9	procedural 9:4,5
line 6:17	name 4:8 6:11	ones 6:16	17:16 20:23 22:12	14:5 16:5,10
list 16:20 18:13,16	names 8:22 19:24	open 11:22 13:10	pausing 11:12	19:14 21:4,5,17
19:24 20:19,22,23	20:1,25 21:10,11	19:3	PC 3:4,10	22:24
21:2	National 1:24	opinion 14:6,9	pending 18:8	proceed 6:21
listed 18:23	NE 2:23	opportunity 10:14	people 20:2	proceeding 5:12
literally 18:25	necessary 8:16	22:5	Pepple 3:9 6:6,7	8:25
little 12:19	need 13:20 14:23	oppose 14:15	14:14,14 15:4	process 18:25
LLC 1:21	15:15 22:17	opposed 14:10	period 11:7	processing 19:7
long 15:15	needs 9:17 19:5	opposing 13:20	person 20:25	Project 2:21 5:20
look 11:13	new 13:4 16:5 18:4	22:1,3,8,14	perspective 22:5	5:22 6:23
Loop 1:18	Nina 2:12 5:17	option 11:9 13:3	pertains 7:19	proposal 9:6 16:5
lot 19:3	nina.suetake@at	order 7:25 8:3,4	petition 4:19 6:18	propose 16:13,16
lunch 10:11	2:15	10:23 14:20 17:12	6:20 21:24	proposed 9:4,10,14
	notice 5:14 9:22	10.23 14.20 17.12	0.20 21.24	9:15,19,25 10:3
	I	I	I	I

				1 490 20
13:4 17:9,14	Reporter 24:7	22:22,24	sounds 15:4	tcp@dvclaw.com
22:22	Reporting 1:21	schedules 11:19	Southeast 1:18	3:12
protective 8:3,4	representative 8:20	13:20	speak 6:19 10:5,6	Teams 6:18 10:7
provided 9:4 20:2,4	20:1	School 2:23	10:10 14:4 19:1	14:12 15:14
Public 2:11 5:16,18			speaking 7:18	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	representatives 8:23	Seattle 1:22,23 2:14	. U	telephone 4:24 6:18
purpose 18:9			specifically 12:2	TELEPHONIC
push 10:13 14:18	representing 6:7	second 17:25 18:4	speculating 11:2	
pushes 14:19	6:12	see 4:25 14:24	Spokane 2:18	1:11
pushing 10:19 15:9	request 11:6 17:16	15:12 19:4	Square 1:18	tell 13:23
put 16:6	17:17 18:18,19,21	send 15:18 19:14	staff 2:5 4:17 5:8	tendency 13:16
0	18:22	20:8,17,21,23	5:11 8:23 12:22	tentative 11:18
	requested 8:2	21:5	16:25 18:8	test 12:8
quandary 20:7	requests 17:18	sending 16:11	Staff's 21:21,23	testimony 9:12,12
question 12:1	18:11,23,24 19:13	20:12,13	22:3,6,15	9:13 12:12,17
14:17 20:10	require 8:10	sense 19:9	staring 10:12	16:13,17
questions 14:21	requires 8:6	sent 10:3 17:14	start 12:22	thank 5:5,7,15,17
18:2	resolve 14:20	serve 8:9	State 24:3,7	5:19,23 6:4,13
quick 11:13	resolved 15:11	serves 18:21	step 10:7 14:11,12	11:5 12:7 16:8,24
R	resolving 14:4	service 8:7,20	15:12	17:8 19:18 22:11
	respect 7:6	session 12:22	stone 18:15	22:21,21 23:5
R 2:1 3:1 4:4 24:1	Respondent 1:9	set 9:20 18:15 22:1	Street 3:15	thing 10:21 13:22
rate 4:15 8:3 18:7	response 16:13	setting 11:21	stress 7:5	18:12 19:19
reach 12:5	17:6,16	settlement 16:16	strict 21:8	think 10:13,22,22
read 6:22 16:9	responses 4:20	seven 10:22	subject 18:11,17,19	13:21 14:5,16,20
realize 12:16	17:19 19:13 21:22	sharing 19:12	18:20 19:4	17:7,9 21:3
Realtime 1:21	21:25 22:2,6,14	short 5:3 9:11,22	submit 13:20	thirty 12:10
reasonable 15:4	restart 13:8	16:1	Suetake 2:12 5:17	thought 20:16 21:7
21:15	retained 16:22	Shorthand 24:6	5:18	thoughts 14:23
reasons 22:8	review 9:10	shortly 9:8 16:3	suggest 13:1	three 8:11,14 21:10
rebuttal 9:13,16,20	revised 13:9	22:24	Suite 1:22 2:13,23	THURSTON 24:4
12:11 16:16	right 6:17 7:20	Sierra 3:13 6:8,12	3:4,10,15	time 4:7 6:19 9:11
receive 13:10 18:25	Road 2:23	6:24 7:6,18	support 8:23	9:17 10:7 12:15
received 10:10	Roberson 2:7	Simon 2:22 5:22	sure 7:15 10:11	12:20 14:11,19
receiving 20:24	15:18	simon@ffitchlaw	surprised 14:24	15:2,3,12 16:3,21
reconvene 13:18	room 5:2	2:24	surrounding 7:8	17:6
record 4:6 14:11	roughly 12:10	simply 13:4	suspects 18:14	timeframe 21:22
15:20 16:1,4,6	rule 8:8	sinply 15.4 six 10:24 12:16,19	SW 3:4,10	22:10
23:6	Tule 0.0	14:24	switch 21:18	timeline 4:19 22:5
redacted 8:16,16	S	skill 24:9	5WILLII 21.10	22:13
referring 20:11	S 2:1 3:1 4:4	skii 24.9 slash 12:11	Т	today 4:13 11:11
relate 7:7	schedule 9:4,5,10	software 4:23	T 24:1,1	12:22 13:23 22:18
relatively 18:4	9:14,25 10:3,12	soltware 4:25 soon 8:21	take 7:17 11:13	tomorrow 13:5,5
remind 21:14	12:9,13,24 13:2,5	soon 8:21 sooner 14:7 15:19	15:2,2	13:11
repeat 9:7	13:9 14:5 15:9		taken 15:23	
report 13:4	16:5,10 17:9,14	15:22	talking 10:18 13:22	topic 18:24 21:17
REPORTED 1:20	19:14 21:5,17	sorry 21:5	Tayler 1:20 24:6,14	topics 18:14,22
	17.14 21.3,17	sort 20:23	Layici 1.20 24.0,14	21:18
	I	I	I	I

tracking 18:1 19:2	VOLUME 1:11	Y	3727 2:18	
transcript 24:8	vs 1:6	Yarnall-Loarie	38- 12:10	
Transportation 1:2		3:14 6:10,11 7:12	383 2:23	
1:4,18 4:10	W	7:14	389-2055 2:14	
true 24:8	want 8:1 9:3,7 11:9	yeah 19:22	39-day 12:10	
try 12:14 13:6	12:13 13:16,17	ycan 17.22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
trying 10:12 18:15	21:20,21 23:1	Z	4	
turn 7:11 16:6	wanted 7:5 12:8		450 3:4,10	
21:10	14:15	0	47250 2:8	
turns 7:17	wants 14:9 22:12		495-4316 2:19	
two 14:22 17:13,19	Washington 1:1,4	1	4th 1:22 15:7,10	
20:1	1:18,19,22 2:8,14	1-24 1:12		
Tyler 3:9 6:6 14:14	2:18,23 4:1,9 24:3	1:35 1:16 4:2,7	5	
	24:7	1:54 15:24	5:00 22:15	
U	way 3:4,10 15:1	1:55 15:13	503 3:5,11	
UE-200894 4:18	we'll 16:10	12th 11:22	509 2:19	
21:25	we're 4:13 10:18	1300 3:15	534-9066 1:23	
UE-200900 1:4	11:1 15:8 18:15	1325 1:22	5th 2:13	
4:14 16:2	19:1 20:7 23:5	13th 16:23	6	
UG-200901 1:4	we've 7:18 10:11	14 1:15 4:1	621 1:18	
4:15 16:3	16:22 18:12 20:4	16 11:22	664-1186 2:9	
unaware 6:25	Webster 3:15	1750 3:4,10	669-8197 2:24	
unchanged 19:17	Wednesday 11:14	17th 9:21	6th 11:16,18 16:16	
understand 11:3	16:13	18 16:18 22:2,16	0111110,1010.10	
15:8 18:5	week 9:21 11:16,22	1840 1:22	7	
understanding 7:7	12:17,18 14:18	2	7 11:25	
7:13,15 9:5 18:16	15:6,7 16:15 23:2	2:25 15:14,21 16:3	7th 11:7,15,21	
uniform 18:15	weekend 15:10	2:26 15:24	16:22	
unredacted 8:15	weeks 10:22,24	2:40 23:7		
unsure 11:20	12:16,19 14:25	2000 2:13	8	
update 10:4	Western 5:24 6:2	2020 1:15 4:1,15	8 11:25	
use 21:9	6:23	22:2,16	800 1:24 2:13	
usual 13:22 18:13	willing 20:18	206 1:23 2:14,24	846-6989 1:24	
usually 21:3	wish 6:18	21 16:13		
utc.wa.gov 9:2	Woodland 1:18	2101 3:15	9	
Utilities 1:2,4,8,18	work 10:24 12:3	21st 9:21	9 11:17,21,25 16:22	
4:9	17:9 20:3 working 18:13	241-7242 3:5,11	94612 3:15	
V	working 18:15 works 22:9	287-9066 1:23	97201 3:5,11	
Van 3:4,10	writing 6:16 13:21	28th 16:17	98101 1:22	
version 8:15,17	16:11	29th 9:15	98104 2:14	
12:25	written 6:25 9:12		98110 2:23	
versions 8:17	www.buellrealti	3	98503 1:19	
video 4:23	1:25	30th 16:15,19,19	98504 2:8	
virtual 4:13 14:3	1.20	321 2:23	99220 2:18 9th 0:16 11:7 15	
virtually 4:23	X	3358 1:20 24:14	9th 9:16 11:7,15	
		360 1:23 2:9		
	1	I	1	I