WUTC v. Cascadia Water, LLC

Docket No. UW-240151 - Vol. I

August 21, 2024



1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 Bellingham | Everett | Tacoma | Olympia | Yakima | Spokane Seattle 206.287.9066 Tacoma 253.235.0111 Eastern Washington 509.624.3261 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u> email: <u>audio@buellrealtime.com</u>

Page 1	Page 3
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	1 A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued)
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND) TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)) Complainant,) vs.) DOCKET NO. UW-240151) CASCADIA WATER, LLC,)) Respondent.)) PAGES 1-45 PREHEARING CONFERENCE - VOL. I August 21, 2024 BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE M. HAYLEY CALLAHAN Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop SE Lacey, Washington 98504 TRANSCRIBED BY: ELIZABETH PATTERSON HARVEY, WA CCR 2731	2 FOR INTERVENOR WATER CONSUMER ADVOCATES OF 3 WASHINGTON: 4 Kent E. Hanson 2345 Goodell Road 5 Freeland, Washington 98249 kent.hanson1@gmail.com 6 206.919.6684 7 8 Vicki Colburn 9 Amy Lehman 10 Eric W. Nelson Rick Smith 11 Jisong Wu 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES 2	1 August 21, 2024
FOR COMMISSION STAFF:	2 -000-
Lisa W. Gafken	3
4 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov Attorney General of Washington	4 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Good morning. We are here
5 PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504	 today for a prehearing conference in Docket UW-240151, which is captioned Washington Utilities and
6 360.664.1187 7 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:	 7 Transportation Commission versus Cascadia Water, LLC.
8 Tad Robinson O'Neill	8 My name is Hayley Callahan. I am an
Tad.ONeill@atg.wa.gov 9 Office of the Attorney General	 administrative law judge with the commission, and I will
Public Counsel Unit 10 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000	10 be presiding in this matter.
Seattle, Washington 98104	11 Let's start by taking appearances and
11 206.464.6595 12 FOR THE RESPONDENT:	12 addressing the petition for intervention. Let's begin
13 Pamela J. Anderson PJAnderson@perkinscoie.com	13 with Cascadia.
14 Byron Starkey	14 ATTORNEY ANDERSON Good morning, Judge
byronstarkey@perkinscoie.com 15 Perkins Coie LLP	15 Callahan. My name is Pam Anderson. I'm with the law
10885 Northeast Fourth Street	16 firm of Perkins Coie. I represent the petitioner,
Bellevue, Washington 98004	17 Cascade [sic] Water, LLC.
17 425.635.1400 18	18 With me in this virtual prehearing conference
FOR INTERVENOR WATER CONSUMER ADVOCATES OF	19 is Byron Starkey, also an attorney with Perkins Coie; and
19 WASHINGTON: 20 Judith A. Endejan	20 Eric Nelson, inhouse counsel for Cascade Water and NW
Jendejan@gmail.com 21 5109 23rd Ave W	21 Natural.
Everett, Washington 98203-1526	22 We also have a number of Cascadia Water
23 Stephen M. Todd	employees joining the prehearing conference. We're not
3845 Goldfinch Lane 24 Clinton, Washington 98236	24 going to add their names to the record, but we did want
stevetodd1864@gmail.com	25 you to know that there is a group, including the general

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

	Page 5		Page 7
1	manager, the rates and regulatory manager, the director	1	Bennett, Kent Hanson, Rick Smith, and Judy Endejan.
2	of accounting and finance, the office manager, and the	2	So I would like to turn the attention to
3	regional manager for the Pacific Northwest. In addition,	3	Ms. Endejan.
4	the vice president of rates and regulatory affairs for NW	4	ATTORNEY ENDEJAN: Yes, good morning, your
5	Natural, the parent company of Cascadia Water, is joining	5	Honor. I had
6	the prehearing conference.	6	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Good morning. Yes, I just
7	Thank you.	7	want to clarify something with you, if I may.
8	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Anderson, did you say	8	So you previously filed a notice of
9	that a representative from NW Natural is also present?	9	appearance with the commission on April 16, 2024, as the
10	ATTORNEY ANDERSON: That's Eric Nelson. He	10	counsel for this Advocates group.
11	is inhouse counsel for Cascadia Water and NW Natural,	11	You also indicated in the intervention
12	which is the parent company of Cascadia Water.	12	petition that you have withdrawn from the representation;
13	JUDGE CALLAHAN: I understand that. I just	13	however, I do not see you filed a motion to withdraw.
14	want to make sure, does he appear to be a representative	14	At this juncture, do you want to orally move
15 16	for the party because he's the parent company's counsel,	15 16	for a motion to withdraw your representation as the counsel for Water Consumer Advocates?
17	or does he appear to be just an observer? ATTORNEY NELSON: Your Honor, we have	17	ATTORNEY ENDEJAN: Good morning, your Honor.
18	retained outside counsel to represent Cascadia Water in	18	Yes, what is our intention is that I will file a notice
19	this matter. I am acting as internal coursel on behalf	19	of withdrawal as a formal representative of the
20	of the utility and its affiliates.	20	Advocates, and in that place will be Kent Hanson and
21	JUDGE CALLAHAN: I still am not sure. So are	21	Steve Todd as stated in the petition for intervention.
22	you a representative, or are you an observer, because you	22	So I am here at this prehearing conference
23	retained outside counsel to represent the company, so I	23	solely for the purpose of trying to address your
24	understand your role. I just want to clarify, though,	24	question. I don't blame you that you're probably
25	what is your role here?	25	confused about who's on first. So that's what our
	Page 6		Page 8
1	ATTORNEY NELSON: Yes. So I would say that I	1	intention is.
2	am an observer.	2	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Noted. So your motion to
3	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you.	3	withdraw is granted.
4	ATTORNEY NELSON: And it will be outside	4	Are there any petitions for intervention
5	counsel that will be representing us at this prehearing	5	other than the one that has been filed in writing?
6	conference.	6	Hearing none, let's proceed.
7	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Noted. Thank you.	7	Okay. There is an objection filed by the
8	ATTORNEY NELSON: Thank you.	8	company's counsels. The intervenor filed a reply to the
9	JUDGE CALLAHAN: All right. Let's go to	9	company's response dated August 20, 2024. That was
10 11	staff. Ms. Gafken?	10 11	yesterday. Since the intervenor did not file a motion
12	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Good morning, Judge Callahan. My name is Lisa Gafken. I'm an assistant	12	for leave to reply to that response as required by WAC
13	attorney general appearing on behalf of commission staff.	13	480-07-3705, the commission will not consider that reply.
14	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you.	14	The commission evaluates petitions to
15	Let's go to public counsel. Mr. O'Neill?	15	intervene on the standard of whether the intervenor has a
16	ATTORNEY ONEILL: Good morning, your Honor.	16	substantial interest in the proceeding or whether the
17	Tad Robinson O'Neill. I'm also an assistant attorney	17	intervenor will be in the public interest.
18	general appearing on behalf of public counsel.	18	I have reviewed the intervenor's petition,
19	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. Thank you.	19	and I found that Water Consumer Advocates may provide
20	So that brings us to the petition for	20	valuable input towards the completion of the record of
21	intervention. So on July 9, 2024, Water Consumer	21	this matter. Therefore, the petition to intervene is
22	Advocates of Washington filed a petition to intervene.	22	granted, subject to the condition that Water Consumer
23	The individuals that represent the Water Consumer	23	Advocates will not expand the issues of this proceeding;
			1 States and the state of th
24	Advocates of Washington named on the petition were	24	i.e., will not attempt to expand the issues beyond those
24 25	Advocates of Washington named on the petition were Stephen L. Todd, Vicki Colburn, Dr. Blaine Gilles, Dave	24 25	that are identified in the initial filing dated April 19,

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

	Page 9		Page 11
1	2024, and the complaint dated June 28, 2024.	1	So let's hear from Ms. Gafken.
2	Okay. This instruction will be in writing in	2	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Thank you. And I do
3	the prehearing conference order. Because there are some	3	understand the ruling. But I did want to state
4	folks I see that they might not be familiar with these	4	commission staff's thoughts and concerns about the
5	proceedings, I just want to let them know the background.	5	petition for intervention.
6	Okay?	6	Staff does not object to the customer's
7	So the next topic yes? I hear somebody	7	petition for intervention. But we do share many of the
8	trying to say something? No? Okay.	8	concerns articulated in Cascadia's response.
9	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Ms. Anderson, go ahead.	9	Our lack of objection is primarily based on
10	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Gafken, go ahead,	10	the idea that including more voices and perspectives
11	please.	11	usually derives better outcomes.
12	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Ms. Anderson came off of	12	And frankly, this group of customers are
13	mute. I do want to address the petition for intervention	13	particularly insistent in its criticism in the
14	as well. But I want to cede first to Ms. Anderson, and	14	commission's process, making it perhaps reasonable that
15	then I'll go, if that's okay with you.	15	they participate in the process with all of the rights
16	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. Ms. Anderson?	16	and responsibilities of a party so they witness the
17	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Thank you, your Honor. I	17	evidence-based decision making that occurs here at the
18	did understand that you were putting conditions on the	18	commission.
19	intervention by the consumers.	19	Admittedly, this does not necessarily meet
20	I'm not going to reiterate everything that	20	the requirements for intervention under WAC 480-07-355,
21	was in our document because I understand that you have	21	but is rather a more philosophical approach.
22	read it, but Cascadia Water has a significant concern	22	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay.
23	that it is not clear who the Water Advocates actually	23	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: I want to get on the
24	represent. They claim that they're a group that it's	24	record kind of the three areas of staff's concerns. And
25	undefined, and it's not clear under what authority the,	25	some of them are raised by the prehearing draft outline
	Page 10		Page 12
1	quote, executive committee or representatives actually	1	that the parties requesting intervention sent on Monday.
2	represent this undefined group of customers.	2	I won't go over in much detail the first
3	And we had asked for some guardrails or some	3	concern, which is we're not exactly certain who is
4	conditions that would require the advocates to identify	4	represented by the customer group. I think Ms. Anderson
5	the customers that they're representing.	5	set that out very clearly. And staff does support the
6	Typically the commission has allowed certain	6	requested guardrails and requirements because they do
7	501(c) organizations who have a unique interest to	7	address our concern there.
8	intervene. That doesn't appear to be the case here.	8	Our second bucket of concerns is about
9	There also appears to be individuals who are	9	expanding the scope of the proceeding or confusing the
10	not Cascadia Water customers, including the president of	10	issues. I think the requirements that you placed
11	a water system that receives wholesale service from	11	probably address this, but I want to highlight a couple
12	Cascadia and has been in negotiations in the past to	12	of the areas that were raised in the prehearing draft
13	transfer that system.	13	outline of examples where there might be an expansion or
14	Your Honor and the parties need to be sure	14	confusion of the issue.
15 16	that the individuals representing the group have the necessary authority and legal ability to enter into	15	One example is the intersection of DOH water
16 17	settlements, handle discovery, and make representations	16 17	system plans and UTC cost recovery. Water system plans are similar, I think, to energy integrated resource
18	to the commission.	18	planning. While the plan may inform prudence, it doesn't
18	Therefore, Cascadia Water would request that	19	govern prudence.
20	in addition to the conditions you just listed, you	20	Another example is water quality. The UTC is
20	consider additional conditions so that we at least know	20	the economic regulator, while the Department of Health
22	who this group is and the authority under which the	22	regulates water quality.
23	representatives claim to be representing them. Thank	23	They also indicate that discovery will be
24	you.	24	adversarial and may require motions to compel. While
25	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you.	25	discovery disputes are always a possibility in any
	·		

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

	Page 13	Page 1	15
1	litigation, such disputes that rise to the level of	1 do so here. But staff does not believe that it should be	
2	motion practice is fairly rare before the commission.	2 subjected to the approval of other parties or that it	
3	And it is concerning to staff that this is the assumption	3 should be required to interact in ways that go beyond	
4	that the customers come in with.	4 normal party interactions. Staff's role, similar to all	
5	The last example that I'll highlight is that	5 parties, is to present the best quality evidence to the	
б	they I'm sorry; they indicate that they will engage in	6 commission on which it can base its decisions.	
7	unusual motions practice, particularly involving	7 My third bucket of concerns, or staff's third	
8	confidential documents and staff's role.	8 bucket of concerns, is also about the duplication of	
9	With respect to confidentiality, I know we	9 public counsel's role. Public counsel is the statutory	
10	haven't talked about standard protective orders yet, but	10 consumer advocate in Washington for matters before the	
11	there is a request for that, and staff supports issuance	11 commission. Public counsel represents customers	
12	of a standard protective order in this case. And so	12 generally. They don't represent individuals or consumer	
13	confidentiality will be addressed through issuance of a	13 groups individually in proceedings before the commission	ı.
14	standard protective order.	14 As Ms. Anderson stated, customer groups have	
15	Parties do not automatically have access to	generally been required to show more than a general	
16	confidential information when that happens; but rather,	16 interest in the outcome of the case. And they provided	
17	parties signing the protective order will have access to	17 numerous examples in their response that I won't repeat	
18	confidential information. The Advocates have not clearly	18 here.	
19	indicated whether they would sign such a confidentiality	But I do want to add one example to that list	
20	agreement.	20 of examples, and that is CENSE, C-E-N-S-E, which is an	
21	With respect to staff's role, the consumer	21 acronym for the Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for	
22	seeks some sort of, quote/unquote, agreement from staff	22 Sensible Energy. That group intervened in Puget Sound	
23	regarding its role in this case. This is probably my	Energy's 2022 rate case, which was in Dockets UE-22006	66
24	biggest concern. Staff will have an opportunity to	²⁴ and UG-220067.	
25	engage in discovery, file testimony, and do all the	25 CENSE was interested in a very specific	
	Page 14	Page 1	16
1	Page 14 things necessary to build its response case. And staff	Page 1 capital investment, and that was a transmission project	16
1 2			16
	things necessary to build its response case. And staff	1 capital investment, and that was a transmission project	
2	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly.	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission 	
2 3	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget 	
2 3 4	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. 	
2 3 4 5	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ,	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight 	
2 3 4 5 6	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use 	t
2 3 4 5 6 7	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and 	t
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff.	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave 	t
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. 	t
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gav it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring 	t
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the 	t
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal 	t
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering 	t
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. 	t
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and presenting it through testimony and exhibits during this formal process. Based on the customer's prehearing draft	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. Here, we have a customer group whose interest 	t
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and presenting it through testimony and exhibits during this formal process. Based on the customer's prehearing draft outline, staff is concerned that it will not be afforded	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. Here, we have a customer group whose interest really is the general outcome of the case. And if the 	t
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and presenting it through testimony and exhibits during this formal process. Based on the customer's prehearing draft outline, staff is concerned that it will not be afforded the opportunity to develop its case if the customers are	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. Here, we have a customer group whose interest really is the general outcome of the case. And if the commission does grant the intervention, I would recommentary. 	tre
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and presenting it through testimony and exhibits during this formal process. Based on the customer's prehearing draft outline, staff is concerned that it will not be afforded the opportunity to develop its case if the customers are dissatisfied in some way with what they perceive to be	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. Here, we have a customer group whose interest really is the general outcome of the case. And if the commission does grant the intervention, I would recomme 	tre
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and presenting it through testimony and exhibits during this formal process. Based on the customer's prehearing draft outline, staff is concerned that it will not be afforded the opportunity to develop its case if the customers are dissatisfied in some way with what they perceive to be deficiencies. If granted intervention, they will have	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. Here, we have a customer group whose interest really is the general outcome of the case. And if the commission does grant the intervention, I would recomme that the commission not to abandon its standard of 	t re nd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and presenting it through testimony and exhibits during this formal process. Based on the customer's prehearing draft outline, staff is concerned that it will not be afforded the opportunity to develop its case if the customers are dissatisfied in some way with what they perceive to be deficiencies. If granted intervention, they will have the opportunity to respond to staff's case just as other	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. Here, we have a customer group whose interest really is the general outcome of the case. And if the commission does grant the intervention, I would recomme that the commission not to abandon its standard of requiring more than commentary and more than a general 	t re nd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and presenting it through testimony and exhibits during this formal process. Based on the customer's prehearing draft outline, staff is concerned that it will not be afforded the opportunity to develop its case if the customers are dissatisfied in some way with what they perceive to be deficiencies. If granted intervention, they will have the opportunity to respond to staff's case just as other parties will.	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. Here, we have a customer group whose interest really is the general outcome of the case. And if the commission does grant the intervention, I would recomme that the commission not to abandon its standard of requiring more than commentary and more than a general interest in the outcome to establish intervention, 	t re nd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and presenting it through testimony and exhibits during this formal process. Based on the customer's prehearing draft outline, staff is concerned that it will not be afforded the opportunity to develop its case if the customers are dissatisfied in some way with what they perceive to be deficiencies. If granted intervention, they will have the opportunity to respond to staff's case just as other parties will. As a general matter, staff regularly	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. Here, we have a customer group whose interest really is the general outcome of the case. And if the commission does grant the intervention, I would recomme that the commission not to abandon its standard of requiring more than commentary and more than a general interest in the outcome to establish intervention, 	t re nd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things necessary to build its response case. And staff will present its findings accordingly. To be clear, staff operates as a party in this proceeding separate from the decision-making arm of the commission, which consists of the commissioners, ALJ, and advisory staff. There is an ex parte wall that separates the decision-making arm of the commission from all of the parties, including commission staff. Staff will, as it does, apply its expertise and fulfill its duty in this case. I will note that staff did exactly this during the informal process before the tariff was suspended, and staff will continue to do this by reviewing the company's filing when it submits its direct case and by developing its response case and presenting it through testimony and exhibits during this formal process. Based on the customer's prehearing draft outline, staff is concerned that it will not be afforded the opportunity to develop its case if the customers are dissatisfied in some way with what they perceive to be deficiencies. If granted intervention, they will have the opportunity to respond to staff's case just as other parties will.	 capital investment, and that was a transmission project in Eastern King County. Prudence of the transmission project was at issue in that 2022 rate case because Puget Sound Energy was seeking cost recovery. Prior to the rate case, CENSE had, for eight or more years, participated in various land use proceedings, PSE's integrated resource planning, and other proceedings. That experience, CENSE argued, gave it a degree of expertise and perspective. And CENSE also indicated that it would bring in at least one external expert witness to address the issues. CENSE was a nonprofit organization with legal representation and the ability to participate by offering evidence beyond commentary. Given the specificity of CENSE's interests, they were granted intervention status in that rate case. Here, we have a customer group whose interest really is the general outcome of the case. And if the commission does grant the intervention, I would recomme that the commission not to abandon its standard of requiring more than commentary and more than a general interest in the outcome to establish intervention, 	t re nd

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

	Page 17		Page 19
1	commission may grant intervention in this case using its	1	to be shipped or trucked to Kitsap County. And residents
2	discretion.	2	of the various water systems may have differing interests
3	Thank you.	3	from each other.
4	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Ms. Gafken.	4	And ultimately, public counsel's
5	Now I'd like to turn to Mr. O'Neill. Would	5	representation of all consumers means that our
6	you like to give your comment to the intervention	6	representation doesn't necessarily line up with
7	motion?	7	individual groups of consumers.
8	ATTORNEY ONEILL: Yes, your Honor.	8	One example of that in this case is the
9	Public counsel supports the intervention of	9	single rate, which public counsel supports. There are
10	the Water Advocates in this matter.	10	and that's because we believe that in total, the public
11	In the Washington utility case against	11	will be benefited by sharing rates across multiple water
12	PacifiCorp, Docket UE-23171, Order 8 at paragraph 327,	12	systems. When there are projects in one system that we
13	the commission wrote: Staff, public counsel, and	13	have to pay for now, there will be projects in another
14	intervening parties all play a crucial role in developing	14	system later. And overall, public counsel supports that
15	the record and representing various facets of the public	15	approach. This group may well not support that approach.
16	interest in commission proceedings. The conflict and	16	And we have different definitions of what public
17	competition between the parties sharpens the debate and	17	interests are.
18	develops the record on all of the issues.	18	And they've articulated their we believe
19	In 1975, before public counsel existed, the	19	that they've articulated their benefit to this process
20	commission addressed whether attorney general	20	sufficiently to justify intervention.
21	participation in a matter precluded residents from also	21	To the extent that there are questions about
22	participating, and concluded that it did not. And that	22	which group or what group the membership participates, we
23	was in Docket U-74-1, the supplemental order from March	23	would welcome further clarification, but we don't know
24	31 of 1975.	24	that it's necessary to participate.
25	We take from these general principles that	25	As we understand from Mr. Todd and
	Page 18		Page 20
1	the key question is whether this group of advocates will	1	Mr. Hanson, they intend to present evidence and to
2	sharpen the debate and help develop the record on all the	1	
2		2	
3	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that	2	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to
			conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present
3	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that	3	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to
3 4	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that	3 4	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one
3 4 5	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop	3 4 5	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will
3 4 5 6	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record.	3 4 5 6	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of
3 4 5 6 7	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the	3 4 5 6 7	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures
3 4 5 7 8	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three	3 4 5 6 7 8	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443.
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, submit to time
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, and we think that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the regulations	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here. I am also confident in the ability of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the regulations in this matter.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here. I am also confident in the ability of the commission and the parties to focus the issues on this
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the regulations in this matter. There are significant reasons that this is	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, submit to time restrictions as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here. I am also confident in the ability of the commission and the parties to focus the issues on this rate case. And the example that Ms. Gafken gave, for
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the regulations in this matter. There are significant reasons that this is different than a large utility rate case where there are	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, submit to time restrictions as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here. I am also confident in the ability of the commission and the parties to focus the issues on this rate case. And the example that Ms. Gafken gave, for example, in the Department of Health is a different
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the regulations in this matter. There are significant reasons that this is different than a large utility rate case where there are hundreds of thousands of residents and issues involving	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, submit to time restrictions as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here. I am also confident in the ability of the commission and the parties to focus the issues on this rate case. And the example that Ms. Gafken gave, for example, in the Department of Health is a different regulatory body and sets water quality standards is true.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the regulations in this matter. There are significant reasons that this is different than a large utility rate case where there are hundreds of thousands of residents and issues involving joint use of resources; the natural gas and electricity	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here. I am also confident in the ability of the commission and the parties to focus the issues on this rate case. And the example that Ms. Gafken gave, for example, in the Department of Health is a different regulatory body and sets water quality standards is true. But the company has interjected DOH water quality
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the regulations in this matter. There are significant reasons that this is different than a large utility rate case where there are hundreds of thousands of residents and issues involving joint use of resources; the natural gas and electricity is used by all of the customers.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here. I am also confident in the ability of the commission and the parties to focus the issues on this rate case. And the example that Ms. Gafken gave, for example, in the Department of Health is a different regulatory body and sets water quality standards is true. But the company has interjected DOH water quality standards into its prudency calculations by defending
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the regulations in this matter. There are significant reasons that this is different than a large utility rate case where there are hundreds of thousands of residents and issues involving joint use of resources; the natural gas and electricity is used by all of the customers. Water cases involve intensely local	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here. I am also confident in the ability of the commission and the parties to focus the issues on this rate case. And the example that Ms. Gafken gave, for example, in the Department of Health is a different regulatory body and sets water quality standards is true. But the company has interjected DOH water quality standards into its prudency calculations by defending them, by reference to those. So it's not like all the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	issues. And we believe, or public counsel believes, that they have articulated a reasonable basis to believe that their participation will sharpen the debate and develop the record. Initially, public counsel notes that in the prior rate case, Cascadia Water case, the same group of advocates represented by Ms. Endejan participated successfully and productively, resulting in three different open meetings and a final resolution. They have done so in this matter as well, and nothing about their conduct has disrupted the process. And I don't there isn't a sufficient record to believe that they will not honor this commission's orders or the procedures that are imposed by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the regulations in this matter. There are significant reasons that this is different than a large utility rate case where there are hundreds of thousands of residents and issues involving joint use of resources; the natural gas and electricity is used by all of the customers.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conduct discovery in a unified manner and then present that evidence to the commission for the commission to weigh those issues. Whether that comes from one individual or multiple individuals, the evidence will speak for itself. We note that the Administrative Procedures Act specifically contemplates the aggregation of individuals into a single group. And that's at RCW 34-05-443. And whether this is a loose constellation of individuals or an organized group, the commission can require them to participate as an organized group, submit testimony as an organized group, and we think that that's probably appropriate here. I am also confident in the ability of the commission and the parties to focus the issues on this rate case. And the example that Ms. Gafken gave, for example, in the Department of Health is a different regulatory body and sets water quality standards is true. But the company has interjected DOH water quality standards into its prudency calculations by defending

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

	Page 21		Page 23
1	issues.	1	future.
2	And I have full confidence in the abilities	2	In terms of our interest in the case, I think
3	of this of the ALJ and of the parties to focus on the	3	it's already been noted what those are. They go beyond a
4	issues at hand.	4	general interest.
5	With respect to motions practice, the	5	The ratepayers have been asked to, by way of
6	regulations and administrative code provide for	6	the proposed tariff, to pay rates that are as much as 133
7	provisions for how to participate in discovery	7	percent above their current rates, a very large increase,
8	objections. I fully believe that the parties will abide	8	as I understand it, compared to what's typical in these
9	by those. And if to the extent that they are overly	9	kinds of proceedings. They have a substantial interest.
10	burdensome, these a remedy in the response.	10	It's direct. It's immediate. It's not general. We're
11	The parties nothing about the conduct of	11	not here to try simply to, you know, make some larger
12	the advocates to this point has indicated their inability	12	general point.
13	to follow the regulations and rulings of the court.	13	So in that regard, we have identified the
14	So in sum, public counsel supports the	14	issues in detail so that the commission knows what we
15	intervention. We believe that the commission should	15	think is important. And you can certainly indicate where
16	rightly narrow the issues to this rate case. And we	16	we have gone beyond the scope of the issues.
17	believe that the Water Advocates have indicated their	17	But the issues of, you know, reasonableness,
18	ability to participate meaningfully and sharpen the	18	fairness, justice, sufficiency, prudence, all are the
19	debate in this matter for a just resolution.	19	issues we've raised all fall under the rubric of those
20	So with that, I will pause my comments.	20	issues. And we have not gone far afield to try to open
21	Thank you.	21	other issues.
22	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. O'Neill.	22	We did note the possibility of discovery
23	Now I would like to turn to the advocate	23	disputes. And we did that only because we saw in the
24 25	group, either Mr. Todd or Mr. Hanson. Either of you can	24	practice of Cascadia of asserting comprehensive and
25	speak on behalf of your group.	25	overly broad claims of confidentiality to documents as
	Page 22		Page 24
1	MR. HANSON: Thank you, your Honor. You	1	everyday as contractor invoices, where we're trying to
2	know, help focus my comments, because there have been a	2	find out whether the costs were justified or prudent and
3	number of issues raised. I would be happy to address any	3	they claim invoices are confidential, to us that was a
4	particular questions that you might have about our	4	flag. It's a flag that Cascadia was seeking to hide from
5	participation.	5	us information that was critical to the proceeding. Now
6	I will say that well, I'd also like to	6	granted, we have not had party status. But, you know, if
7	apologize for filing a reply without having filed a	7	we we saw that as a warning sign, and that's why we
8	motion. And if it would help expedite the development of	8	included it as a possible issue to be addressed in this
9	the record, you know, if I could ask permission to have	9	proceeding.
10	that reply permission entered nunc pro tunc to have that	10	Let's see. Oh, the who we are. In the
11	reply made part of the record, or if I could incorporate	11	Water Consumer Advocates' filing of public comments, they
12	the comments in that reply as part of my comments here,	12	attached an exhibit in June to the comments filed in
13	that will, you know, maybe expedite some of the	13	June. And that exhibit contains a list of many people
14	proceedings this morning.	14	who have contacted the Advocates group to say, We agree
15	So we Mr. Todd and I are experienced	15	with you. And we you know, We support your comments.
16	litigators. We have litigated in many forums. I have	16	A lot of these people also submitted independent public
17	litigated in the state courts not in Washington State,	17	comments, but not everybody. And so that's the
18	but in other state courts and in federal courts across	18	foundation of our participation.
19	the country. And I have also litigated a number of cases	19	And in terms of aggregating those kinds of
20	dealing with administrative law, although not with public	20	comments so that they can be presented in an efficient
21	utilities law.	21	and concise manner to the commission, you know, Advocates
22	I know how these proceedings go in general;	22	is an effective vehicle for that. We communicate with
23	although I will confess, as indicated by the filing of	23 24	those people. We send out emails to those people to let
24 25	our reply without permission, that I missed some of the finer detail, and I will work hard not to do that in the	24	them know what is going on. We ask them to respond and to give us their input on what they think should happen
		- 20	
25			

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

	Page 25		Page 27
1	in their best interest in this case.	1	have been involved since the first rate case that
2	And so we funnel all that information, and we	2	Cascadia filed and are very familiar with the individuals
3	will present it through Mr. Todd and myself as seasoned	3	who have expressed an interest in us advocating on their
4	advocates in order to try to bring the most relevant	4	behalf. So that executive committee will make the
5	information to the commission so that it can make the	5	decision.
6	best decision in this case.	6	And I'd point out that that doesn't really
7	Thank you.	7	present a problem, for example, for settlement. If we
8	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mr. Hanson, I have a couple	8	if we as an organization, our executive committee
9	questions for you. So I listened to Ms. Gafken and	9	approves a settlement, that will be binding on the
10	Ms. Anderson's concerns. I do share similar concerns.	10	organization as a party.
11	So number one, I would like to ask you who	11	And if any individual pops up and says, Well,
12	how the Advocates are organized. Do you object to share	12	I didn't approve that, well there's an obvious remedy to
13	a member list?	13	that. You could have moved yourself to intervene and to
14	MR. HANSON: We do not object to sharing a	14	participate in settlement negotiations.
15	list of people who have contacted us, since I've	15	So this, you know, imaginary concern about
16	indicated we've already filed that in the context of the	16	these stray people not participating in the settlement or
17	comments earlier.	17	whatever is really not a real issue.
18	But I would note that there is that the	18	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. Thank you.
19	rules allow the intervention of any organization,	19	So Mr. Hanson, are you willing to drop
20	regardless of how it's constituted. And we will I	20	some of the issues identified by Ms. Gafken?
21	acknowledge we do not have a formal organization. We	21	MR. HANSON: I will oh, the issues
22	have not incorporated for the purposes of this proceeding	22	identified by Ms. Gafken?
23	to create a corporation or nonprofit corporation of any	23	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. If you don't
24	kind.	24	remember, you don't need to give me the answer right now.
25	We are, however, well organized and	25	I just want to give you, like, a general idea what is
	-		
		1	
	Page 26		Page 28
1	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a	1	your position.
2	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture,	2	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first
2 3	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more	2 3	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said
2 3 4	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are.	2 3 4	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues
2 3 4 5	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative,	2 3 4 5	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those
2 3 4 5 6	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into	2 3 4 5 6	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be
2 3 4 5 6 7	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present	2 3 4 5 6 7	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this point, more than a couple hundred people, focusing their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this point, more than a couple hundred people, focusing their comments, and being able to present them to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying to do a very focused, pointed argument of the issues that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this point, more than a couple hundred people, focusing their comments, and being able to present them to the commission efficiently.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying to do a very focused, pointed argument of the issues that are relevant in this case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this point, more than a couple hundred people, focusing their comments, and being able to present them to the commission efficiently. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying to do a very focused, pointed argument of the issues that are relevant in this case. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Mr. Hanson. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people, focusing their comments, and being able to present them to the commission efficiently. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Hanson. So who has the authority in your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying to do a very focused, pointed argument of the issues that are relevant in this case. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Mr. Hanson. So whether the Advocates will agree to confidential
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this point, more than a couple hundred people, focusing their comments, and being able to present them to the commission efficiently. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Hanson. So who has the authority in your organization, and how will decisions be made if there is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying to do a very focused, pointed argument of the issues that are relevant in this case. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Mr. Hanson. So whether the Advocates will agree to confidential agreement, will your group be agreeing to that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this point, more than a couple hundred people, focusing their commission efficiently. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Hanson. So who has the authority in your organization, and how will decisions be made if there is a settlement?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying to do a very focused, pointed argument of the issues that are relevant in this case. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Mr. Hanson. So whether the Advocates will agree to confidential agreement, will your group be agreeing to that? MR. HANSON: Yes. You know, I think we would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this point, more than a couple hundred people, focusing their comments, and being able to present them to the commission efficiently. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Hanson. So who has the authority in your organization, and how will decisions be made if there is a settlement? MR. HANSON: We have an executive committee	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying to do a very focused, pointed argument of the issues that are relevant in this case. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Mr. Hanson. So whether the Advocates will agree to confidential agreement, will your group be agreeing to that? MR. HANSON: Yes. You know, I think we would ask that the confidentiality agreements be you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this point, more than a couple hundred people, focusing their comments, and being able to present them to the commission efficiently. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Hanson. So who has the authority in your organization, and how will decisions be made if there is a settlement? MR. HANSON: We have an executive committee that is as we indicated in our petition for intervention.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying to do a very focused, pointed argument of the issues that are relevant in this case. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Mr. Hanson. So whether the Advocates will agree to confidential agreement, will your group be agreeing to that? MR. HANSON: Yes. You know, I think we would ask that the confidentiality agreements be you know, that the persons able to enter into those confidentiality
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	communicating with people. And if you needed to put a label on us, we are in the nature of a joint venture, which is defined as any agreement between two or more persons to pursue a common project. And here we are. So, you know, if, you know, the alternative, you know, to get the comments of all these people into the commission appropriately and to allow them to present evidence, not only their general comments, but more specific expert testimony, including a Ph.D. economist with vast experience in regulatory matters will help us with the analysis, will help us focus on what's relevant to this proceeding, you know. And, you know, a water system operator who knows these issues can help us too. What we're doing is we're taking these diverse you know, a couple hundred people at this point, more than a couple hundred people, focusing their comments, and being able to present them to the commission efficiently. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Hanson. So who has the authority in your organization, and how will decisions be made if there is a settlement? MR. HANSON: We have an executive committee	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your position. MR. HANSON: Well, you know, my first reaction is I will review the two documents that you said at the outset of this hearing. We'll define the issues in this case. And anything that is outside of those issues, you know, you know, would seem to me to be inappropriate for us to pursue. You know, there might be something that those documents fail to include, in which case I might, you know, ask for leave to raise an issue. But we're not going to willy-nilly just try to, you know, raise a bunch of issues. It's not in our interest, either as, you know, just as parties to this case or in the interests of Mr. Todd or myself, who, you know, are not exactly participating in this with a huge bunch of staff and resources backing us up. We're trying to do a very focused, pointed argument of the issues that are relevant in this case. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Mr. Hanson. So whether the Advocates will agree to confidential agreement, will your group be agreeing to that? MR. HANSON: Yes. You know, I think we would ask that the confidentiality agreements be you know,

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

	Page 29		Page 31
1		1	
1 2	committee, so that they have the information so that they can make decisions on behalf of the organization, and,	1 2	look again at some of the conditions we suggested. Thank you.
∠ 3	you know, decide what's appropriate for the next steps	3	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Ms. Anderson.
4	for Mr. Todd and myself to argue in this case; and that	4	I'm going to turn back for Mr. Hanson to
5	we also be able to share it with any expert witnesses.	5	respond to Ms. Anderson's comment. Mr. Hanson?
6	But of course, you know, my expectation is	6	MR. HANSON: Yes. The organization had a
7	these things, in my experience, normally play out is that	7	
8	each of those individuals will sign a confidentiality	8	name change. But even when they filed their comments, the people listed on those comments in the exhibit
9	agreement themselves, you know, so the parties that will	9	included residents of Whidbey Island, who had already
10	be bound will be specified and known to all the other	10	approached the organization and said, We agree with your
11	participants in this case.	11	concerns.
12	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.	12	And so we have simply done a name change.
13	The last question I have for you is within	13	You might think of it as a d/b/a, just as NW Natural,
14	your group, who will be privy to the confidential	14	Cascadia's holding company, has a d/b/a on Whidbey Island
15	information?	15	doing business as a satellite management agency.
16	MR. HANSON: Well, as I said, anybody who	16	So, you know, the fact that we have a name
17	signs a confidentiality agreement. And it would be the	17	change does not affect in any way any of the substantive
18	executive committee and Mr. Todd and I play two roles:	18	issues around our participation. Again, it's an illusory
19	We're on the executive committee, and we're the	19	issue here.
20	designated representatives in this proceeding; and then	20	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.
21	with experts, so we can share confidential information	21	I think I have heard enough, each party's
22	with our experts so they can formulate the appropriate	22	comment.
23	expert opinion on their relevant issue.	23	I would like to move to my next item. Okay.
24	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you.	24	Let's talk about the effective date.
25	So I have listened to all the parties'	25	So okay. So company filed a replacement page
	Page 30	1	
	idge so		Page 32
1	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant	1	Page 32 for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1,
1 2		1	Ū.
	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant		for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1,
2	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention.	2	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1.
2 3	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions	2 3	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted
2 3 4	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing.	2 3 4	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am
2 3 4 5	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of	2 3 4 5	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct.
2 3 4 5 6	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes?	2 3 4 5 6	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor?	2 3 4 5 6 7	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And the petition was filed on behalf of the Water Consumer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And the petition was filed on behalf of the Water Consumer Advocates of Washington.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff does agree with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And the petition was filed on behalf of the Water Consumer Advocates of Washington. And this, as we noted in our opposition, is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff does agree with the proposed schedule.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And the petition was filed on behalf of the Water Consumer Advocates of Washington. And this, as we noted in our opposition, is the third iteration of the group. And that just, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff does agree with the proposed schedule. I would add and I did run this by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And the petition was filed on behalf of the Water Consumer Advocates of Washington. And this, as we noted in our opposition, is the third iteration of the group. And that just, I think, sort of puts a finer point on it's not clear who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff does agree with the proposed schedule. I would add and I did run this by the parties, and I heard from almost everybody. I didn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And the petition was filed on behalf of the Water Consumer Advocates of Washington. And this, as we noted in our opposition, is the third iteration of the group. And that just, I think, sort of puts a finer point on it's not clear who this group is. And I would just like to make that point	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff does agree with the proposed schedule. I would add and I did run this by the parties, and I heard from almost everybody. I didn't hear specifically from the Consumer Advocates. But or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And the petition was filed on behalf of the Water Consumer Advocates of Washington. And this, as we noted in our opposition, is the third iteration of the group. And that just, I think, sort of puts a finer point on it's not clear who this group is. And I would just like to make that point so that you can understand why we have a concern.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff does agree with the proposed schedule. I would add and I did run this by the parties, and I heard from almost everybody. I didn't hear specifically from the Consumer Advocates. But or the Customer Advocates.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And the petition was filed on behalf of the Water Consumer Advocates of Washington. And this, as we noted in our opposition, is the third iteration of the group. And that just, I think, sort of puts a finer point on it's not clear who this group is. And I would just like to make that point so that you can understand why we have a concern. And I appreciate that you're going to go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff does agree with the proposed schedule. I would add and I did run this by the parties, and I heard from almost everybody. I didn't hear specifically from the Consumer Advocates. But or the Customer Advocates. The one change that I would propose is with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concerns. I'm going to stand by my ruling to grant intervention. But I will give the company's conditions further consideration and may include some in writing. I will also enter into advisement of Ms. Gafken's concerns. So let's ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: If I may? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ANDERSON I don't mean to interrupt you. I would just like to make one point as relates to the idea of a group. Mr. Hanson spoke about comments that were filed. And the comments were filed by the consumer the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. And the petition was filed on behalf of the Water Consumer Advocates of Washington. And this, as we noted in our opposition, is the third iteration of the group. And that just, I think, sort of puts a finer point on it's not clear who this group is. And I would just like to make that point so that you can understand why we have a concern.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for the tariffs, put down the effective date as July 1, 2024, where the original tariff filing was June 1. For the sake of clarification, I just wanted to confirm that the effective date was July 1, 2024. Am I right, Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that's correct. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you. So before the conference call today, the parties provided a proposed procedural schedule. So there appear to be no conflicts with regard to the days in the proposed procedural schedule. Do all the parties agree to the procedural schedule at this point? ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, this is Lisa Gafken for commission staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff does agree with the proposed schedule. I would add and I did run this by the parties, and I heard from almost everybody. I didn't hear specifically from the Consumer Advocates. But or the Customer Advocates.

	Page 33		Page 35
1	follows what is generally done in rate cases.	1	out the date. So two public comment hearing dates is not
2	So, you know, until response testimony is filed	2	a problem. We can have that, okay?
3	on November 20, the response time would be the standard	3	So I'm going to pause and mute myself right
4	ten days, ten business days.	4	now.
5	On November 20, once when parties file	5	(Recess.)
6	their response testimony, discovery responses would	6	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Will one of the parties now
7	reduce in time to seven business days. And that would	7	read the procedural schedule into the record?
8	remain in effect until cross answering and rebuttal	8	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Judge Callahan, I've been
9	testimony is filed on January 10.	9	tapped to read the schedule into the record, starting
10	At that time, discovery responses would be	10	with the prehearing conference that's occurred today on
11	due in five business days.	11	August 21, 2024.
12	My understanding is that there's general	12	The company will file its direct case on
13	agreement on that. And it's important because the	13	September 26, 2024.
14	schedule assumes that ratcheting down of discovery	14	The parties will hold a settlement conference
15	response times, and it really comes into play when we	15	on October 15, 2024.
16	look at the discovery cutoff deadline and the due date	16	Let me pause for just a second. I know the
17	for the cross exhibits. That really assumes that	17	Advocates had also raised the issue of assigning a
18	five-day window.	18	mediator. Staff would also like to make that request,
19	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So I'm going to have	19	but after we talk about schedule. So that date, we've
20	a recess to allow the parties to iron out these	20	penciled in October 15 for the settlement date. But if
21 22	procedures. There are two things I want to point out,	21 22	we are granted a mediator not a celestial body, but a
22	though: So one thing, there was a typo in the e-mail that one of the parties sent to me that the date was	22	mediator that date might change. But for now we've put in October 15 as the date we're all available.
23 24	2026. It should be 2025, regarding some of the briefs.	23	Going back to the list here, we have staff,
25	And then just for the sake of clarification,	25	public counsel, and intervenor response testimony due on
	Page 34		Daga 26
			Page 36
1	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open	1	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses
1 2	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it	1 2	
2 3	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing	2 3	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time
2 3 4	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure	2 3 4	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days.
2 3 4 5	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that.	2 3 4 5	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times
2 3 4 5 6	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to	2 3 4 5 6	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days.
2 3 4 5 6 7	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule.	2 3 4 5 6 7	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring in the evening.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Given the level of public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Given the level of public participation and interest, I don't think one is enough.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring in the evening. The discovery cutoff deadline would be January
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Given the level of public participation and interest, I don't think one is enough. Are there dates available in January on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring in the evening. The discovery cutoff deadline would be January 17, 2025.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Given the level of public participation and interest, I don't think one is enough. Are there dates available in January on the commission schedule that you can give us now and we can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring in the evening. The discovery cutoff deadline would be January 17, 2025. Cross exhibits cross estimates and errata
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Given the level of public participation and interest, I don't think one is enough. Are there dates available in January on the commission schedule that you can give us now and we can incorporate into our final request after we return? JUDGE CALLAHAN: I don't have it right now because I have to run by the commissioner's schedules.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring in the evening. The discovery cutoff deadline would be January 17, 2025. Cross exhibits cross estimates and errata would be due on January 8, 2025.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Given the level of public participation and interest, I don't think one is enough. Are there dates available in January on the commission schedule that you can give us now and we can incorporate into our final request after we return? JUDGE CALLAHAN: I don't have it right now because I have to run by the commissioner's schedules. So I would propose that you guys talk about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring in the evening. The discovery cutoff deadline would be January 17, 2025. Cross exhibits cross estimates and errata would be due on January 8, 2025. The evidentiary hearing would take place on February 4, 2025. Posthearing briefs would be due on February
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Given the level of public participation and interest, I don't think one is enough. Are there dates available in January on the commission schedule that you can give us now and we can incorporate into our final request after we return? JUDGE CALLAHAN: I don't have it right now because I have to run by the commissioner's schedules. So I would propose that you guys talk about it during the break. And then I will do my piece and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring in the evening. The discovery cutoff deadline would be January 17, 2025. Cross exhibits cross estimates and errata would be due on January 8, 2025. The evidentiary hearing would take place on February 4, 2025. Posthearing briefs would be due on February 25, 2025.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Given the level of public participation and interest, I don't think one is enough. Are there dates available in January on the commission schedule that you can give us now and we can incorporate into our final request after we return? JUDGE CALLAHAN: I don't have it right now because I have to run by the commissioner's schedules. So I would propose that you guys talk about it during the break. And then I will do my piece and I will find out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring in the evening. The discovery cutoff deadline would be January 17, 2025. Cross exhibits cross estimates and errata would be due on January 8, 2025. The evidentiary hearing would take place on February 4, 2025. Posthearing briefs would be due on February 25, 2025. Reply briefs would be due on March 11,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	so the briefing should be post-hearing, but not open briefs or I don't remember a reply brief, because it would not make sense to have them due after the hearing day. So when you read into the record, just make sure you're aware of that. So I'm going to have a recess right now to allow the parties to talk about a hearing schedule. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Before you go, this is public counsel. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Can I put on the schedule proposed to have two public comment hearings in January of 2025? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Given the level of public participation and interest, I don't think one is enough. Are there dates available in January on the commission schedule that you can give us now and we can incorporate into our final request after we return? JUDGE CALLAHAN: I don't have it right now because I have to run by the commissioner's schedules. So I would propose that you guys talk about it during the break. And then I will do my piece and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	November 20, 2024. And at this time, discovery responses will be due within seven days. Prior to November 20, discovery response time will be ten business days. After November 20, discovery response times are seven business days. Next we have company rebuttal and all other party cross answering. That will be due on January 10, 2025. And at that time, discovery will be due in five business days. We've requested two January public comment hearings if the commission has those available. The parties do agree that virtual would be beneficial, and the parties are okay with having both of those occurring in the evening. The discovery cutoff deadline would be January 17, 2025. Cross exhibits cross estimates and errata would be due on January 8, 2025. The evidentiary hearing would take place on February 4, 2025. Posthearing briefs would be due on February 25, 2025.

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

	Page 37		Page 39
1	And that is the suspension date is the	1	July 1. That means the suspension date will be May 1,
2	last date, which is July 1, 2025.	2	2025.
3	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. Thank you.	3	ATTORNEY ANDERSON: That's correct. Thank
4	So okay. So let's get the public comment	4	you. May 1, 2025.
5	hearings TBD for now. The commissioner may not preside	5	JUDGE CALLAHAN: So just want to put that in
6	at that in this proceeding, but I will confirm and	6	the record. It's May 1 because of the change in the
7	then get back to the parties.	7	effective date.
8	So now, let's go to my next item. So we	8	So now let's see. Okay.
9	talked about discovery, right? The parties agreed to	9	So Ms. Anderson, the company has submitted a
10	provide all parties with each data request at the time it	10	claim of confidentiality letter dated April 12, 2024. So
11	is propounded, and each data request response at the time	11	do the parties request a protective order to be issued?
12	it is served on the requester.	12	ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. We do.
13	That is the and the data request, the	13	And at this time, we at least the company
14	parties are proposing that the data request response time	14	and I won't speak for the others, but we believe the
15	is normal ten business days, and the onset and five	15	standard protective order would be adequate.
16	business day okay. So the parties agree to a	16	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So an order will be
17	five-business-day response time for data requests.	17	issued granting the motion in conjunction with the
18	Any additional comments from the parties?	18	prehearing conference order for this matter. So I will
19	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: This is Lisa from staff.	19	issue a protective order.
20	I just wanted to highlight what you just	20	And just some issue I just wanted to address
21	covered in terms of providing all data requests to all	21	is a standard issue regarding electronic filing and
22	parties and then all responses to all parties. That is a	22	electronic service. I just want to read that in the
23	unique part of our practice, and I wanted to just	23	record.
24	highlight that for the intervenors. We used to file me	24	The commission requires electronic filing of
25	too, the me too, I want all of the discovery.	25	documents for normal filings.
	Page 38		Page 40
1	rage 50		rage to
		1	
	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Right.	1	Also, the commission's rules provide for
2	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion	2	electronic service of documents. The commission will
2 3	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So	2 3	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will
2 3 4	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of	2 3 4	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically.
2 3 4 5	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will	2 3 4 5	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water
2 3 4 5 6	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody.	2 3 4 5 6	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington
2 3 4 5 6 7	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks.	2 3 4 5 6 7	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have misspoken earlier, which prompted a change in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is Hayleycallahan@UTC.wa.gov. You all have my e-mail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have misspoken earlier, which prompted a change in the procedural schedule which Ms. Gafken read into the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is Hayleycallahan@UTC.wa.gov. You all have my e-mail address.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have misspoken earlier, which prompted a change in the procedural schedule which Ms. Gafken read into the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is Hayleycallahan@UTC.wa.gov. You all have my e-mail address. So is there anything else we need to address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have misspoken earlier, which prompted a change in the procedural schedule which Ms. Gafken read into the record. It was my understanding that the parties had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is Hayleycallahan@UTC.wa.gov. You all have my e-mail address. So is there anything else we need to address today?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have misspoken earlier, which prompted a change in the procedural schedule which Ms. Gafken read into the record. It was my understanding that the parties had agreed that May 1 would be the suspension date. And I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is Hayleycallahan@UTC.wa.gov. You all have my e-mail address. So is there anything else we need to address today? Hearing none
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have misspoken earlier, which prompted a change in the procedural schedule which Ms. Gafken read into the record. It was my understanding that the parties had agreed that May 1 would be the suspension date. And I think I misunderstood your earlier question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is Hayleycallahan@UTC.wa.gov. You all have my e-mail address. So is there anything else we need to address today? Hearing none ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff has one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have misspoken earlier, which prompted a change in the procedural schedule which Ms. Gafken read into the record. It was my understanding that the parties had agreed that May 1 would be the suspension date. And I think I misunderstood your earlier question. JUDGE CALLAHAN: May 1 suspension date,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is Hayleycallahan@UTC.wa.gov. You all have my e-mail address. So is there anything else we need to address today? Hearing none ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff has one JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes, Ms. Gafken.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have misspoken earlier, which prompted a change in the procedural schedule which Ms. Gafken read into the record. It was my understanding that the parties had agreed that May 1 would be the suspension date. And I think I misunderstood your earlier question. JUDGE CALLAHAN: May 1 suspension date, that's my understanding as well because the original	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is Hayleycallahan@UTC.wa.gov. You all have my e-mail address. So is there anything else we need to address today? Hearing none ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff has one JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes, Ms. Gafken. ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Sorry. Staff has one thing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: And the judges' discussion there eliminated the necessity to do that me too DR. So we will all file not file; we will all serve all of our discovery on everybody, and all of the responses will also be served on everybody. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thanks. So it looks to me that discovery is agreed upon with the parties. And the parties agree to provide all parties with each data request at the time it is propounded and each data request response at the time it is served on the requester. At this point, any comments from the parties other than Ms. Gafken? ATTORNEY ANDERSON Your Honor, this is Pam Anderson on behalf of Cascadia. I believe I may have misspoken earlier, which prompted a change in the procedural schedule which Ms. Gafken read into the record. It was my understanding that the parties had agreed that May 1 would be the suspension date. And I think I misunderstood your earlier question. JUDGE CALLAHAN: May 1 suspension date,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically, and the parties will serve each other electronically. And I already received an NOA from the Water Advocates. The Water Consumer Advocates of Washington filed a notice of appearance August 18, 2024, designating Steve Todd and Kent Hanson as their representatives. I just want to read that in the record. And the (inaudible) addition of supporting staff, also if anyone would like to add names and e-mail addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please e-mail that to us as well. Okay? So my e-mail address is Hayleycallahan@UTC.wa.gov. You all have my e-mail address. So is there anything else we need to address today? Hearing none ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff has one JUDGE CALLAHAN: Yes, Ms. Gafken.

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

1 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Please. 1 participation of a judicial officer is very helpful. And 2 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff would like to request 3 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Clay. So thank you, 4 At the June 27, 2024, open meeting. 3 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Clay. So thank you, 4 At the June 27, 2024, open meeting. 3 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Clay. So thank you, 7 addresses mediation in commission dockets. 7 N Harson. 7 addresses mediation in commission dockets. 7 N Harson. N 9 settlement conferences since June 27. And prior to that, 10 Norther ANDERSON: Your Honor, Cascadia 10 discuss this case. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Clay. So is there any objection right now? Norther ANDERSON: Your Honor, Cascadia 11 public coursel, and Cascadia have provided substantial information, but at times it fields like we are taking particular value to that. It's just think as a group, Norther MassON: No. No objection. 10 mediator cas break through some of the logiams that many avist among the parties. Norther MassON: No. No objection. 11 particular value to that. It's just think as a group, Norther MassON: No. No objection. 12 modidiator oserue as the mediator, they would are to serve		Page 41		Page 43
2 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff would like to request mediation. 2 that's what I would request in this case. 3 mediation. 3 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you, 4 At the June 27, 2024, open meeting, 3 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you, 5 commissioner Rendahl mentioned a mediation as a possibility to resolving this case. 1 Id in ot hear from Ms. Anderson, because multiple parties were taiking. Do you have any objection in Son Anderson? 7 addresses mediation in commission dockets. 7 8 The parties have engaged in three informal information, but at time embers of the intervenors, to discuss this case. 10 12 discuss this case. 11 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So is there any objection in projeve to mediate, not necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate, not necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate, not necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate, not necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate, not necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate, not necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate, not necessarily and LJ, just and LJ, sut we will go ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a updified employee to serve as the mediator provant to we diate mediator to serve as a mediator, which would a qualified employee to serve as the mediator provant as a mediator. While we serve as the mediator would how outside mediator, which would a fueld employee to serve as the mediator provands as a	2	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Please.	1	participation of a judicial officer is very helpful. And
3 mediation. 3 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So thank you, 4 At the June 27, 2024, open meeting, Mr. Hanson. 5 Commissioner Rendahl mentioned a mediation as a mitigipe parties were taking. Do you have any 9 addresses mediation in commission dockets. mitigipe parties were taking. Do you have any 9 settlement conferences since June 27. And prior to that, staff held three informal informational sessions with 9 settlement conferences since June 27. And prior to that, staff held three informal informational sessions with 11 customers, including members of the intervenors, to JUDGE CALLAHAN: Now, So is there any 12 discuss this case. 11 13 These interactions have indicated that a 13 14 mediator caub cast inny respects. J cloin ta assign any 16 16 information, but at times it feels like we are taking 17 18 particular value to that. It's just I think as a group, 18 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a 100EC CALLAHAN: Hearing none. No objection. 12 Staff requests that the commission assign a 21 13 mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 23	2	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Staff would like to request	2	
4 At the June 27, 2024, open meeting, 4 Mr. Hanson. 5 Commissioner Rendahl mentioned a mediation as a possibility to resolving this case. WAC 480-07-710 5 I did not hear from Ms. Anderson, because multiple parties were taiking. Do you have any objection, Ms. Anderson? 7 addresses mediation in commission dockets. 7 ONENCY ANDERSON: Your Honor, Cascadia 9 settlement conferences since June 27. And prior to that, outsomers, including members of the intervenors, to discuss this case. 7 Objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate, not necessarily an ALJ, Just a UTC employee to mediate? 12 discuss this case. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. All right. So we discuss a statement conferences assistance. In my experience, a mediator can break through some of the logiams that may capted to modiate not assign any usit at times it feels like we are taiking and a mediator. No kay? 12 mediator can break through some of the logiams that may capted to modiate mediator use were as a mediator, which would a speak. Hearing none? JUDGE CALLAHAN: Now State time to speak. Hearing none? 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hring an quistiff employee to serve as the mediator prevents a mediator, which would an mindul that reasonable mediator. 22 So if we have an outside mediator, which would and that reasonable and that reasonable and that reasonable mediator. 23 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hring an outside mediator to serve as a media	3	mediation.	3	
5 Commissioner Rendahl mentioned a mediation as a 5 I did not hear from Ms. Anderson, because 6 possibility to resolving this case. WAC 480-07-710 addresses mediation in commission dockets. 7 addresses mediation in commission dockets. 6 8 The parties have engaged in three informal 9 9 settlement conferences since June 27. And prior to that, 9 10 staff held three informal informational sessions with 10 11 oustomers, including members of the intervenors, to 11 12 discuss this case. 11 13 These interactions have indicated that a 13 14 mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, 14 15 public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial 15 16 information, but at times it feels like we are talking 16 17 particular value to that. It's just 1 think as a group, 18 18 there any objection. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ckay. All right. So we 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a 19 10 mediator can break through some of the logiams that may 20 ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? <th>4</th> <td>At the June 27, 2024, open meeting,</td> <th>4</th> <td></td>	4	At the June 27, 2024, open meeting,	4	
7 addresses mediation in commission dockets. 7 objection, Ms. Anderson? 8 The parties have engaged in three informal 3 9 settlement conferences since June 27. And prior to that, 3 10 satif held three informal informational sessions with 10 11 customers, including members of the intervenors, to 10 12 discuss this case. 11 13 These interactions have indicated that a 11 14 mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, 14 15 public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial 15 16 information, but at times it feels like we are talking 16 17 particular value to that. It's just I think as a group, 18 18 particular value to that. It's just I think as a group, 18 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a 19 10 qualified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to 20 21 staff requests that the commission assign a 21 22 staff requests that would include mediator 22 31 increase the cost, right? 24 24 VAC 40-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an 25 31 increase the would include mediator, they w	5		5	I did not hear from Ms. Anderson, because
8 The parties have engaged in three informal settlement conferences since June 27. And prior to that, staff held three informal informational sessions with customers, including members of the intervenors, to discuss this case. 8 ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Your Honor, Cascadia Water does not object to Ms. Galken's recommendation. 12 discuss this case. 11 objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate, not discuss this case. 13 These interactions have indicated that a mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, information, but at times it feels like we are talking past each other in many respects. I don't assign any past each other in many respects. 11 Objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate? 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a mediator can break through some of the logiams that may exist among the parties. 19 MR. HANSON: No. No objection. 22 Staff requests that the commission assign a qualified employee to serve as a mediator, which would 20 ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 23 qualified employee to serve as a mediator, which would 22 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on. 24 Marce Ade Controlinons that are set forth at this incerporases. 1 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on. 25 While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool	6	possibility to resolving this case. WAC 480-07-710	6	multiple parties were talking. Do you have any
9 settlement conferences since June 27. And prior to that, staff held three informal informational sessions with 9 Water does not object to Ms. Gafken's recommendation. 10 customers, including members of the intervenors, to discuss this case. 10 UDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So is there any objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate, not necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate? 13 These interactions have indicated that a mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial information, but at times it feels like we are talking 16 okay. I'm sorry? 14 MR. HANSON: No. No objection. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. All right. So we don't know. It will likely be an ALJ. But we will go ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 15 gualified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to wita mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 10 So lef's see. All right. So is there anything else before we adjourn? Now is the time to speak. Hearing none? 16 increase the cost, right? 1 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on. 10 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff in rates, and staff believes that would include mediator expenses. 1 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on. 11 therease an ediator fee, as they should. But staff is mindful that rea	7	addresses mediation in commission dockets.	7	objection, Ms. Anderson?
10 staff held three informal informational sessions with customers, including members of the intervenors, to discuss this case. 10 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So is there any objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate, not necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate? 13 These interactions have indicated that a mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, 11 objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate? 14 mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, 14 ATTORNEY ONEILL: None from public coursel. 100 public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial information, but at times it feels like we are talking 16 okay. I'm sorry? 17 past each other in many respects. I don't assign any past each other in many respects. I don't assign any 17 MR. HANSON: No. No objection. 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a 19 don't know. It will likely be an ALJ. But we will go 20 mediator can break through some of the logjams that may 20 ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 21 Staff requests that the commission assign a 21 So left's see. All right. So is there 22 Staff requests mediator, which would 23 speak. Hearing none? 24 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: So we will issue an order <tr< td=""><th>8</th><td>The parties have engaged in three informal</td><th>8</th><td>ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Your Honor, Cascadia</td></tr<>	8	The parties have engaged in three informal	8	ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Your Honor, Cascadia
11 customers, including members of the intervenors, to 11 objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate, not 12 discuss this case. 12 objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate? 13 These interactions have indicated that a 13 Is there any objection right now? 14 mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, 14 14 ATTORNEY ONEILL: None from public counsel. 15 public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial 15 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Hearing none. No objections 16 information, but at times it feels like we are talking 16	9	settlement conferences since June 27. And prior to that,	9	Water does not object to Ms. Gafken's recommendation.
12 discuss this case. 12 necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate? 13 These interactions have indicated that a 13 necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate? 14 mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial information, but at times it feels like we are talking 15 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Hearing none. No objection. 15 public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial information, but at times it feels like we are talking 16 okay. I'm sorry? 18 particular value to that. It's just I think as a group, 18 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. All right. So we don't know. Itwill likely be an ALJ. But we will go alhead and assign a mediator. Okay? 21 exist among the parties. 20 ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 22 so let's see. All right. So is there anything else before we adjourn? Now is the time to speak. Hearing none? 24 VAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 23 25 So if we have an outside mediator, they would request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. 1 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on. 3 The most cost-effe	10	staff held three informal informational sessions with	10	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. So is there any
13 These interactions have indicated that a 13 Is there any objection right now? 14 mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, 14 ATTORNEY ONEILL: None from public counsel. 15 public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial 15 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Hearing none. No objections 16 information, but at times if feels like we are talking 16 okay. I'm sorry? 17 past each other in many respects. I don't assign any 17 MR. HANSON: No. No objection. 18 particular value to that. It's just I think as a group, 18 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Hearing none. No objection. 20 mediator can break through some of the logiams that may 20 ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 21 So Is there 30 21 Staff requests that the commission assign a 22 anything else before we adjourn? Now is the time to 23 qualified employee to serve as a mediator, which would 25 JUDGE CALLAHAN: So we will issue an order 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an outside mediator, they would 25 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 25 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Takawould include mediaton anoffail is in orage and staff believes that would include mediaton </td <th>11</th> <td>customers, including members of the intervenors, to</td> <th>11</th> <td>objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate, not</td>	11	customers, including members of the intervenors, to	11	objection to assigning a UTC employee to mediate, not
14 mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff, 14 ATTORNEY ONEILL: None from public counsel. 15 public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial 15 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Hearing none. No objections 16 normation, but at times if fiels like we are talking 16 okay. I'm sorry? 17 past each other in many respects. I don't assign any 17 MR. HANSON: No. No objection. 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. All right. So we 20 mediator can break through some of the logjams that may 20 ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 21 Staff requests that the commission assign a 21 So lift requests that the commission assign a 22 Staff requests that the commission assign a 21 So lift we have an outside mediator, which would 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an 24 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 25 outside mediator to serve as a mediator, they would 25 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other 26 white we see mediation as a very useful and 1 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other 27 White we see mediation as a very useful and <	12	discuss this case.	12	necessarily an ALJ, just a UTC employee to mediate?
15 public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial 15 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Hearing none. No objections 16 information, but at times it feels like we are talking 16 okay. Im sorry? 17 past each other in many respects. I don't assign any 17 MR. HANSON: No. No objection. 18 particular value to that. It's just I think as a group, 18 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. All right. So we 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a 19 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. All right. So we 20 mediator can break through some of the logjams that may 20 ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 21 staff requests that the commission assign a 22 So let's see. All right. So is there 22 Staff requests that be preferable to hiring an 24 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 25 outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 25 Stoff we have an outside mediator, they would 25 26 so if we have an outside mediator, they would 1 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other 27 So if we have an outside mediator 1 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other 28 so if we have an outside mediator nor sup as we s	13	These interactions have indicated that a	13	Is there any objection right now?
16 information, but at times it feels like we are talking 16 okay. I'm sorry? 17 past each other in many respects. I don't assign any 17 18 particular value to that. It's just I think as a group, 18 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a 19 20 mediator can break through some of the logjams that may 20 21 exist among the parties. 21 22 Staff requests that the commission assign a 21 31 qualified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to 22 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an 23 25 outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 24 26 Fage 42 1 27 So if we have an outside mediator, they would 25 28 So if we have an outside mediator, they would 2 29 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is 3 4 mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included 1 5 subject to the conditions that are set for that this 6 expenses. 1 7 While we see mediator	14	mediator could be useful; and in particular, staff,	14	ATTORNEY ONEILL: None from public counsel.
17 past each other in many respects. I don't assign any particular value to that. It's just I think as a group, arediator can break through some of the logiams that may exist among the parties. 17 MR. HANSON: No. No objection. 18 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. All right. So we don't know. It will likely be an ALJ. But we will go ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 21 exist among the parties. 20 22 Staff requests that the commission assign a quified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 21 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 24 25 outside mediator goes as a mediator, they would request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in nates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. 1 7 While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff 1 10 requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. 1 13 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. 13 14 So I would like to ask at this point if 14 15 there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. 15 16	15	public counsel, and Cascadia have provided substantial	15	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Hearing none. No objections
18 particular value to that. It's just I think as a group, 18 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. All right. So we 19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a 19 20 mediator can break through some of the logjams that may 20 21 exist among the parties. 20 22 Staff requests that the commission assign a 22 23 qualified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to 23 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an 24 25 outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 25 26 Page 42 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 27 So if we have an outside mediator, they would 25 28 increase the cost, right? 1 3 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is 3 on. 4 mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included 5 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other 3 request a mediator here, we also want to deploy that tool in 8 beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in 8 4 beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in 8 Mac Andres	16	information, but at times it feels like we are talking	16	okay. I'm sorry?
19 we could use some assistance. In my experience, a mediator can break through some of the logiams that may exist among the parties. 19 don't know. It will likely be an ALJ. But we will go ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? 21 exist among the parties. 20 So let's see. All right. So is there 23 qualified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to wAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 23 So let's see. All right. So is there anything else before we adjourn? Now is the time to speak. Hearing none? Page 42 1 increase the cost, right? 1 2 So if we have an outside mediator, they would request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included to in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. 1 3 While we see mediation as a very useful and the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff 1 10 requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. 11 13 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if 12 14 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if 14	17	past each other in many respects. I don't assign any	17	MR. HANSON: No. No objection.
20mediator can break through some of the logjams that may exist among the parties.20ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? So let's see. All right. So is there anything else before we adjourn? Now is the time to speak. Hearing none?21WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would20ahead and assign a mediator. Okay? So let's see. All right. So is there anything else before we adjourn? Now is the time to speak. Hearing none?22WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would21ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. JUDGE CALLAHAN: So we will issue an orderPage 42increase the cost, right?1shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on.93request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses.14mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses.77While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative it with us.911law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us.1213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken, So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1314So I would like to ask at this point if	18	particular value to that. It's just I think as a group,	18	JUDGE CALLAHAN: Okay. All right. So we
21 exist among the parties. 21 So let's see. All right. So is there 22 Staff requests that the commission assign a 22 anything else before we adjourn? Now is the time to 23 qualified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to 23 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an 24 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 25 outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 25 JUDGE CALLAHAN: So we will issue an order Page 42 1 increase the cost, right? 1 2 So if we have an outside mediator, they would 2 3 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is 3 4 mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included 4 5 in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation 5 6 expenses. 7 While we see mediation as a very useful and 7 While we see mediation as a result, staff 9 9 We are adjourned. Thank you. 10 requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative 10 10 (Hearing concluded at 10:37 a.m.) <td< td=""><th>19</th><td>we could use some assistance. In my experience, a</td><th>19</th><td>don't know. It will likely be an ALJ. But we will go</td></td<>	19	we could use some assistance. In my experience, a	19	don't know. It will likely be an ALJ. But we will go
22 Staff requests that the commission assign a 22 anything else before we adjoum? Now is the time to 23 qualified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to 23 anything else before we adjoum? Now is the time to 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an 24 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 25 JUDGE CALLAHAN: So we will issue an order 24 1 increase the cost, right? 1 2 Staff believes that would include mediator 5 3 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is 3 4 mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included 5 5 in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation 5 6 expresse. 6 7 While we see mediation as a very useful and 5 8 beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in 8 9 the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff 9 10 requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative 10 12 with us. 12 13 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. 13 14	20	mediator can break through some of the logjams that may	20	ahead and assign a mediator. Okay?
23 qualified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to 23 speak. Hearing none? 24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 24 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 25 vustide mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 23 speak. Hearing none? 24 increase the cost, right? 24 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 2 bo if we have an outside mediator, they would 25 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is 3 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is 3 3 4 mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included 4 The motion for intervention is granted 5 in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation 6 Hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken 7 While we see mediation as a very useful and 7 Beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in 8 9 the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff 9 We are adjourned. Thank you. 9 11 law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or 11 12 We are adjourned. Thank you. 12 13	21	exist among the parties.	21	So let's see. All right. So is there
24 WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 24 ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff. 25 uside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 25 Page 42 1 increase the cost, right? 1 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other 2 So if we have an outside mediator, they would 2 shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other 3 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is 3 on. The motion for intervention is granted 4 mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included 4 The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this 6 expenses. 6 hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken 7 While we see mediation as a very useful and 7 8 beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in 8 hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken minorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you. Hearing concluded at 10:37 a.m.) 11 law judge, be assigned to mediate this po	22	Staff requests that the commission assign a	22	anything else before we adjourn? Now is the time to
25 outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would 25 JUDGE CALLAHAN: So we will issue an order Page 42 Page 42 Page 44 1 increase the cost, right? 1 2 So if we have an outside mediator, they would 1 3 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is 1 4 mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included 4 5 in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation 5 6 expenses. 6 7 While we see mediation as a very useful and 7 8 beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in 7 9 the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff 9 10 requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative 10 11 law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or 11 12 with us. 12 13 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. 13 14 So I would like to ask at this point if 14 15 there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. 15 16 ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no	23	qualified employee to serve as the mediator pursuant to	23	speak. Hearing none?
Page 42 Page 44 1 increase the cost, right? 1 2 So if we have an outside mediator, they would 2 3 request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is 3 4 mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included 4 5 in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation 4 6 expenses. 6 7 While we see mediation as a very useful and 7 8 beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in 8 9 the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff 9 11 law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or 11 12 with us. 12 13 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. 13 14 So I would like to ask at this point if 14 15 there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. 15 16 ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no 16 17 objection. 17	24	WAC 480-07-710(3). This would be preferable to hiring an	24	ATTORNEY GAFKEN: Nothing further from staff.
1increase the cost, right?1shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on.2So if we have an outside mediator, they would request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses.1shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on.7mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses.4The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order.9the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative with us.9We are adjourned. Thank you. (Hearing concluded at 10:37 a.m.)11law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us.121313JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1316ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	25	outside mediator to serve as a mediator, which would	25	JUDGE CALLAHAN: So we will issue an order
2So if we have an outside mediator, they would2guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on.3request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included374mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included4The motion for intervention is granted5in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation5subject to the conditions that are set forth at this6expenses.6hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken7While we see mediation as a very useful and7and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order.9the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff9We are adjourned. Thank you.10requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or1111law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or1112with us.1213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.1314So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17		Page 42		Page 44
2So if we have an outside mediator, they would2guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early on.3request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included374mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included4The motion for intervention is granted5in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation5subject to the conditions that are set forth at this6expenses.6hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken7While we see mediation as a very useful and7and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order.9the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff9We are adjourned. Thank you.10requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or1111law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or1112with us.1213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.1314So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	1	increase the cost, right?	1	shortly containing the procedural schedule and the other
3request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is3on.4mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included4The motion for intervention is granted5in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation4The motion for intervention is granted6expenses.6subject to the conditions that are set forth at this7While we see mediation as a very useful and7and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might8beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in8incorporate some of that into the writing in my order.9the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff9We are adjourned. Thank you.10requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative10(Hearing concluded at 10:37 a.m.)11law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or1112with us.1213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.1314So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	2	-	2	
5in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses.5subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order.7While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in 97Subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order.9the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff 109We are adjourned. Thank you.10requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us.1113JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection.1617objection.17		request a mediator fee, as they should. But staff is		guidelines for disposition of this case, as I said early
6expenses.6hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken7While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in 97and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order.9the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff9We are adjourned. Thank you.10requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or111213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.131214So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	3	request a mediator ree, as they should. Dut stall is	3	
 While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection. 				on.
8beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in8incorporate some of that into the writing in my order.9the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff9We are adjourned. Thank you.10requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative10(Hearing concluded at 10:37 a.m.)11law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or1112with us.1213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.1314So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	4	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included	4	on. The motion for intervention is granted
9the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff9We are adjourned. Thank you.10requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative10(Hearing concluded at 10:37 a.m.)11law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or1112with us.1213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.1314So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	4 5	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation	4 5	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this
10requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative10(Hearing concluded at 10:37 a.m.)11law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or1112with us.1213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.1314So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public coursel has no1617objection.17	4 5 6	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses.	4 5 6	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken
11law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or1112with us.1213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.1314So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	4 5 6 7	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and	4 5 6 7	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might
12with us.1213JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.1314So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	4 5 6 7 8	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in	4 5 6 7 8	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order.
13JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.1314So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	4 5 6 7 8 9	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff	4 5 6 7 8 9	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
14So I would like to ask at this point if1415there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	4 5 7 8 9 10	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative	4 5 7 8 9 10	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
15there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.1516ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
16ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no1617objection.17	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
17 objection. 17	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
18 JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Anderson? 18	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Anderson?</pre>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Cascadia Water has no</pre>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Cascadia Water has no we do not object.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Cascadia Water has no we do not object. MR. HANSON: And Advocates do not object.</pre>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Cascadia Water has no we do not object. MR. HANSON: And Advocates do not object. We would request serious consideration of the</pre>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Cascadia Water has nowe do not object. We would request serious consideration of the mediator being an ALJ in this case. In my experience, 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
25 experience versus one of the judicial officers, the 25	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	mindful that reasonable ratemaking expenses are included in rates, and staff believes that would include mediation expenses. While we see mediation as a very useful and beneficial tool here, we also want to deploy that tool in the most cost-effective way. And as a result, staff requests that a UTC employee, perhaps an administrative law judge, be assigned to mediate this matter for us or with us. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Thank you Ms. Gafken. So I would like to ask at this point if there's any objection to Ms. Gafken's comment. ATTORNEY ONEILL: Public counsel has no objection. JUDGE CALLAHAN: Ms. Anderson? ATTORNEY ANDERSON: Cascadia Water has no we do not object. We would request serious consideration of the mediator being an ALJ in this case. In my experience, generally, with dealing with people who have mediation	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	on. The motion for intervention is granted subject to the conditions that are set forth at this hearing. And the concerns that were raised by Ms. Gafken and Ms. Anderson, we'll take into consideration. I might incorporate some of that into the writing in my order. We are adjourned. Thank you.

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

	Page 45	
1	CERTIFICATE	
2		
3	STATE OF WASHINGTON)	
4) ss	
5	COUNTY OF KING)	
6		
7	I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified	
8	Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter	
9	within and for the State of Washington, do hereby	
10 11	certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that I	
12	received the electronic recording in the proprietary	
13	format; that I am not a relative or employee of any	
14	attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor	
15	financially interested in its outcome.	
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my	
17	hand this September 6, 2024.	
18		
19		
20	Elizabet Fale Saltary	
21 22	Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, CCR 2731	
23	Elizabelli Pallerson Harvey, CCR 2/31	
24		
25		

12 (Page 45)

				1 aye 40
A	6:22,24 7:10,16	Anderson's 25:10	attached 24:12	benefit 19:19
	7:20 8:19,23 9:23	31:5	attempt 8:24	benefited 19:11
a.m 44:10	10:4 13:18 17:10	answer 27:24	attention 7:2	Bennett 7:1
abandon 16:21	18:1,9 21:12,17	answering 33:8	attorney 2:4,9 4:14	best 15:5 25:1,6
abide 21:8	24:14,21 25:4,12	36:8	4:19 5:10,17 6:1,4	best 15:5 25:1,6 better 11:11
abilities 21:2	28:20 30:16,18	anybody 29:16	6:8,11,13,16,17	beyond 8:24 15:3
ability 10:16 16:13	32:22,23 35:17	apologize 22:7	7:4,17 9:9,12,17	16:14 23:3,16
20:17 21:18	40:6,6 42:21	appear 5:14,16	11:2,23 17:8,20	biggest 13:24
able 26:17 28:24	Advocates' 24:11	10:8 32:11	30:7,9,11 32:6,15	binding 27:9
29:5	advocating 27:3	appearance 7:9	32:18 34:8,11,15	Blaine 6:25
access 13:15,17	affairs 5:4	40:7	35:8 37:19 38:2	blame 7:24
accounting 5:2	affect 31:17	appearances 4:11	38:15 39:3,12	bleed 20:25
acknowledge 25:21	affiliates 5:20	appearing 6:13,18	40:22,24 41:2	body 20:21 35:21
acronym 15:21	afforded 14:18			bound 29:10
Act 18:17 20:8		appears 10:9	42:16,19 43:8,14	
acting 5:19	afield 23:20	apply 14:9	43:24 45:14	Box 2:5 break 34:23 41:20
add 4:24 15:19	agency 31:15	appreciate 30:24	August 1:12 4:1 8:9	
32:20 40:11	aggregating 24:19	appreciative 30:25	35:11 40:7	brief 34:2
addition 5:3 10:20	aggregation 20:8	approach 11:21	authority 9:25	briefing 34:1
40:10	agree 24:14 28:20	19:15,15	10:16,22 26:20	briefs 33:24 34:2
additional 10:21	31:10 32:13,18	approached 31:10	automatically	36:22,24
37:18	36:13 37:16 38:9	appropriate 20:16	13:15	bring 16:10 25:4
address 7:23 9:13	agreed 37:9 38:8	29:3,22	available 34:17	brings 6:20
12:7,11 16:11	38:21	appropriately 26:7	35:23 36:12	broad 23:25
22:3 39:20 40:16	agreeing 28:21	approval 15:2	Ave 2:21	bucket 12:8 15:7,8
40:18,19	agreement 13:20	approve 27:12	Avenue 2:10	build 14:1
addressed 13:13	13:22 26:3 28:21	approves 27:9	aware 34:5	bunch 28:12,16
17:20 24:8	29:9,17 33:13	April 7:9 8:25	<u> </u>	burdensome 21:10
addresses 40:12	agreements 28:23	39:10		business 31:15 33:4
41:7	28:25	areas 11:24 12:12	back 30:25 31:4	33:7,11 36:4,6,10
addressing 4:12	ahead 9:9,10 43:20	argue 29:4	35:24 37:7	37:15,16
adequate 39:15	ALJ 14:5 21:3	argued 16:8	background 9:5	Byron 2:14 4:19
adjourn 43:22	42:23 43:12,19	argument 28:17	backing 28:16	byronstarkey@p
adjourned 44:9	allow 25:19 26:7	arm 14:4,7	base 15:6	2:14
adjudications	33:20 34:7	articulated 11:8	based 11:9 14:17	
14:25	allowed 10:6	18:4 19:18,19	basis 18:4	$\frac{C}{C}$
administrative	alternative 26:5	asked 10:3 23:5	behalf 5:19 6:13,18	C 2:1 3:1 45:1,1
1:13 4:9 18:17	Amy 3:9	asserting 23:24	21:25 27:4 29:2	C-E-N-S-E 15:20
20:7 21:6 22:20	analysis 26:11	assign 41:17,22	30:17 38:16	calculations 20:23
42:10	Anderson 2:13	43:20	believe 15:1 18:3,4	call 32:9
Admittedly 11:19	4:14,15 5:8,10 9:9	assigned 42:11	18:15 19:10,18	Callahan 1:13 4:4
adversarial 12:24	9:12,14,16 12:4	assigning 35:17	21:8,15,17 32:7	4:8,15 5:8,13,21
advisement 30:5	15:14 30:7,9,11	43:11	38:16 39:14	6:3,7,9,12,14,19
advisory 14:6	31:3 32:5,6 38:15	assistance 41:19	believes 18:3 42:5	7:6 8:2 9:10,16
advocate 15:10	38:16 39:3,9,12	assistant 6:12,17	Bellevue 2:16	10:25 11:22 17:4
21:23	42:18,19 43:5,7,8	assumes 33:14,17	beneficial 36:13	21:22 25:8 26:19
advocates 2:18 3:2	44:7	assumption 13:3	42:8	27:18,23 28:19

				
29:12,24 30:8,10	claim 9:24 10:23	commissioners	7:22 9:3 32:9	copies 40:13
31:3,20 32:8,15	24:3 39:10	14:5	35:10,14 39:18	corporation 25:23
32:17 33:19 34:10	claims 23:25	committee 10:1	conferences 41:9	25:23
34:14,20 35:6,8	clarification 19:23	26:23 27:4,8 29:1	confess 22:23	correct 32:7 39:3
37:3 38:1,7,23	32:3 33:25	29:18,19	confidence 21:2	cost 12:16 16:4
39:5,16 40:23	clarify 5:24 7:7	common 26:4	confident 20:17	42:1
41:1 42:13,18	clear 9:23,25 14:3	communicate	confidential 13:8	cost-effective 42:9
43:3,10,15,18,25	30:21	24:22	13:16,18 24:3	costs 24:2
capital 16:1	clearly 12:5 13:18	communicates	28:20 29:14,21	counsel 2:7,9 4:20
captioned 4:6	Clinton 2:24	14:25	confidentiality	5:11,15,18,19,23
Cascade 4:17,20	Coalition 15:21	communicating	13:9,13,19 23:25	6:5,15,18 7:10,16
Cascadia 1:7 4:7	code 21:6	26:1	28:23,24 29:8,17	15:9,11 16:24
4:13,22 5:5,11,12	Coie 2:15 4:16,19	company 5:5,12,23	39:10	17:9,13,19 18:3,7
5:18 9:22 10:10	Colburn 3:8 6:25	20:22 31:14,25	confirm 32:4 37:6	19:9,14 21:14
10:12,19 18:8	come 13:4	35:12 36:7 39:9	conflict 17:16	34:9 35:25 41:15
23:24 24:4 27:2	comes 20:4 33:15	39:13	conflicts 32:11	42:16 43:14 45:14
38:16 41:15 42:19	comment 17:6 31:5	company's 5:15 8:8	confused 7:25	counsel's 15:9 19:4
43:8	31:22 34:12 35:1	8:9 14:13 30:3	confusing 12:9	counsels 8:8
Cascadia's 11:8	36:11 37:4 42:15	compared 23:8	confusion 12:14	country 22:19
31:14	commentary 16:14	compel 12:24	conjunction 39:17	County 16:2 19:1
case 10:8 13:12,23	16:22	competition 17:17	consider 8:13	45:5
14:1,10,14,14,19	comments 21:20	Complainant 1:5	10:21	couple 12:11 25:8
14:22 15:16,23	22:2,12,12 24:11	complaint 9:1	consideration 30:4	26:15,16
16:3,5,16,18 17:1	24:12,15,17,20	completion 8:20	42:22 44:7	course 29:6
17:11 18:8,8,20	25:17 26:6,8,17	comprehensive	considerations	court 21:13 45:8
19:8 20:19 21:16	30:14,15 31:7,8	23:24	18:25	courtesy 40:13
23:2 25:1,6 27:1	37:18 38:13	concern 9:22 12:3	consists 14:5	courts 22:17,18,18
28:5,9,14,18 29:4	commission 1:2,4	12:7 13:24 27:15	constellation 20:11	covered 37:21
29:11 35:12 41:6	1:15 2:2 4:7,9	30:23	constituted 25:20	create 25:23
41:12 42:23 43:2	6:13 7:9 8:13,14	concerned 14:18	consumer 2:18 3:2	critical 24:5
44:2	10:6,18 11:4,18	concerning 13:3	6:21,23 7:16 8:19	criticism 11:13
cases 18:24 22:19	13:2 14:5,7,8 15:6	concerns 11:4,8,24	8:22 13:21 15:10	cross 33:8,17 36:8
33:1	15:11,13 16:19,20	12:8 15:7,8 25:10	15:12 24:11 30:15	36:18,18
CCR 1:24 45:22	16:21 17:1,13,16	25:10 30:1,6	30:16,17 32:22	crucial 17:14
cede 9:14	17:20 20:3,3,12	31:11 44:6	40:6	Cully 3:9
celestial 35:21	20:18 21:15 23:14	concise 24:21	consumers 9:19	current 23:7
CENSE 15:20,25	24:21 25:5 26:7	concluded 17:22	19:5,7	customer 12:4
16:5,8,10,12	26:18 32:16 34:18	44:10	contacted 24:14	15:14 16:17 32:23
CENSE's 16:15	36:12 39:24 40:2	condition 8:22	25:15	customer's 11:6
certain 10:6 12:3	41:7,22	conditions 9:18	containing 44:1	14:17
certainly 23:15	commission's	10:4,20,21 30:3	contains 24:13	customers 10:2,5
Certified 45:7	11:14 18:16 40:1	31:1 44:5	contemplates 20:8	10:10 11:12 13:4
certify 45:10	commissioner 37:5	conduct 18:13 20:2	context 25:16	14:19 15:11 18:23
change 31:7,12,17	41:5	21:11	continue 14:12	41:11
32:24 35:22 38:17	commissioner's	conference 1:11	Continued 3:1	cutoff 33:16 36:16
38:25 39:6	34:21	4:5,18,23 5:6 6:6	contractor 24:1	
				l

				Faye 40
D	18:5	E	errata 36:18	expressed 27:3
d/b/a 31:13,14	developing 14:14	E 2:1,1 3:1,1,4 45:1	establish 16:23	extent 19:21 21:9
data 37:10,11,13	17:14	E 2.1,1 5.1,1,4 45.1 45:1	estimates 36:18	external 16:11
	development 22:8	e-mail 33:22 40:11	evaluates 8:14	
37:14,17,21 38:10	develops 17:18		evening 36:15	F
38:11	different 18:11,20	40:14,16,17	Everett 2:21	F 45:1
date 31:24 32:1,4	19:16 20:20	earlier 25:17 38:17	everybody 24:17	facets 17:15
33:16,23 35:1,19	differing 19:2	38:22	32:21 38:5,6	fact 31:16
35:20,22,23 37:1	direct 14:14 23:10	early 44:2	everyday 24:1	fail 28:9
37:2 38:21,23,25	35:12	Eastern 16:2	evidence 15:5	fairly 13:2
39:1,7	direction 45:11	Eastside 15:21	16:14 20:1,3,5	fairness 23:18
dated 8:9,25 9:1	director 5:1	economic 12:21	26:8	fall 23:19
39:10	discovery 10:17	economist 26:9	evidence-based	familiar 9:4 27:2
dates 34:17 35:1	v	effect 33:8	11:17	far 23:20
Dave 6:25	12:23,25 13:25	effective 24:22		February 36:21,22
day 34:4 37:16	20:2 21:7 23:22 32:25 33:6,10,14	31:24 32:1,4 39:7	evidentiary 36:20 ex 14:6	federal 22:18
days 32:11 33:4,4,7		efficient 24:20		fee 42:3
33:11 36:2,4,6,10	33:16 36:1,3,5,9	efficiently 26:18	exactly 12:3 14:11 28:15	feels 41:16
37:15	36:16 37:9,25	eight 16:5		Fifth 2:10
deadline 33:16	38:5,8	either 21:24,24	example 12:15,20	file 7:18 8:11 13:25
36:16	discretion 17:2	28:13	13:5 15:19 19:8	33:5 35:12 37:24
dealing 22:20	discuss 41:12	electricity 18:22	20:19,20 27:7	38:4,4
42:24	discussion 38:2	electronic 39:21,22	examples 12:13	,
debate 17:17 18:2,5	disposition 44:2	39:24 40:2,13	15:17,20	filed 6:22 7:8,13
21:19	disputes 12:25 13:1	45:12	executive 10:1	8:5,7,8 22:7 24:12
decide 29:3	23:23	electronically 40:3	26:23 27:4,8	25:16 27:2 30:15
decision 11:17 25:6	disrupted 18:13	40:4	28:25 29:18,19	30:15,17 31:7,25
27:5	dissatisfied 14:20	eliminated 38:3	exhibit 24:12,13	33:2,9 40:7,14
decision-making	diverse 26:15	Elizabeth 1:24 45:7	31:8	filing 8:25 14:13
14:4,7	Docket 1:6 4:5	45:22	exhibits 14:15	22:7,23 24:11
decisions 15:6	17:12,23	emails 24:23	33:17 36:18	32:2 38:25 39:21
26:21 29:2	dockets 15:23 41:7	employed 45:14	exist 41:21	39:24
defending 20:23	document 9:21	employee 41:23	existed 17:19	filings 39:25
deficiencies 14:21	documents 13:8	42:10 43:11,12	expand 8:23,24	final 18:11 34:19
define 28:4	23:25 28:3,9	45:13	expanding 12:9	finance 5:2
defined 26:3	39:25 40:2,14	employees 4:23	expansion 12:13	financially 45:15
definitions 19:16	DOH 12:15 20:22	Endejan 2:20 7:1,3	expectation 29:6	find 24:2 34:24
degree 16:9	doing 26:14 31:15	7:4,17 18:9	expedite 22:8,13	findings 14:2
Department 12:21	Dr 6:25 38:3	energy 12:17 15:22	expenses 42:4,6	finer 22:25 30:21
20:20	draft 11:25 12:12	16:4	experience 16:8	firm 4:16
deploy 42:8	14:17	Energy's 15:23	26:10 29:7 41:19	first 7:25 9:14 12:2
derives 11:11	drop 27:19	engage 13:6,25	42:23,25	27:1 28:2
designated 29:20	due 33:11,16 34:3	engaged 41:8	experienced 22:15	five 33:11 36:9
designating 40:7	35:25 36:2,8,9,19	enter 10:16 28:24	expert 16:11 26:9	37:15
detail 12:2 22:25	36:22,24	30:5	29:5,23	five-business-day
23:14	duplication 15:8	entered 22:10	expertise 14:9 16:9	37:17
develop 14:19 18:2	duty 14:10	Eric 3:10 4:20 5:10	experts 29:21,22	five-day 33:18
20,000 F 1117 10.2				

				1 ugc 40
flag 24:4,4	27:25 33:12	handle 10:17	hundred 26:15,16	informal 14:11
focus 20:18 21:3	generally 15:12,15	Hanson 3:4 7:1,20	hundreds 18:21	41:8,10
22:2 26:11	33:1 42:24	20:1 21:24 22:1		information 13:16
focused 28:17	Gilles 6:25	25:8,14 26:19,23	I	13:18 24:5 25:2,5
focusing 26:16	give 17:6 24:25	27:19,21 28:2,19	i.e 8:24	29:1,15,21 41:16
folks 9:4	27:24,25 30:3	28:22 29:12,16	idea 11:10 27:25	informational
follow 21:13	34:18	30:14 31:4,5,6,20	30:13	41:10
follows 33:1	Given 16:15 34:15	40:8 42:21 43:4	identified 8:25	inhouse 4:20 5:11
foregoing 45:10	go 6:9,15 9:9,10,15	43:17	23:13 27:20,22	initial 8:25
formal 7:19 14:16	12:2 15:3 22:22	happen 24:25	identify 10:4	Initially 18:7
25:21	23:3 30:24 34:8	happens 13:16	illusory 31:18	input 8:20 24:25
format 45:13	37:8 43:19	happy 22:3	imaginary 27:15	insistent 11:13
formulate 29:22	going 4:24 9:20	hard 22:25	immediate 23:10	instruction 9:2
forth 44:5	18:25 24:24 28:11	Harvey 1:24 45:7	immune 20:25	integrated 12:17
forums 22:16	30:1,24,25 31:4	45:22	important 23:15	16:7
found 8:19	33:19 34:6 35:3	Hayley 1:13 4:8	33:13	intend 20:1
foundation 24:18	35:24	Hayleycallahan	imposed 18:16	intensely 18:24
Fourth 2:15	Goldfinch 2:23	40:17	inability 21:12	intention 7:18 8:1
frankly 11:12	good 4:4,14 6:11,16	Health 12:21 20:20	inappropriate 28:7	interact 15:3
Freeland 3:5	7:4,6,17	hear 9:7 11:1 32:22	inaudible 40:10	interactions 15:4
fulfill 14:10	Goodell 3:4	43:5	include 28:9,25	41:13
full 21:2	govern 12:19	heard 31:21 32:21	30:4 42:5	interest 8:16,17
fully 21:8	grant 16:19 17:1	hearing 8:6 28:4	included 24:8 31:9	10:7 15:16 16:17
funnel 25:2	30:1	34:3,7 35:1 36:20	42:4	16:23 17:16 23:2
further 19:23 30:4	granted 8:3,22	40:21 43:15,23	including 4:25	23:4,9 25:1 27:3
43:24	14:21 16:16 24:6	44:6,10	10:10 11:10 14:8	28:13 34:16
future 23:1	35:21 44:4	hearings 34:12	26:9 41:11	interested 15:25
	granting 39:17	36:12 37:5	incorporate 22:11	45:15
G	group 4:25 7:10	held 41:10	34:19 44:8	interests 16:15
Gafken 2:3 6:10,11	9:24 10:2,15,22	help 18:2 22:2,8	incorporated 25:22	19:2,17 28:14
6:12 9:9,10,12,17	11:12 12:4 15:22	26:10,11,13	increase 23:7 42:1	interjected 20:22
11:1,2,23 17:4	16:17 18:1,8	helpful 43:1	independent 24:16	internal 5:19
20:19 25:9 27:20	19:15,22,22 20:9	hereto 45:14	indicate 12:23 13:6	interrupt 30:11
27:22 32:15,16,18	20:12,13,14,15	hereunto 45:16	23:15	intersection 12:15
35:8 37:19 38:2	21:24,25 24:14	hide 24:4	indicated 7:11	intervene 6:22 8:15
38:14,18 40:22,23	28:21 29:14 30:13	highlight 12:11	13:19 16:10 21:12	8:21 10:8 27:13
40:24 41:2 42:13	30:20,22 41:18	13:5 37:20,24	21:17 22:23 25:16	intervened 15:22
43:24 44:6	groups 15:13,14	hiring 41:24	26:24,25 41:13	intervening 17:14
Gafken's 30:6	19:7	hold 35:14	individual 19:7	intervenor 2:18 3:2
42:15 43:9	guardrails 10:3	holding 31:14	20:5 27:11	8:8,11,15,17
gas 18:22	12:6	honor 5:17 6:16 7:5	individually 15:13	35:25
general 2:4,9 4:25	guidelines 44:2	7:17 9:17 10:14	individuals 6:23	intervenor's 8:18
6:13,18 14:24	guidennes 44.2 guys 34:22	17:8 18:15 22:1	10:9,15 15:12	intervenors 37:24
15:15 16:18,22	54 J ⁶ J ⁷ .22	30:7 32:6 38:15	20:5,9,12 27:2	41:11
17:20,25 22:22	Н	39:12 43:8	29:8	intervention 4:12
23:4,10,12 26:8	hand 21:4 45:17	huge 28:15	inform 12:18	6:21 7:11,21 8:4
				5.21 7.11,21 0.1
1	-	-	-	-

9:13,19 11:5,7,20	25:8 26:19 27:18	L	making 11:14,17	multiple 19:11 20:5
12:1 14:21 16:16	27:23 28:19 29:12	L 6:25	management 31:15	43:6
16:19,23 17:1,6,9	29:24 30:8,10	label 26:2	manager 5:1,1,2,3	mute 9:13 35:3
19:20 21:15 25:19	31:3,20 32:8,15	Lacey 1:16	manner 20:2 24:21	
26:24 30:2 44:4	32:17 33:19 34:10	lack 11:9	March 17:23 36:24	<u> </u>
investment 16:1	34:14,20 35:6,8	land 16:6	matter 4:10 5:19	N 2:1 3:1
invoices 24:1,3	37:3 38:1,7,23	Lane 2:23	8:21 14:24 17:10	name 4:8,15 6:12
involve 18:24	39:5,16 40:23	large 18:20 23:7	17:21 18:12,18	31:7,12,16
involved 27:1	41:1 42:11,13,18	larger 23:11	21:19 39:18 42:11	named 6:24
involving 13:7	43:3,10,15,18,25	law 1:13 4:9,15	matters 15:10	names 4:24 40:11
18:21	judges' 38:2	22:20,21 42:11	26:10	narrow 21:16
iron 33:20 34:25	judicial 42:25 43:1	leave 8:12 28:10	mean 30:11	natural 4:21 5:5,9
Island 18:25 31:9	Judith 2:20	legal 10:16 16:12	meaningfully 21:18	5:11 18:22 31:13
31:14	Judy 7:1	45:10	means 19:5 39:1	nature 26:2
issuance 13:11,13	July 6:21 32:1,4	Lehman 3:9,9	mediate 42:11	necessarily 11:19
issue 12:14 16:3	37:2 39:1	let's 4:11,12 6:9,15	43:11,12	19:6 43:12
24:8 27:17 28:10	juncture 7:14	8:6 11:1 24:10	mediation 41:3,5,7	necessary 10:16
29:23 31:19 35:17	June 9:1 24:12,13	30:6 31:24 37:4,8	42:5,7,24	14:1 19:24
39:19,20,21 43:25	32:2 38:25 41:4,9	39:8 43:21	mediator 35:18,21	necessity 38:3
issued 39:11,17	justice 23:18	letter 39:10	35:22 41:14,20,23	need 10:14 27:24
issues 8:23,24	justified 24:2	level 13:1 34:15	41:25,25 42:2,3	40:19
12:10 16:12 17:18	justify 19:20	line 19:6	42:23 43:20	needed 26:1
18:3,21 20:4,18		Lisa 2:3 6:12 32:16	meet 11:19	negotiations 10:12
21:1,4,16 22:3	K	37:19	meeting 41:4	27:14
23:14,16,17,19,20	Kent 3:4 7:1,20	lisa.gafken@atg	meetings 18:11	Neighborhoods
23:21 26:13 27:20	40:8	2:4	member 25:13	15:21
27:21 28:4,6,12	kent.hanson1@g	list 15:19 24:13	members 41:11	Nelson 3:10 4:20
28:17 31:18	3:5	25:13,15 35:24	membership 19:22	5:10,17 6:1,4,8
item 31:23 37:8	key 18:1	listed 10:20 31:8	mentioned 41:5	NOA 40:5
iteration 30:20	kind 11:24 20:25	listened 25:9 29:25	mindful 42:4	non-precedential
	25:24	litigated 22:16,17	missed 22:24	16:20
J	kinds 23:9 24:19	22:19	misspoken 38:17	nonprofit 16:12
J 2:13	King 16:2 45:5	litigation 13:1	misunderstood	25:23
January 33:9 34:12	Kitsap 19:1	litigators 22:16	38:22	normal 15:4 37:15
34:17 36:8,11,16	know 4:25 9:5	LLC 1:7 4:7,17	Mm-hm 34:14	39:25
36:19	10:21 13:9 19:23	LLC 1.7 4.7,17 LLP 2:15	Monday 12:1	normally 29:7
Jendejan@gmail	22:2,9,13,22	local 18:24	morning 4:4,14	Northeast 2:15
2:20	23:11,17 24:6,15	logjams 41:20	6:11,16 7:4,6,17	Northwest 5:3
Jisong 3:11	24:21,24 26:5,5,6	look 31:1 33:16	22:14	note 14:10 20:7
joining 4:23 5:5	26:12,12,15 27:15	looks 38:8	motion 7:13,15 8:2	23:22 25:18
joint 18:22 26:2	28:2,6,6,8,10,12	Loop 1:15	8:11 13:2 17:7	noted 6:7 8:2 23:3
judge 1:13 4:4,9,14	28:13,15,22,23	loose 20:11	22:8 39:17 44:4	30:19
5:8,13,21 6:3,7,9	29:3,6,9 31:16	lot 24:16	motions 12:24 13:7	notes 18:7
6:11,14,19 7:6 8:2	33:2 35:16 43:19	101 24.10	21:5	notice 7:8,18 40:7
9:10,16 10:25	known 29:10	M	move 7:14 31:23	November 33:3,5
11:22 17:4 21:22	knows 23:14 26:13	M 1:13 2:23	moved 27:13	36:1,3,5
		1,1,1,0 2,20		

				Fage JT
number 4:22 22:3	open 18:11 23:20	participants 29:11	perceive 14:20	21:5 23:24 37:23
22:19 25:11	34:1 41:4	participate 11:15	percent 23:7	precluded 17:21
numerous 15:17	operates 14:3	16:13 19:24 20:13	perjury 45:10	preferable 41:24
nunc 22:10	operator 26:13	21:7,18 27:14	Perkins 2:15 4:16	prehearing 1:11
NW 4:20 5:4,9,11	opinion 29:23	participated 16:6	4:19	4:5,18,23 5:6 6:5
31:13	opportunity 13:24	18:9	permission 22:9,10	7:22 9:3 11:25
	14:19,22	participates 19:22	22:24	12:12 14:17 35:10
0	opposition 30:19	participating 17:22	persons 26:4 28:24	39:18
O'Neill 2:8 6:15,17	orally 7:14	27:16 28:15	perspective 16:9	present 3:7 5:9
17:5 21:22	order 9:3 13:12,14	participation 17:21	perspectives 11:10	14:2 15:5 20:1,2
o0o- 4:2	13:17 17:12,23	18:5 22:5 24:18	petition 4:12 6:20	25:3 26:7,17 27:7
object 11:6 25:12	25:4 39:11,15,16	31:18 34:16 43:1	6:22,24 7:12,21	presented 24:20
25:14 42:20,21	39:18,19 43:25	particular 22:4	8:18,21 9:13 11:5	presenting 14:15
43:9	44:8	41:14,18	11:7 26:24 30:17	preside 37:5
objection 8:7 11:9	orders 13:10 18:16	particularly 11:13	petitioner 4:16	president 5:4 10:10
42:15,17 43:7,11	organization 16:12	13:7	petitions 8:4,14	presiding 4:10
43:13,17	25:19,21 26:21	parties 10:14 12:1	Ph.D 26:9	previously 7:8
objections 21:8	27:8,10 29:2 31:6	13:15,17 14:8,23	philosophical	primarily 11:9
43:15	31:10	14:25 15:2,5	11:21	principles 17:25
observer 5:16,22	organizations 10:7	17:14,17 20:18,25	piece 34:23	prior 16:5 18:8
6:2	organized 20:12,13	21:3,8,11 28:13	PJAnderson@pe	36:3 41:9
obvious 27:12	20:14,15 25:12,25	29:9 32:10,13,21	2:13	privy 29:14
occurred 35:10	original 32:2 38:24	33:5,20,23 34:7	place 7:20 36:20	pro 22:10
occurring 36:14	outcome 15:16	35:6,14 36:13,14	placed 12:10	probably 7:24
occurs 11:17	16:18,23 45:15	37:7,9,10,14,16	plan 12:18	12:11 13:23 20:16
October 35:15,20	outcomes 11:11	37:18,22,22 38:9	planning 12:18	problem 27:7 35:2
35:23	outline 11:25 12:13	38:9,10,13,20	16:7	procedural 32:10
offering 16:13	14:18	39:11 40:3,3 41:8	plans 12:16,16	32:12,13 35:7
office 2:9 5:2	outset 28:4	41:21 43:6 45:14	play 17:14 29:7,18	38:18 44:1
officer 43:1	outside 5:18,23 6:4	parties' 29:25	33:15	Procedure 18:17
officers 42:25	28:5 41:25 42:2	party 5:15 11:16	please 9:11 40:14	procedures 18:16
oh 24:10 27:21	overall 19:14	14:3 15:4 24:6	41:1	20:7 33:21
okay 6:19 8:7 9:2,6	overly 21:9 23:25	27:10 36:8	PO 2:5	proceed 8:6
9:8,15 11:22	P	party's 31:21	point 21:12 23:12	proceeding 8:16,23
27:18 31:23,25		Patterson 1:24	26:16 27:6 30:12	12:9 14:4 24:5,9
32:8 33:19 35:2	P 2:1,1 3:1,1 P acific 5:2	45:7,22	30:21,22 32:14	25:22 26:12 29:20
36:14 37:3,4,16	Pacific 5:3	pause 21:20 35:3	33:21 38:13 42:14	37:6 40:14
39:8,16 40:15	PacifiCorp 17:12	35:16	pointed 28:17	proceedings 9:5
43:3,10,16,18,20 Olympia 2:5	page 31:25 PAGES 1:9	pay 19:13 23:6	pops 27:11	15:13 16:7,8
Olympic 30:16	PAGES 1:9 Pam 4:15 38:15	penalty 45:10	position 28:1	17:16 22:14,22
once 33:5	Pamela 2:13	penciled 35:20	possibility 12:25	23:9
ONEILL 6:16 17:8	paragraph 17:12	Peninsula 30:16	23:22 41:6	process 11:14,15
34:8,11,15 42:16	parent 5:5,12,15	people 24:13,16,23	possible 24:8	14:11,16 18:13
43:14	part 22:11,12 37:23	24:23 25:15 26:1	post-hearing 34:1	19:19
onset 37:15	parte 14:6	26:6,15,16,25,25	Posthearing 36:22	productively 18:10 Professional 45:8
	Parte 17.0	27:16 31:8 42:24	practice 13:2,7	Professional 45:8
	I	I	I	I

Page	52
------	----

				1 490 02
project 16:1,3 26:4	Q	recess 33:20 34:6	34:2 36:24	resource 12:17
projects 19:12,13		35:5	Reporter 45:8,8	16:7
prompted 38:17	qualified 41:23	recognize 16:25	represent 4:16 5:18	resources 18:22
proposal 32:25	quality 12:20,22	recommend 16:19	5:23 6:23 9:24	28:16
propose 32:23	15:5 20:21,22	recommendation	10:2 15:12	respect 13:9,21
34:22	question 7:24 18:1	43:9	representation	21:5 32:25
proposed 23:6	29:13 38:22	reconvene 34:25	7:12,15 16:13	respects 41:17
32:10,12,19 34:12	questions 19:21	record 4:24 8:20	19:5,6	respond 14:22
proposing 37:14	22:4 25:9	11:24 17:15,18	representations	24:24 31:5
propounded 37:11	quote 10:1	18:2,6,15 22:9,11	10:17	Respondent 1:8
38:11	quote/unquote	34:4 35:7,9 38:19	representative 5:9	2:12
proprietary 45:12	13:22	39:6,23 40:9	5:14,22 7:19	response 8:9,12
protective 13:10,12	R	recording 45:12	representatives	11:8 14:1,14
13:14,17 39:11,15	$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R} 2:1 3:1 45:1}$	recordings 45:11	10:1,23 29:20	15:17 21:10 32:25
39:19	raise 28:10,12	recovery 12:16	40:8,12	33:2,3,6,15 35:25
provide 8:19 21:6	raised 11:25 12:12	16:4	represented 12:4	36:3,5 37:11,14
37:10 38:9 40:1	22:3 23:19 35:17	reduce 33:7	18:9	37:17 38:11
provided 15:16	44:6	reference 20:24	representing 6:5	responses 33:6,10
32:10 41:15	rare 13:2	regard 23:13 32:11	10:5,15,23 17:15	36:1 37:22 38:5
providing 37:21	ratcheting 33:14	regarding 13:23	represents 15:11	responsibilities
provisions 21:7	rate 15:23 16:3,5	33:24 39:21	request 10:19	11:16
prudence 12:18,19	16:16 18:8,20	regardless 25:20	13:11 34:19 35:18	restrictions 20:15
16:2 23:18	19:9 20:19 21:16	regional 5:3	37:10,11,13,14	result 42:9
prudency 20:23	27:1 33:1	Registered 45:8	38:10,11 39:11	resulting 18:10
prudent 24:2	ratemaking 42:4	regularly 14:24	40:25 41:2 42:3	retained 5:18,23
PSE's 16:7	ratepayers 23:5	regulates 12:22	42:22 43:2	return 34:19
public 2:7,9 6:15	rates 5:1,4 19:11	regulations 18:17	requested 12:6	review 28:3
6:18 8:17 15:9,9	23:6,7 42:5	21:6,13	36:11	reviewed 8:18
15:11 16:24 17:9	RCW 20:9	regulator 12:21	requester 37:12	reviewing 14:13
17:13,15,19 18:3	reaction 28:3	regulatory 5:1,4	38:12	Rick 3:10 7:1
18:7 19:4,9,10,14	read 9:22 34:4 35:7	20:21 26:10	requesting 12:1	right 6:9 27:24
19:16 21:14 22:20	35:9 38:18 39:22	reiterate 9:20	requests 37:17,21	32:5 34:6,20 35:3
24:11,16 34:9,12	40:9	relates 30:12	41:22 42:10	37:9 38:1 42:1
34:15 35:1,25	real 27:17	relative 45:13	require 10:4 12:24	43:13,18,21
36:11 37:4 41:15	really 16:18 27:6	relevant 25:4 26:11	20:13	rightly 21:16
42:16 43:14	27:17 30:25 33:15	28:18 29:23	required 8:12 15:3	rights 11:15
Puget 15:22 16:3	33:17	remain 33:8	15:15	rise 13:1
purpose 7:23	reasonable 11:14	remedy 21:10	requirements	Road 3:4
purposes 25:22	18:4 42:4	27:12	11:20 12:6,10	Robinson 2:8 6:17
pursuant 41:23	reasonableness	remember 27:24	requires 39:24	role 5:24,25 13:8
pursue 26:4 28:7	23:17	34:2	requiring 16:22	13:21,23 15:4,9
put 26:1 32:1 34:11	reasons 18:19	Rendahl 41:5	residents 17:21	17:14
35:23 39:5	rebuttal 33:8 36:7	repeat 15:17	18:21 19:1 31:9	roles 29:18
puts 30:21	receive 40:13	replacement 31:25	resolution 18:11	rubric 23:19
putting 9:18	received 40:5 45:12	reply 8:8,12,13	21:19	rules 25:19 40:1
-	receives 10:11	22:7,10,11,12,24	resolving 41:6	ruling 11:3 30:1

				i aye 55
rulings 21:13	share 11:7 25:10,12	40:24 41:2,10,14	24:15 40:12	42:13 43:3 44:9
run 32:20 34:21	29:5,21	41:22 42:3,5,9	supporting 40:10	Thanks 38:7
	sharing 19:11	43:24	supports 13:11	thing 33:22 40:24
S	25:14	staff's 11:4,24 13:8	17:9 19:9,14	things 14:1 29:7
S 2:1 3:1	sharpen 18:2,5	13:21 14:22 15:4	21:14	33:21
sake 32:3 33:25	21:18	15:7	sure 5:14,21 10:14	think 12:4,10,17
satellite 31:15	sharpens 17:17	stand 30:1	34:4	20:15 23:2,15
saw 23:23 24:7	shipped 19:1	standard 8:15	suspended 14:12	24:25 28:22 30:21
says 27:11	shortly 44:1	13:10,12,14 16:21	suspension 37:1	31:13,21 34:16
schedule 32:10,12	show 15:15	33:3 39:15,21	38:21,23 39:1	38:22 41:18
32:14,19 33:14	sic 4:17	standards 20:21,23	system 10:11,13	third 15:7,7 30:20
34:7,11,18 35:7,9	sign 13:19 24:7	Starkey 2:14 4:19	12:16,16 19:12,14	thoughts 11:4
35:19 38:18 44:1	29:8	start 4:11	26:13	thousands 18:21
schedules 34:21	significant 9:22	starting 35:9	systems 19:2,12	three 11:24 18:10
scope 12:9 23:16	18:19	state 11:3 16:24		41:8,10
SE 1:15	signing 13:17	22:17,17,18 45:3	T	time 20:14 33:3,7
seasoned 25:3	signs 29:17	45:9	T 45:1,1	33:10 36:1,3,9
Seattle 2:10	similar 12:17 15:4	stated 7:21 15:14	Tad 2:8 6:17	37:10,11,14,17
second 12:8 35:16	25:10	status 16:16 24:6	Tad.ONeill@atg	38:10,11 39:13
see 7:13 9:4 24:10	simply 23:11 31:12	statutory 15:9	2:8	43:22
39:8 42:7 43:21	single 19:9 20:9	Stephen 2:23 6:25	take 17:25 36:20	times 32:25 33:15
seeking 16:4 24:4	Smith 3:10 7:1	steps 29:3	44:7	36:5 41:16
seeks 13:22	solely 7:23	Steve 7:21 40:8	talk 31:24 34:7,22	today 4:5 32:9
send 24:23	somebody 9:7	stevetodd1864@	35:19	35:10 40:20
sense 34:3	sorry 13:6 40:24	2:24	talked 13:10 37:9	Todd 2:23 6:25
Sensible 15:22	43:16	stray 27:16	talking 41:16 43:6	7:21 19:25 21:24
sent 12:1 33:23	sort 13:22 30:21	Street 2:15	tapped 35:9	22:15 25:3 28:14
separate 14:4	Sound 15:22 16:4	subject 8:22 44:5	tariff 14:12 23:6	28:25 29:4,18
separates 14:7	speak 20:6 21:25	subjected 15:2	32:2	40:8
September 35:13	39:14 43:23	submit 20:13,14	tariffs 32:1	tool 42:8,8
45:17	specific 15:25 26:9	submits 14:13	TBD 37:5	topic 9:7
serious 42:22	specifically 20:8	submitted 24:16	ten 33:4,4 36:4	total 19:10
serve 38:4 40:3,4	32:22	39:9	37:15	transcribed 1:24
41:23,25	specificity 16:15	substantial 8:16	terms 23:2 24:19	45:11
served 37:12 38:6	specified 29:10	23:9 41:15	37:21	transfer 10:13
38:12	spoke 30:14	substantive 31:17	testimony 13:25	transmission 16:1
service 10:11 39:22	Square 1:15	successfully 18:10	14:15 20:14 26:9	16:2
40:2	ss 45:4	sufficiency 23:18	33:2,6,9 35:25	Transportation 1:2
sessions 41:10	staff 2:2 6:10,13	sufficient 18:14	thank 5:7 6:3,7,8	1:4,15 4:7
set 12:5 44:5 45:16	11:6 12:5 13:3,11	sufficiently 19:20	6:14,19 9:17	trucked 19:1
sets 20:21	13:22,24 14:1,3,6	suggested 31:1	10:23,25 11:2	true 20:21
settlement 26:22	14:8,9,11,12,18	Suite 2:10,16	17:3,4 21:21,22	try 23:11,20 25:4
27:7,9,14,16	14:24 15:1 16:25	sum 21:14	22:1 25:7 26:19	28:11
35:14,20 41:9	17:13 28:16 32:16	supplemental	27:18 28:19 29:12	trying 7:23 9:8
settlements 10:17	32:18 35:18,24	17:23	29:24 31:2,3,20	24:1 28:16
seven 33:7 36:2,6	37:19 40:11,12,22	support 12:5 19:15	32:8 37:3 39:3	tunc 22:10
	l			

				Faye 34
turn 7:2 17:5 21:23	venture 26:2	we're 4:23 12:3	11 36:24	40128 2:5
31:4	versus 4:7 42:25	23:10 24:1 26:14	12 39:10	425.635.1400 2:17
two 26:3 28:3 29:18	vice 5:4	26:14 28:11,16	133 23:6	480-07-355 11:20
33:21 34:12 35:1	Vicki 3:8 6:25	29:19,19 35:23	15 35:15,20,23	480-07-3705 8:13
36:11	virtual 4:18 36:13	we've 23:19 25:16	16 7:9	480-07-710 41:6
typical 23:8	voices 11:10	35:19,22 36:11	17 36:17	480-07-710(3)
Typically 10:6	VOL 1:11	weigh 20:4	18 40:7	41:24
typo 33:22	vs 1:6	welcome 19:23	19 8:25	
		WHEREOF 45:16	1975 17:19,24	5
U	W	Whidbey 18:25		501(c) 10:7
U-74-1 17:23	W 2:3,21 3:10	31:9,14	2	5109 2:21
UE-220066 15:23	WA 1:24	wholesale 10:11	20 8:9 33:3,5 36:1,3	
UE-23171 17:12	WAC 8:12 11:20	willing 27:19	36:5	6
UG-220067 15:24	41:6,24	willy-nilly 28:11	2000 2:10	6 45:17
ultimately 19:4	wall 14:6	window 33:18	2022 15:23 16:3	621 1:15
undefined 9:25	want 4:24 5:14,24	withdraw 7:13,15	2024 1:12 4:1 6:21	
10:2	7:7,14 9:5,13,14	8:3	7:9 8:9 9:1,1 32:2	7
understand 5:13	11:3,23 12:11	withdrawal 7:19	32:4 35:11,13,15	700 2:16
5:24 9:18,21 11:3	15:19 27:25 33:21	withdrawn 7:12	36:1 39:10 40:7	8
19:25 23:8 30:23	37:25 39:5,22	witness 11:16	41:4 45:17	8 17:12 36:19
understanding	40:9 42:8	16:11 45:16	2025 33:24 34:13	800 2:10
33:12 38:20,24	wanted 32:3 37:20	witnesses 29:5	36:9,17,19,21,23	800 2:10
unified 20:2	37:23 39:20	Woodland 1:15	36:25 37:2 39:2,4	9
unique 10:7 37:23	warning 24:7	work 22:25	2026 33:24	96:21
Unit 2:9	Washington 1:1,4	writing 8:5 9:2	206.464.6595 2:11	98004 2:16
unusual 13:7	1:15,16 2:4,5,10	30:4 44:8	206.660.6860 2:25	98104 2:10
urge 16:21	2:16,19,21,24 3:3	wrote 17:13	206.799.4843 2:22	98203-1526 2:21
use 16:6 18:22	3:5 4:6 6:22,24	Wu 3:11	206.919.6684 3:6	98236 2:24
41:19	15:10 17:11 22:17		21 1:12 4:1 35:11	98249 3:5
useful 41:14 42:7	30:18 40:6 45:3,9	X	2345 3:4	98504 1:16 2:5
usually 11:11	water 1:7 2:18 3:2		23rd 2:21	702041.10 2.5
UTC 12:16,20	4:7,17,20,22 5:5	<u> </u>	25 36:23	
42:10 43:11,12	5:11,12,18 6:21	years 16:6	26 35:13	
utilities 1:2,4,15	6:23 7:16 8:19,22	yesterday 8:10	27 41:4,9	
4:6 22:21	9:22,23 10:10,11	Z	2731 1:24 45:22	
utility 5:20 17:11	10:19 12:15,16,20		28 9:1	
18:20	12:22 17:10 18:8	0	<u> </u>	
UW-240151 1:6 4:5	18:24,25 19:2,11		3	
	20:21,22 21:17	1	31 17:24	
	24:11 26:12 30:16	1 32:1,2,4 37:2	327 17:12	
valuable 8:20	30:17 40:5,6	38:21,23,25 39:1	34-05-443 20:10	
value 41:18	42:19 43:9	39:1,4,6	360.664.1187 2:6	
various 16:6 17:15	way 14:20 23:5	1-45 1:9	3845 2:23	
19:2	31:17 42:9	10 33:9 36:8	4	
vast 26:10	ways 15:3	10:37 44:10	4 36:21	
vehicle 24:22	we'll 28:4 44:7	10885 2:15	- JU.21	