

**Docket Nos. UE-190334, UG-190335, and UE-190222
(Consolidated) - Vol. II**

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

October 15, 2019



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)
DOCKETS UE-190334, UG-190335)
and UE-190222 (Consolidated)

)
Complainant,)

)
vs.)

)
AVISTA CORPORATION, d/b/a)
AVISTA UTILITIES,)

)
Respondent.)

HEARING, VOLUME II

Pages 47-130

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ANDREW O'CONNELL

October 15, 2019

10:00 A.M.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast
Lacey, Washington 98503

REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358

Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 287-9066 | Seattle
(360) 534-9066 | Olympia
(800) 846-6989 | National
www.buellrealtime.com

1 APPEARANCES (Cont.)

2 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:

3 JOE DALLAS

4 DANIEL J. TEIMOURI

5 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI (via phone)

6 Assistant Attorneys General

7 PO Box 40128

8 Olympia, Washington 98504

9 (360) 664-1192

10 joe.dallas@utc.wa.gov

11 daniel.teimouri@utc.wa.gov

12 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov

13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:

14 LISA W. GAFKEN

15 Assistant Attorney General

16 Washington Attorney General's Office

17 Public Counsel Unit

18 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000

19 Seattle, Washington 98104

20 (206) 464-6595

21 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov

22 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT:

23 SIMON FFITCH (via phone)

24 Law Office of Simon J. ffitch

25 321 High School Road Northeast

Suite D3, No. 383

Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110

(206) 669-8197

simon@ffitchlaw.com

FOR AWEC:

TYLER C. PEPPE

Davison Van Cleve PC

1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450

Portland, Oregon 97201

(503) 241-7242

tcp@dvclaw.com

1 APPEARANCES

2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

3 ANDREW J. O'CONNELL

4 FOR AVISTA:

5 DAVID J. MEYER, ESQ.

6 VP and Chief Counsel for Regulatory and

7 Governmental Affairs

8 Avista Corporation

9 P.O. Box 3727

10 1411 E. Mission Avenue, MSC-27

11 Spokane, Washington 99220

12 (509) 495-4316

13 david.meyer@avistacorp.com

14 FOR PACIFIC POWER:

15 KATHERINE A. McDOWELL

16 McDowell Rackner Gibson PC

17 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400

18 Portland, Oregon 97205

19 (503) 595-3924

20 katherine@mrg-law.com

21 AJAY K. KUMAR

22 Pacific Power

23 Rocky Mountain Power

24 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1800

25 Portland, Oregon 97232

(503) 813-5161

ajay.kumar@pacificcorp.com

FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY:

DONNA L. BARNETT

Perkins Coie

The PSE Building

10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700

Bellevue, Washington 98004

(425) 635-1419

dbarnett@perkinscoie.com

1 APPEARANCES (Cont.)

2 FOR SIERRA CLUB:

3 JESSICA YARNALL LOARIE (via phone)

4 Senior Attorney, Sierra Club

5 2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300

6 Oakland, California 94612

7 (415) 977-5636

8 jessica.yarnall@sierraclub.com

9 FOR NW ENERGY COALITION:

10 MARIE BARLOW (via phone)

11 Sanger Thompson PC

12 1041 SE 58th Place

13 Portland, Oregon 97215

14 (503) 919-3779

15 marie@sanger-law.com

16 * * * * *

Page 51	Page 53
<p>1 LACEY, WASHINGTON; OCTOBER 15, 2019 2 10:00 A.M. 3 --o0o-- 4 P R O C E E D I N G S 5 6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Good morning. 7 Let's be on the record. The time is approximately 8 10 o'clock in the morning on Tuesday, 9 October 15th, 2019. 10 My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an 11 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities 12 and Transportation Commission, and I am co-presiding 13 with the Commissioners in Avista's general rate case and 14 ERM. And I will be presiding at this hearing on Staff's 15 motion to sever Avista's ERM from this general rate case 16 and consolidate it with PSE's, Puget Sound Energy's, PCA 17 and Pacific Power's PCAM. 18 The Commission has yet to decide on how to 19 rule on Staff's motion. Thank you to all the parties 20 for waiving the seven days notice so that we could have 21 this hearing today. We have a number of concerns and 22 questions that we want the input from the parties in how 23 to best resolve, but before we get to that, let's take 24 appearances, and short appearances are sufficient. 25 Let's begin with the companies and Avista.</p>	<p>1 Loarie for Sierra Club. 2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And the Northwest Energy 3 Coalition? 4 MS. BARLOW: This is Marie Barlow with 5 Northwest Energy Coalition. 6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. 7 I believe we have a representative from 8 every party. I want to start by saying we're not 9 pleased with any party or about the situation we find 10 ourselves in. The timing of Staff's motion is 11 difficult, and the apparent lack of information being 12 shared is very disappointing. We determined this 13 hearing was necessary to help us decide the best option 14 going forward. The Commissioners would prefer to 15 preside along with me, but their schedules didn't permit 16 it. 17 Let's -- let's first address the elephant in 18 the room. The issue we want to address today is the 19 decision-making leading up to the 2018 Colstrip outage 20 and how the Commission can get the information it needs 21 to make a decision. 22 The three companies, Avista, Pacific Power, 23 and PSE, are all co-owners of Colstrip, and each has 24 filed a separate case seeking to recover for power costs 25 including costs related to the 2018 Colstrip outage. We</p>
Page 52	Page 54
<p>1 MR. MEYER: Thank you, Your Honor. I want 2 to make sure my mic is on. There we go. For Avista, 3 David Meyer. 4 MS. McDOWELL: Katherine McDowell here on 5 behalf of Pacific Power. 6 MR. KUMAR: Ajay Kumar on behalf of Pacific 7 Power. 8 MS. BARNETT: Donna Barnett on behalf of 9 Puget Sound Energy. 10 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. 11 And for Staff? 12 MR. DALLAS: Joe Dallas on behalf of Staff. 13 MR. TEIMOURI: Daniel Teimouri on behalf of 14 Staff. 15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And Public Counsel? 16 MS. GAFKEN: Lisa Gafken on behalf of Public 17 Counsel. 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And the Alliance of 19 Western Energy Consumers, AWEC? 20 MR. PEPPLE: This is Tyler Pepple for AWEC. 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: The Energy Project? 22 MR. FFITCH: Simon ffitich representing The 23 Energy Project. 24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sierra Club? 25 MS. YARNALL LOARIE: This is Jessica Yarnall</p>	<p>1 are well aware that the companies' cases have a plethora 2 of different issues in them, which share little or no 3 commonality. We're not holding this hearing because of 4 these issues. We're holding this hearing because of the 5 2018 Colstrip outage decision-making. It's an issue 6 that we may or may not decide is large enough to 7 outweigh the lack of commonality in the rest of the 8 filings. 9 We see that in Avista's general rate case 10 and ERM, we are going to be asked to make a decision 11 regarding prudence of decision-making leading up to the 12 2018 Colstrip outage. The burden is on Avista in that 13 case to show prudence and it is the burden of the other 14 companies to show prudence in their own cases. We are 15 concerned that we may not have sufficient information to 16 make a determination of prudence and keep in mind 17 whether ratepayers should pay for increased power costs 18 that the companies incurred resulting from the outage. 19 This hearing is about how we, the -- the 20 Commission, can get the information we need to make a 21 decision. It's not just any longer the concern of Staff 22 and getting the information that it needs. We are 23 concerned that we will not have sufficient information. 24 And if we determine that the only way we're going to get 25 sufficient information is by consolidating the dockets,</p>

Page 55	Page 57
<p>1 then we might have to do that. 2 All parties will have multiple chances to 3 speak at this hearing. I want the parties to stay 4 focused on the elephant in the room, the decision-making 5 leading up to the 2018 Colstrip outage and how the 6 Commission can most efficiently get the information we 7 need. 8 I'll allow at the end of the proceeding for 9 the parties to have input into anything that does not 10 otherwise come up in the hearing related to this 11 question, but I want the parties to stay focused on the 12 topics we address when we address them. If, during the 13 hearing, the parties believe a short recess is 14 necessary, perhaps where they can discuss amongst 15 themselves, I would permit such a request. 16 We see several options for moving forward, 17 but, though, let's talk about the obvious ones to start, 18 both of which have flaws. The first is, we keep 19 Avista's ERM with its general rate case and we keep the 20 dockets all separate. The problems that we see with 21 keeping Avista's ERM with its general rate case is that 22 the issue of decision-making leading up to the 2018 23 Colstrip outage is also an issue in PSE and Pacific 24 Power's filings. 25 While we were making only a decision as to</p>	<p>1 option. 2 I want to start by hearing from Staff three 3 questions I want to put at this time to Staff. First, I 4 want Staff to outline what information is lacking and 5 what they would need from the companies in order to make 6 a prudency determination. 7 Second, I want to give Staff the opportunity 8 at this time to explain why it believes we have to 9 consolidate Avista's ERM with PSE's PCA and Pacific 10 Power's PCAM. 11 Last, is there another way, other than 12 through consolidation of these dockets, that Staff can 13 envision getting the necessary information. 14 Mr. Dallas. 15 MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Your Honor. So I 16 will take each question in the order you presented them. 17 So Staff's position is that the narrative 18 behind what happened leading up to the 2018 Colstrip 19 outage is spread across three dockets. Staff would like 20 to tell this narrative to the Commission; however, Staff 21 cannot provide this narrative pertaining to what 22 happened without referencing confidential information 23 within each docket. 24 Staff believes the information it would like 25 to reference would not be considered confidential among</p>
Page 56	Page 58
<p>1 Avista in its ERM docket, the problem is that we were 2 only making a decision as to Avista, while PSE and 3 Pacific Power are also co-owners of Colstrip. Having to 4 make three different evaluations and determinations of 5 prudency and three separate proceedings for an issue, 6 the decision-making of the ownership for Colstrip 7 leading up to the outage, that could be resolved more 8 efficiently with a single determination. 9 The second, sever the ERM, consolidate with 10 the PCA and the PCAM as has been requested by Staff. 11 The effective date for Avista's ERM presents an 12 unfortunately tight timeline for resolution. Avista can 13 correct me if I'm mistaken, but I believe that date is 14 in early April 2020. 15 MR. MEYER: That's correct, Your Honor. 16 April 1st. 17 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. 18 We believe that an adjudication can be done 19 on that timeline, but there would be difficulties to 20 overcome as the companies have pointed out in their 21 responses. But we may feel after this hearing that we 22 have no other choice to get the information that we 23 need. This hearing is to determine if there is a better 24 option than the two I've outlined, and I'll allow all 25 the parties the opportunity to perhaps collaborate on an</p>	<p>1 the companies as joint owners of Colstrip. This is 2 because this information relates to the operation and 3 management of Colstrip. Staff cannot provide a complete 4 narrative of what happened during the 2018 outage in 5 three separate dockets at this time and will have 6 completely different recommendations as to each Colstrip 7 owner based on the different administrative records in 8 each docket. 9 It would be unwieldy, uneconomic, and 10 awkward to have a docket where concerning the same 11 doc -- the same document, one company withholds the 12 document based on asserted privilege or confidentiality, 13 one company represents the document doesn't exist, and 14 one company represents the document exists and provides 15 it as a confidential response. This information 16 incongruity among the three dockets can lead to 17 different outcomes as to each company. 18 To illustrate this point, one company has 19 not yet acknowledged the fact that Talen has conducted a 20 Q-1 investigation. One company acknowledged this 21 investigation did occur, but did not provide any 22 documentation on it. And another company had 23 acknowledged there was an investigation, but provided 24 documents pertaining to the investigation as a 25 confidential response. This designation limits Staff's</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 ability to use that information in the other two 2 dockets. And -- and just to make this clear, Staff must 3 make its recommendation based on the individual 4 administrative records in each power cost filing. 5 Although the companies disagree, Staff's 6 position is that it would like to tell one narrative 7 about what happened. If the individual companies did 8 something different than the other ones, Staff would 9 acknowledge this distinction within its single 10 recommendation. Staff believes the Commission needs to 11 hear the complete narrative that is spread across the 12 three dockets to provide a result that's fair, just, and 13 reasonable. 14 As to specifics, Staff would propose a 15 two-tiered level of confidentiality in the consolidated 16 adjudication. The first tier would be confidential 17 information that is not confidential among the Colstrip 18 owners relating to the operation and management of 19 Colstrip. 20 The second layer of confidentiality would be 21 confidentially commercially sensitive information that 22 would be confidential amongst the Colstrip owners. 23 We believe that this two-tiered level of 24 confidentiality will accomplish the goal of giving Staff 25 the information to give the Commission the best</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 different based off the incongruity in the record. We 2 believe that a consolidated adjudication can deal with 3 these confidentiality issues in one proceeding so we can 4 have the information pertaining to what happened before 5 the outage, and specifically what Talen did prior to the 6 outage given the fact that we believe the outage was 7 foreseeable. 8 And also, I think there's a judicial economy 9 aspect as well. It'd be much easier from a -- from a 10 resource perspective for the Commission to -- to make 11 this determination in one proceeding as opposed to -- 12 to -- to three separate proceedings on -- on -- on 13 really the same cost and the same parties, the Colstrip 14 owners. 15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: There might be some 16 judicial economy having the decision made in one 17 proceeding, but we're operating under a timeline that 18 makes it rather tight and difficult. 19 MR. DALLAS: So -- so -- so Staff's position 20 is -- is we do not want consolidation to prejudice 21 Avista at all. We -- it's very important to us that any 22 consolidated adjudication wrap up before April 1st. We 23 believe this consolidation -- this consolidated 24 adjudication will be narrowly focused on one issue, and 25 that's going to be what happened before the Colstrip</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 recommendation and preserving the companies' individual 2 commercially sensitive information. 3 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me -- let me stop you 4 just for a moment and back up. So I'm hearing a lot 5 about the -- the reasons why we should consolidate into 6 a single document, a single case, but what 7 specifically -- without revealing confidential 8 information, I'm -- I'm -- I guess I'm asking for 9 general topics, but what specifically do you not have 10 that you think you need to get? 11 MR. DALLAS: So really right now, there's a 12 big gap in the record. When the Company submitted their 13 initial filing, they submitted testimony from the outage 14 on, and there was a huge gap in the record pertaining to 15 what happened before the outage. We believe that we 16 have information that shows the outage was foreseeable. 17 Just because the outage was foreseeable, Staff's 18 position is that, that it's not imprudent, but we need 19 more information to determine what Talen and the 20 companies did before the outage. 21 But right now we don't have information in 22 each docket. We have information pertaining to what 23 happened in one docket, but not the other two. The 24 information that we do have is confidential, so when we 25 write our recommendations, they're going to be wildly</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 outage. And -- and -- and this could be a very 2 expedited proceeding. And it's very important to Staff 3 that this wrap up before the suspension date and the 4 GRC. 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, let's get to that a 6 little bit later, but I do recall that there are other 7 parties in Avista's GRC that intend to bring up other 8 contested issues other than the decision-making leading 9 up to the Colstrip outage. 10 MR. DALLAS: Yeah, and if I could mention 11 that for a second, Your Honor. We are aware that AWEC 12 and Public Counsel may have other issues they want to 13 discuss in the consolidated adjudication pertaining to 14 the ERM. Staff's understanding is that these issues are 15 relatively small in comparison to the issue of the 16 Colstrip outage. And I really want -- want to focus on 17 the legal standard here, that the -- the standard is 18 that the issues of fact and principles of law have to be 19 related, not identical. But -- but I -- I -- I can't 20 speak for AWEC and Public Counsel. 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: How -- has Staff thought 22 about how else we could go about this to get the 23 information Staff says it needs in order to make a 24 decision, the information that we also -- we need? 25 MR. DALLAS: So -- so really our -- our</p>

4 (Pages 59 to 62)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 preference would be -- would be to have one protective 2 order, and in that one protective order, we would -- we 3 would figure out how we deal with the confidentiality 4 among the Colstrip owners. Now, if the Commission 5 doesn't go that route, we're going to have to fight 6 every individual designation so we can have three 7 identical administrative records so we can tell the same 8 story. Staff -- Staff thinks it's -- it doesn't make 9 sense for us to have three completely different 10 recommendations based off what the companies provide or 11 or -- or -- or refuse to provide. 12 So I -- I think it would be an uphill battle 13 to try to get three identical administrative records. I 14 think it would be much easier if we just have one 15 protective order and have that two-tier -- two-tiered 16 level of confidentiality, and then we can tell our story 17 and -- and -- and protect the companies' confidential 18 information at the same time. 19 JUDGE O'CONNELL: So no, there isn't another 20 idea that Staff has how to get this -- how to get this 21 information other than consolidate them? 22 MR. DALLAS: So the other option would be to 23 fight every individual designation in an attempt to get 24 three identical administrative records in the three 25 dockets pertaining to the same cost. So it -- it -- it</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 there was a -- a common hearing, a common process 2 that -- that happened. And that might address some of 3 the discomfort with the confidentiality between the 4 companies, but it would also foster the judicial economy 5 of having to deal with this in one proceeding. 6 I hear what Staff is saying about having to 7 fight all the confidentiality designations. I'm not 8 sure if my idea helps with that, particularly if the 9 companies continue to be somewhat inconsistent with how 10 they're providing the information, but that's -- that's 11 an -- an idea. 12 I did want to address briefly the piece of 13 Public Counsel's advocacy that might be more appropriate 14 in the GRC versus Avista's ERM. I have one witness 15 that's addressing both of those concepts. The -- the 16 concept of directional bias, that -- that's the piece 17 that could potentially go into the GRC versus staying 18 with the ERM, and if we separated that out that would 19 keep kind of the commonality intact among the three 20 companies. 21 Our testimony there is really more 22 informative. It -- it -- we're not offering it for 23 decisional purposes. We could sever that piece of the 24 testimony and with the Commission's permission, file 25 that in the GRC. It's relatively short. It's about --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 is possible, but, you know, the legal standard we're 2 dealing with among -- among them is judicial economy, 3 and it's much more efficient to have one protective 4 order that protects all the companies and allow Staff 5 and the Commission to have the relevant information. 6 MR. TEIMOURI: Excuse me, your Honor. Dan 7 Teimouri with Commission Staff. We could also issue 8 bench requests relating directly to this information to 9 the companies and -- and ask them directly for the 10 requested information. 11 MR. DALLAS: But -- but I'm not sure if that 12 would resolve the confidentiality issues but... 13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Let me -- let's 14 turn to Public Counsel. Ms. Gafken, the same questions 15 generally for Public Counsel, is there another way you 16 can envision getting the information needed without 17 consolidating? 18 MS. GAFKEN: I did have one other idea. I'm 19 not certain that it's much better than the consolidation 20 idea. The Commission has conducted proceedings that are 21 not consolidated but conducted simultaneously. So that 22 was done -- I don't have the docket numbers at hand, but 23 a Puget filing back in 2012 or 2013 where they had an 24 ERF and a decoupling docket. Those dockets were not 25 consolidated, but they were held simultaneously. So</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 that portion of the testimony is approximately ten 2 pages, and there's five exhibits that go along with it. 3 I don't believe that Avista would be prejudiced. We 4 outlined what that testimony would say in the letter 5 that we filed on October 3rd outlining what issues we 6 were anticipating on -- on filing. So I think that 7 there would be plenty of opportunity to respond and no 8 prejudice in that case, but we -- we could sever that 9 piece of our testimony out and provide that to the 10 Commission through the GRC and then keep our Colstrip 11 issues separate and deal with that in the ERM proceeding 12 if it's severed and consolidated with the other three. 13 Did you want me to -- to address your second 14 question in terms of why consolidation is -- is 15 necessary or -- 16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, I think -- 17 MS. GAFKEN: -- want me to stop there? 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: -- it was more aimed at 19 Staff -- 20 MS. GAFKEN: Okay. 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: -- the proponent of 22 wanting to consolidate. If you think that's the best 23 option, I would be interested to hear that. I -- I do 24 have a question, though, about your suggestion with 25 sharing a common procedural schedule for the separated</p>

Page 67	Page 69
<p>1 dockets and, you know, hearing them together but keeping 2 them separate. And I'm curious, do you think we would 3 have any trouble, any confusion making sure that those 4 items stay separate when they get heard in front of 5 Commission and then when they get decided? Just because 6 in my review of that example you gave, that caused a big 7 issue for the Commission later on.</p> <p>8 MS. GAFKEN: I -- I think it's a flawed 9 approach if I'm being completely frank. It's a little 10 bit illusory because in my mind, it is consolidated, and 11 it does pose some administrative hassles on the 12 decision-making side in terms of having -- you still 13 have to produce three orders, you know, if you are 14 keeping it separate. It does look like it's 15 consolidated, and so I think it's hard to understand so 16 it lacks transparency. If you're Joe public looking in, 17 I'm not sure that they fully understand what's going on 18 in that circumstance.</p> <p>19 I do believe that consolidation would be 20 more efficient. It would solve a lot of those problems. 21 You would have one record to deal with instead of three, 22 and there is a common story that needs to be told with 23 respect to the Colstrip outage and the -- and the events 24 leading up to that outage. From Public Counsel's 25 perspective, we have a story that we're ready to tell in</p>	<p>1 with informal discovery. Our -- our engagement with 2 PacifiCorp has been a lot lighter, and that's purely a 3 resource adequacy issue. Of course, if these three 4 cases are consolidated, we will fully participate and go 5 forward that way. But there is -- there is a pretty 6 serious resource adequacy issue in dealing with all of 7 the things that come before the Commission.</p> <p>8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 9 I am aware that there are a number of 10 parties on the bridge line who are present here for this 11 hearing, thank you, but they also indicated that they 12 were not going to be really participating in this 13 discussion.</p> <p>14 And I want to check with Mr. Pepple. And I 15 do not recall and I want to offer you the chance to 16 speak, and I was curious if you are participating in 17 this discussion?</p> <p>18 MR. PEPPLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Well, I 19 guess, yeah, we're happy -- we -- we certainly, yes, are 20 interested in participating in this discussion. I guess 21 if the question is whether we intend to file testimony 22 on the Colstrip outage, at this time, we do not, 23 although I wouldn't -- that's -- that's not intended to 24 indicate, you know, a position on it one way or the 25 other.</p>
Page 68	Page 70
<p>1 the Avista ERM filing, but, you know, Staff has 2 expressed some pretty serious concerns that perhaps we 3 don't have a clear story, or the full story, with 4 respect to all three of the companies.</p> <p>5 So while I feel like I have a story to tell 6 the Commission with respect to Avista's ERM, I'm not 7 certain that it's the complete story or that it has all 8 the information that the Commission needs in order to 9 make a decision. And -- and that really goes to, you 10 know, concerns about the -- the regulatory system and 11 public trust and transparency. So I do believe that 12 consolidation would -- would resolve a lot of those 13 issues.</p> <p>14 And in terms of the confidentiality issue, I 15 think those are things we can work through. Staff's 16 idea about the two-tiered confidentiality method is a 17 good one. We can deal with those issues as we come to 18 them. We may still have some discovery battles 19 depending on how things go forward, but we have those 20 anyway with three separate proceedings. And if they 21 were separated, it would take a whole lot more resources 22 than if they were consolidated.</p> <p>23 You know, I mentioned this in our response, 24 Public Counsel only recently filed notices of appearance 25 in the other two dockets. We had engaged with Puget</p>	<p>1 I guess I would say if -- you know, in 2 response to your -- your first question about whether 3 there are alternatives to consolidation, you know, one 4 other idea might be -- it's something that I just came 5 up with on the fly, so if it's a bad idea, then that's 6 fine. But it -- it -- it seems like it might be 7 possible to have another protective order that only 8 applies to the Colstrip outage and would be issued in 9 each utility's power cost docket. That would allow for 10 the exchange and use of information related to the 11 Colstrip outage in each docket without them being 12 necessarily consolidated. So just one other alternative 13 if the Commission does not want to consolidate the 14 dockets.</p> <p>15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. I think we 16 should bring that up later and talk about that one. 17 Next I want -- I want to turn to the 18 companies.</p> <p>19 MR. DALLAS: And -- and, Your Honor, before 20 we turn to the companies, Staff has a proposition that 21 we'd like to hear what the companies thoughts are.</p> <p>22 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Do you want to do that on 23 the record or -- 24 MR. DALLAS: Yeah, we can do it on the 25 record. So after careful review of each filing, Staff</p>

Page 71	Page 73
<p>1 is now willing to stipulate that if these dockets are 2 consolidated, the only issue it will contest is the 3 prudence of the replacement power cost associated with 4 the 2018 Colstrip outage. With this stipulation, 5 though, Staff would like to consolidate the entire 6 dockets because the Commission has to improve the entire 7 deferral balances in each docket. It doesn't make sense 8 to sever individual issues in each docket if the 9 Commission needs to ultimately improve the entire 10 deferral balances. And with that, we -- we would like 11 to hear what the companies thoughts are on Staff's 12 proposed stipulation.</p> <p>13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, before we get there, 14 let's say that the companies reject your offer, but the 15 Commission decides we have to consolidate these anyway, 16 can we hold Staff to this only one issue is going to be 17 contested if this gets consolidated?</p> <p>18 MR. DALLAS: I -- I -- I believe so. That's 19 Staff's position, and, you know, we -- we certainly want 20 to address the Commission's concerns and the companies' 21 concerns about commonality. In preparation for this 22 hearing, Staff looked at every filing, and we do not 23 believe any other costs ought to be included -- included 24 in the 2018 deferral balances were imprudent, so 25 therefore, we would propose that the consolidated</p>	<p>1 start with that as an article of faith, you then find a 2 way to navigate through that, navigate through the 3 confidentiality issues. And I think there are ways to 4 do that.</p> <p>5 I -- I'm not going to reargue because we're 6 vectoring in, if you will, on -- on a more precise 7 Colstrip issue here, but I want to emphasize that when 8 we filed the ERM six months ago, that triggered very 9 extensive discovery and over 150 separate items from 10 Staff and a hundred from other parties involved in the 11 production of 600 documents and countless hundreds of 12 hours of Avista, Staff time. I stand to be corrected, 13 but I don't believe we objected to any or if we did 14 object to any of the discovery, that I know there wasn't 15 a motion to compel, but I don't believe we even 16 objected. Now, whether the responses were sufficient or 17 not, that's I guess in the eye of the -- the reader.</p> <p>18 So we've had, you know, five months of 19 discovery, ongoing, extensive discovery, and -- with 20 multiple rounds. There haven't been any motions to 21 compel in terms of what Avista did or didn't provide. 22 They -- the -- the Company, I think, has really done a 23 masterful job of dedicating the resources. And -- 24 and -- and I can speak, I guess, candidly here is that 25 frankly, there was a lot of angst within the Company</p>
Page 72	Page 74
<p>1 adjudication would be focused on a very narrow issue and 2 can be resolved before April 1st given that this is the 3 only common issue amongst all three Colstrip -- I mean, 4 all three power cost filings.</p> <p>5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And I 6 mentioned that every party is going to have multiple 7 opportunities to speak. I do intend to come back around 8 to Staff.</p> <p>9 MR. DALLAS: Thank you.</p> <p>10 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I would -- I would ask 11 that the companies think about what Mr. Dallas just 12 requested. I'm not going to ask for responses right 13 away because I feel like that might be a little unfair 14 to ask you to respond immediately, but I would like to 15 ask you -- I want to ask each of the companies, Avista, 16 Pacific Power, and Puget Sound Energy, how do we get the 17 information and make a prudence determination and is 18 there a better way, another way other than 19 consolidating?</p> <p>20 Mr. Meyer.</p> <p>21 MR. MEYER: Thank you, Your Honor. First of 22 all, I know Avista feels this way and I suspect the 23 other companies and all parties in these dockets feel 24 this way is that we want the information to be made 25 available so the right decision gets made. So if you</p>	<p>1 about how much effort was being expended. And I was a 2 proponent, and the Company understood that it's 3 necessary to get this information out, but it was a big 4 job, and I suspect it will continue to be a big job.</p> <p>5 And just as an aside, and this is I think 6 somewhat troubling for all of us who practice before the 7 Commission, it's exhausted some of the goodwill on both 8 sides, frankly; Staff, other parties, and the Company. 9 And I hate to see that happening through this extended 10 discovery process. But we'll patch those things up and 11 we'll get on with doing what we always do. But at this 12 point, five months into it, and virtually at the 11th 13 hour, we have the plug pulled on testimony that was to 14 be filed on October 3rd. The testimony surely was 15 written because when the parties were told that, I think 16 it was October 2nd, they didn't need to file that 17 testimony, I -- I -- I -- being prudent practitioners, 18 I'm sure they had it on the shelf ready to file.</p> <p>19 So we lost that opportunity -- and this is 20 just specific to Avista. We lost that opportunity to 21 then keep the clock going in our joint procedural 22 schedule that called for testimony on the rate case and 23 testimony on the ERM all to be filed on October 3rd. 24 Now where are we? We are by -- I suspect, by the time 25 you and the Commission rule on what we're discussing</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 today, another week or so. It's not up to me to say 2 we've gone by, and we will have lost essentially three 3 weeks on our agreed upon schedule. 4 And in that process -- and there's a reason 5 I'm laying this out, because it may play into some 6 alternative suggestions later on. But in that process, 7 we have not disturbed the December 11th through 13th 8 hearing dates, nor do we want to. That was for the 9 general rate case and for the ERM. But what this 10 three-week delay has caused is a shrinkage of time for 11 us to respond. We had a late -- we had a November 6th, 12 I believe, date for a response, and now we're being 13 pinched. So some adjustment, no matter what, if they 14 remain consolidated in Avista's general rate case needs 15 to be made. And depending on which way the Commission 16 goes, there are ways to do that. It's not the end of 17 the world, there are ways to do that without disturbing 18 the general rate case. 19 At the end of the day, what matters to 20 Avista is April 1 of next year. That is the date our 21 new rates would go into effect, and that is the date 22 that we want to empty this bucket. We have a \$30 23 million bucket of ERM dollars that we've been accruing 24 at -- really since 2005, I believe it is. And under the 25 ERM mechanism, you don't tip that bucket, you don't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 \$30 million tipping point. 2 So I hope that gives you some useful 3 information as to why we're so keen on keeping these two 4 proceedings marching in lockstep. It's -- it's not just 5 important for us or important to the efficient use of 6 your resources here, but it's important to our customers 7 as well. And the time's long since passed for that 8 bucket to be -- to be dumped. 9 So that's all by way of background. What -- 10 what troubles me a bit is that -- and, again, I can't 11 and won't speak to what has been going on in the Puget 12 and the PacifiCorp dockets. I don't know what the 13 procedural posture is of those two dockets. I have not 14 talked to the practitioners on my left, and I -- I won't 15 pretend to. But I know that the Commission has 16 recognized discovery tools. Those tools could be 17 motions to compel, there were no motions to compel for 18 Avista, and in due course, if it was necessary to have a 19 motion to compel with respect to another issue, another 20 company, well, so be it, I don't know. So you have 21 that. And it -- it's -- it's a readymade tool, and 22 somebody else mentioned bench requests, so there are 23 ways of getting at this information. 24 It -- it -- it seems to me that -- let -- 25 let me back up a minute. Common issues are not uncommon</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 empty that bucket until you trip the lid, and that lid, 2 as I said, is \$30 million. 3 With this ERM filing, we will -- assuming 4 there were no issues, assuming there were no issues at 5 all, that bucket would have -- approximately \$34 million 6 bucket would have -- have been dumped, proceeds could go 7 where they belong and that's into the pockets of our 8 customers. Even if, even if one were to subtract out 9 the roughly three and a half million of Colstrip 10 ERM-related dollars from that \$34 million figure, it 11 would still trip the lid. 12 So no matter what, we don't want that date, 13 with or without the Colstrip issue in this case, to go 14 by so that we can't see some mitigation for our 15 customers come next April, April 1st, okay? That's why 16 we're trying to keep these pieces together. 17 Now, in the past, Avista has used -- by 18 agreement of the parties, because we never did trip that 19 lid, we've used in the 2013 case, I believe it was, we 20 had a two-year rate plan, we used pieces of that ERM 21 bucket to mitigate some of the rate year impact, and we 22 did it again in, I think, the 2015 case. But that's 23 only with agreement of the parties or with an order of 24 the Commission. The bucket would not have been dumped, 25 if you will, in those cases because we weren't at the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 with Colstrip. Every rate case -- not every rate case, 2 but in the last several rate cases, some party in one of 3 our jurisdictions has argued that you're spending too 4 much to sustain Colstrip beyond any, in their view, 5 reasonable termination date. Of course that involves 6 capital. But those kind of propositions were tested in 7 Idaho with Avista. Those capital spending decisions are 8 made jointly by those of us in the room along with Talen 9 and other owners. 10 We don't find ourselves when we're arguing 11 over capital, common capital decisions struggling with 12 consolidation and confidentiality. So I'm a little 13 surprised we found ourselves at this point at this time. 14 And certainly for Avista surprised that it is at the 15 11th hour so deep into our process. We in discovery 16 asked I -- I -- I believe it was either in a transmittal 17 letter or in the body of the discovery response, we 18 asked essentially if Staff is aware of any inconsistency 19 between the companies or shortcoming, and certain our 20 response is would you let us know. 21 And essentially that question that we posed 22 was left unanswered because it was no secret that Staff 23 along the way was unhappy with some of the responses 24 they were getting. Don't know whether it was our 25 responses, other responses, or what. So we provided</p>

Page 79	Page 81
<p>1 that invitation, let us know. Let us know. And that 2 was done I -- I'm -- I'm guessing five, six weeks ago in 3 plenty of time, in any event, for us to then sit down 4 and -- and -- and sensibly resolve these discovery 5 disputes. 6 So I think that after you've heard from the 7 other parties and at some point this morning, I would 8 like to propose a break and explore a -- a possible 9 process that would bring alignment to the companies, 10 because remember, the companies haven't had a chance to 11 discuss this among ourselves, and there may be ways we 12 can assist and help work this through. So a recess at 13 some point I think would be in order because no reason 14 why we can't come to terms with this today. 15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I do appreciate that, 16 Mr. Meyer, and I -- we were hoping that by getting the 17 parties here together, either on the bridge line or here 18 in person, that we might be able to facilitate some 19 resolution that could be beneficial for everyone. So 20 thank you. I appreciate that sentiment. 21 Let me turn now to Pacific Power. 22 Ms. McDowell and Mr. Kumar, how do we -- of course, 23 the -- the Commission, we're -- we're primarily focused 24 on how we're going to get the information that we need 25 in order to make, as Mr. Meyer says, you know, get the</p>	<p>1 continue to provide that information to Staff. 2 Now, I do want to say that where we're at 3 right now is in the informal process. And so the first 4 step, I believe, is to move to the adjudicatory process 5 so we can get a protective order in place. And I -- and 6 I thought it was quite constructive in Staff's motion 7 that Staff indicated that through the adjudicative 8 process, it believes that the discovery process that's 9 afforded in adjudication will allow Staff to obtain the 10 necessary information to provide a more detailed 11 recommendation to the Commission on the prudence of 12 these costs. 13 So I think, you know, just the first step is 14 adjudication and going into that, and we -- we haven't 15 even gotten to that step yet. So I think Staff 16 acknowledges that will be a material step to, you know, 17 being able to really get the kinds of information they 18 need from PacifiCorp. PacifiCorp has already filed a 19 protective order and hopes to have it entered as a part 20 of the opening of the adjudicatory process, and we are 21 certainly open to discussing a modified protective order 22 that would have the tiers that your -- that Staff 23 mentioned this morning. 24 I think in our response, you know, we tried 25 to respond as constructively as we could to the concerns</p>
Page 80	Page 82
<p>1 right information to make the right decision. Let's -- 2 we want to get the decision right. Wanted to hear what 3 ways you can think of that we can get this information 4 without having to consolidate. 5 MS. McDOWELL: Yeah. You know, Judge, we 6 really appreciate that question, and I would say that 7 that is a question that we have been focused on in the 8 last couple of months as well. You know, just -- just 9 to maybe point out the obvious, the parties are not 10 similarly situated in part because our filing came many 11 months after Avista's and also after Puget's. So, you 12 know, we are in the place where we are still trying to 13 understand what information Staff needs and working to 14 provide it to Staff. 15 One of the ways that we tried to do that and 16 cut through some of the noise was to set a workshop 17 where we really had some dialogue with Staff in a more 18 open-ended way, in a way that I think is usually more 19 constructive than just, you know, dueling data requests 20 and responses. And I'm hoping -- I -- I feel like that 21 was a constructive step. I'm hoping that we can 22 continue to, you know, really understand what it is that 23 Staff's focused on. I think we now understand that it's 24 the pre-outage period, not the post outage period, but 25 that is, you know, information we've gained, and we can</p>	<p>1 we were hearing from Staff about overlapping cases and 2 issues and workload issues and then this discovery 3 issue. And our -- our -- our response was well, let's 4 see if we can just work on conversations where we would 5 agree to allow discovery that is not confidential just 6 as to PacifiCorp, but only confidential among the owners 7 to be shared. 8 So I think our -- our response attempted to 9 try to make the same overture, that -- that if that's a 10 reasonable process we can agree to we're -- you know, if 11 the information is information that the co-owners 12 already have, then I think we can work around the normal 13 limitations of the protective order, and we would be 14 willing to do that. That was one of our responses. 15 So in our -- in our response is before we 16 went to what we think is a fairly drastic and awkward 17 step of consolidation of disparate proceedings, we 18 thought adjudication, we thought a modified protective 19 order or some kind of collaborative process, and -- and 20 frankly, you know, to avoid overlapping cases and the 21 challenges associated with that, I mean, normally the 22 Commission has -- takes these issues one at a time for 23 each utility, creates the record, and makes a decision 24 in that case, and then the next utility, you know, if -- 25 if it's adverse to the utility, then Staff will</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 certainly cite that as a precedent, and that would need 2 to be distinguished by the next utility. If it goes the 3 other way, then Staff would need to argue why that 4 precedent doesn't apply, but you've already -- you're 5 not relitigating every issue, you're trying to say that 6 that precedent decided, in this case it would be Avista, 7 Avista would go first. When we would presumably next 8 get to Puget's case, Puget would be able to say why or 9 why not that decision applies to it or not.</p> <p>10 I mean, it's a -- that's the normal process. 11 We have overlapping issues in cases regularly, and we 12 usually deal with them by deciding the issue in the 13 first case filed, and then the parties are left to deal 14 with the precedent in the preceding cases. You know, we 15 don't usually start all over again.</p> <p>16 So that -- that to me seems like a process 17 that would work here, and I guess in terms of you're 18 trying to find solution space, that's ours. It's really 19 just doing it the way we usually do it, but I think here 20 with the innovative approach on the protective order, 21 that would allow common confidential information to be 22 shared among the individual dockets.</p> <p>23 So I guess just in closing, we'd like to say 24 that, you know, we are still engaged in the discovery 25 process. Our last discovery, you know, our -- our</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 haven't had bench requests, those are available. An 2 in-camera review of documents, an order to compel, 3 workshops, even -- even depositions if we're talking 4 about a narrative. That's certainly an opportunity -- I 5 mean, an alternative that Staff has available -- 6 available in an adjudicative proceeding.</p> <p>7 I think what we're -- we have -- I do want 8 to mirror what Mr. Meyer said, Puget has similarly 9 requested information, specific information what it -- 10 what it is it's lagging. We -- Puget is unclear about 11 what it does not have or what it has not given, and we 12 have not also received an answer to that specifically, 13 but -- so we don't think that the discovery process is 14 over. And even Mr. Pepple's recommendat- -- just option 15 of a protective order that applies just to the Colstrip 16 is an intriguing thought, that maybe some in between 17 that doesn't need to be -- doesn't require a 18 consolidation.</p> <p>19 But I think it's a big deal to consolidate 20 these cases now. Even -- even if Avista weren't so far 21 along in their rate case, but just consolidating 22 multiple utilities in power cost proceeding, which has 23 never been done in 17 years of doing it, is a very big 24 deal for -- for, what, maybe one document or one piece 25 of information that I think we can address and get --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 workshop with Staff was just at the end of last month. 2 We've filed additional follow-up responses out of that 3 workshop just a couple weeks ago. You know, we would -- 4 we look forward to even a deeper discovery process once 5 we have a protective order in place and an adjudication 6 that's opened. So -- so we think this process can work, 7 and we think ultimately it will end up being the 8 cleanest and least complex way of dealing with what is 9 admittedly a complex issue for the Commission. Thank 10 you.</p> <p>11 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. 12 Puget Sound Energy, Ms. Barnett.</p> <p>13 MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Judge O'Connell. 14 First, I'd like to thank you for allowing PSE the 15 opportunity to come up with some seems like a 16 brainstorming session to come up with some creative 17 alternatives to consolidation, because I do think that 18 those alternatives are out there to get Staff what it 19 needs and the Commission what they need to -- to make a 20 recommendation.</p> <p>21 And I don't have a lot to add on because I 22 agree with Mr. Meyer and Ms. McDowell, but I -- I do 23 think that we haven't tried just adjudication, and I 24 think most of the issues can be addressed through 25 adjudic- -- the adjudicative process. We could --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 get to Staff and get to the Commission short of setting 2 a -- a big precedent for -- for future consolidation.</p> <p>3 So I don't think I have anything other to 4 add except I agree with Ms. McDowell that we should take 5 this -- I sense that there was some urgency when Staff 6 has to file testimony and the GRC is -- is gearing up 7 for Avista that -- but we should still try separate 8 steps first and what can we get through with just the 9 adjudicative process.</p> <p>10 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Staff has an idea at the 11 outset of their suggestions, and I'm curious what the 12 companies think about it. Should the Commission, if we 13 decide we don't want to consolidate these dockets but we 14 do want the information, should we, could we issue bench 15 requests to the companies to get that information more 16 immediately?</p> <p>17 And, Mr. Myer.</p> <p>18 MR. MEYER: Yes, it -- it's -- a lot of 19 information I suspect or if there are holes or perceived 20 holes in the presentation will be filled in our 21 rebuttal. And so that may answer bench requests. And 22 while that's a useful tool, that's sometimes a good tool 23 after the issues have been joined and you really see 24 what you already have that's been presented. So we 25 won't be filing our ERM rebuttal for some period of</p>

Page 87

1 time, because if Colstrip is the ERM issue, clearly we
 2 cannot stay with this existing procedural schedule that
 3 we've married up between Avista's GRC and the ERM. It
 4 just won't work. Too much work has to be done with
 5 testimony on the Colstrip issue. That rebuttal can't be
 6 filed by early November.

7 So we're looking in any event, even if you
 8 don't sever the -- the Avista ERM, I'm afraid you're
 9 looking at two sets of hearings for Avista only, one
 10 dealing with a rate case and then a follow-on hearing
 11 with a somewhat -- with a separate pre-filing track for
 12 the ERM issue, all of which would lead to one order
 13 prior to April of next year. So we're -- we're -- we're
 14 in a pickle, and that procedural pickle has to -- has to
 15 be addressed even if you don't sever.

16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: We're aware of the
 17 procedural difficulty that there is in the Avista case
 18 right now, and we will address it one way or the other.

19 MR. MEYER: Thank you.

20 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. McDowell?

21 MS. McDOWELL: Judge O'Connell, I appreciate
 22 you bringing up that issue or that tool of bench
 23 requests, a tool that Staff also referenced. I think
 24 goes back to your initial point that, you know, Staff
 25 has concerns about getting the information, but really

Page 88

1 more importantly, the Commission does. The Commission
 2 needs that information to make the right decision here.
 3 And I think that knowing that you have that tool of
 4 bench requests is -- is a reason to continue to try to
 5 work this out through the normal adjudicative process
 6 knowing that if there are gaps and, you know, Avista's
 7 case goes forward, but you have questions about
 8 potentially the co-owners or some other aspect of the
 9 case that is not being fully fleshed out in the Avista
 10 record, you know, I think the Commission does have that
 11 tool, and it's a less drastic step than consolidating
 12 these cases and -- and trying to keep three records --
 13 trying to develop three records within a single
 14 proceeding, which is what's going to be required, and
 15 that just seems messy.

16 Whereas if you keep the cases separate,
 17 allow Avista's case to go forward, you have the ability,
 18 the Commission has the ability to issue bench requests
 19 if there seem to be gaps in the narrative. And, you
 20 know, that's a situation where, you know, again, we
 21 would -- to the extent you're seeking information common
 22 to the owners, Avista would have that information to
 23 provide and would not be bound by confidentiality issues
 24 to provide it.

25 To the extent, you know, that is information

Page 89

1 specific to one or the other utilities, well, then
 2 appropriately that would come up in their cases. So I
 3 think, you know, it is appropriate to make different
 4 decisions for different utilities when there are
 5 different circumstances, and that may come up. I mean,
 6 it's not -- uniformity is not necessarily going to be
 7 the outcome because we're all differently situated, but
 8 I think through the Avista process and your bench
 9 request process, you can make sure that you have a
 10 complete record to decide Avista's case when it's first
 11 up, then Puget's, and then ours.

12 So that's -- so I would say in some ways I
 13 think the bench request process is one that can provide
 14 you some assurance and the Commission some assurance
 15 that no matter what, you're going to have the record you
 16 need.

17 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Barnett?

18 MS. BARNETT: Thank you. I agree with --
 19 with both Avista and PacifiCorp, and I -- I think the
 20 bench requests are a valuable tool to get you -- to get
 21 the Commission what they need. I think it would be most
 22 valuable after an informal session with Staff to -- to
 23 get to some clarity about what it is they need. I think
 24 if we identify what they need and then the Commission
 25 issue a bench request. There's a difference between

Page 90

1 what we can -- what Puget can get and what they possess
 2 versus what they don't even know about that -- that's
 3 lagging. So I think the bench request, we can -- like
 4 Ms. McDowell, said we get the Commission what it needs,
 5 but I think more informal, like a workshop, to identify
 6 and get clarity around what exactly that is would be
 7 ideal.

8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Before I return to
 9 Staff, I do want to hear Staff's thoughts on what Staff
 10 has heard. But before we get there, I want to bring up
 11 some other options that we see that the parties might
 12 want to think about when we do take a recess, and we
 13 want to say that we are interested in hearing the
 14 parties' thoughts on whether they are a better option.

15 In particular, the idea of severing and
 16 consolidating just the prudence of decision-making
 17 leading up to the outage. Then after a prudence
 18 decision, return those to the separate dockets. And I'm
 19 aware, as Staff described, of the difficulties of
 20 severing just the issue of this prudence determination,
 21 but if a joint or a consolidated decision were made on
 22 prudence on an expedited schedule and time for them to
 23 be reincorporated back into consideration of the rest of
 24 the issues in each of the dockets, could that not
 25 resolve the difficulties of severing just the prudence

Page 91	Page 93
<p>1 decision? 2 Staff? 3 MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Your Honor. Let me 4 first comment on what the companies stated. I -- I 5 really appreciate their thoughtful responses. I think 6 their solutions would certainly resolve the -- the issue 7 of confidentiality, but it would not resolve the issue 8 of judicial economy. Under their solutions, we would 9 still have three hearings, three procedural schedules, 10 three settlement conferences, three written orders. 11 It -- it -- it wouldn't -- would not resolve that 12 concern, and I think Public Counsel voiced earlier that 13 they have resource constraints, that that's the reason 14 why they participated in the ERM more so than the other 15 two. 16 I think your solution, I -- I need to 17 consult with my client, but Staff's position is we want 18 to make sure the Commission has sufficient information 19 to make a decision that's fair, just, and reasonable for 20 both the ratepayer and the Company, and to make sure 21 that these proceedings don't drain the resources of the 22 Commission. So if your solution could accomplish those 23 two, I think Staff would be willing to entertain that, 24 but that's something I'd have to consult with my client 25 on.</p>	<p>1 with Staff on that. 2 So it's -- it's an interesting idea. I 3 think it's worth pondering more, but I -- I do have some 4 question about whether it simply elongates it. 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me -- let me turn to 6 the companies. And this is in consideration of what I 7 know about Avista's ERM filing. I'm not the judge on 8 the PacifiCorp, Puget Sound Energy filings. There 9 hasn't been a judge assigned. So I'm somewhat more 10 familiar with what's going on in Avista's case, and I am 11 aware that the determination of prudence of 12 decision-making leading up to the Colstrip outage is one 13 piece that then also needs to be considered as a whole 14 with the rest of the Avista's ERM filing including the 15 deferral balance. So that's why my question is, is the 16 potential to sever just the prudence determination have 17 a decision on that and then return it to the separate 18 dockets? 19 Mr. Meyer. 20 MR. MEYER: The more we talk this morning, 21 the narrower the issues appear to be. And so in that 22 sense, I think we're moving in the right direction. 23 What I'm -- but I don't want this to be illusory. We -- 24 we talk from Staff's point of view that the real issue 25 is what happened before the outage, and the remedy</p>
Page 92	Page 94
<p>1 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Right. Perhaps that's 2 something you can discuss during the recess. 3 MR. DALLAS: Absolutely. 4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Ms. Gafken, do you 5 have any thoughts? 6 MS. GAFKEN: That's an intriguing idea. I 7 worry a little bit about the time frame. If we have a 8 separate proceeding on the one issue and then try to 9 finish the rest of the issues separately, do we make it 10 to the end, you know, to the targeted end date? And I'm 11 trying to kind of sketch that out in my own mind. I'm 12 not sure if that elongates it versus if we just do it 13 all at once, because I think we can make the April 1 14 date if we just dive in and do it. It's an intriguing 15 idea, though, because it -- it does sever that one 16 issue. It deals with some of the arguments about the 17 Commission has to deal with each one of the filings. 18 I -- I do want to chime in and -- and say 19 that Public Counsel's focus is also Colstrip. You know, 20 we do have that -- the one up -- you know, we want to 21 provide an update regarding the ERM workshop. I still 22 don't see that as a substantive issue, but really the 23 substantive issue that -- that Public Counsel is looking 24 at in all three of the dockets would be the Colstrip 25 issue. So I -- I think we're kind of in the same boat</p>	<p>1 presumably is a disallowance in whole or in part of the 2 power cost replacement dollars. I don't know whether 3 even in exercising that remedy whether the Commission 4 will want to make distinctions between parties, and 5 there may be reasons why in some cases the Company 6 behave with just extraordinary dispatch and 7 reasonableness, and it would just be improper. 8 What -- what our prefiled testimony tells 9 you or tells the Commission about Colstrip in the ERM -- 10 this is in the ERM docket -- is that even with this 11 two-month outage, that plant operated at an 82 percent 12 availability factor. That's pretty good. In fact, 13 the -- the -- I'm not arguing the case, but I'm trying 14 to provide perspective on this, okay? And even with -- 15 with that, we will -- we will remind the Commission that 16 in other months of the year, Colstrip operated much 17 better, much better, greater availability than was 18 anticipated. 19 So at the end of the day, this episode, 20 while -- while certainly something you need to look 21 into, was -- was not so out of the ordinary. Again, I 22 don't want to argue the case, but we will be taking the 23 position that things happen in Colstrip, things happen 24 in every generating plant, and this was managed 25 appropriately, it's not the end of the world, and keep</p>

Page 95	Page 97
<p>1 this issue in some kind of perspective. 2 Okay. So back to the point at hand, I -- I 3 don't know if it -- if it's slimmed down quite the way 4 you describe it, Joe, on -- on behalf of Staff. You 5 know, if it's just a question of outage and power 6 replacement costs. I mean, did each of the three 7 companies monitor and exercise their fiduciary duties as 8 part of the management committee that oversees Talen? I 9 don't know if you're going to make distinctions there. 10 So it's -- it's -- while it's tempting to paint with a 11 broad brush and say it's just -- it's an -- it's an easy 12 up or down decision, there are nuances here that would 13 probably need to be explored on a company-by-company 14 basis. 15 I am heartened to -- to better understand 16 that maybe from even Public Counsel's perspective it 17 really is just the Colstrip issue. The other issue you 18 mentioned we can address perhaps in the rate case, Lisa. 19 So if -- and if there are no other ERM issues and if 20 we've strictly defined what we mean by the Colstrip 21 issue, then that lends itself to -- to some sort of 22 early decision on that just so long as -- and we put the 23 ERM to bed for Avista and we can use those dollars for 24 ratepayers, okay? 25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Pepple, if you're</p>	<p>1 the units at issue, ownership percentages, amounts in 2 controversy, rate impacts, replacement power strategies, 3 and the individual responses of the facts leading up to 4 the outage. 5 Ultimately the Commission has to make three 6 independent determinations on three individualized 7 records. And we -- we don't see that -- we see that as 8 being absolutely more complex in a consolidated 9 proceeding where the things get jumbled than if you do 10 it sequentially, take Avista's, take Puget's, take ours, 11 and then build on the record that gets developed over 12 time in the individual utility cases. 13 That's the normal course of events. We 14 think that is the more efficient process and frankly 15 more comfortable one for us. You know, as we are just 16 now like moving into an adjudicative process, the idea 17 that we are moving into an expedited adjudicative 18 process, which is, you know, like news to us and not 19 exactly in our schedule for the next couple of months, 20 is -- you know, that's not necessarily a welcome 21 development for us. I understand it's imperative for 22 Avista, but for us especially to try to meet, you know, 23 Staff's needs around let's -- let's really understand 24 the story so we can come to the right outcome, that -- 25 that's at odds with but file your testimony next week.</p>
Page 96	Page 98
<p>1 still on the line, I'd like to prepare you for a 2 question I'm going to ask perhaps after we take a 3 recess, and I'm curious about Staff and Public Counsel 4 have made fairly clear that they -- well, that Staff 5 offered to simplify the issues of the ERM to the 6 Colstrip outage. I recall that you, AWEC, have more 7 issues in the ERM docket than just the Colstrip outage, 8 and at some point after we take a recess, I'm going to 9 be interested to hear what -- whether you can make that 10 same offer or what your position on that is. 11 But let me return now to the companies, for 12 Pacific Power. Just for the decision of prudence on the 13 decision-making of the Colstrip outage, if we were to 14 sever that, expedite a decision on just that piece of 15 Pacific Power's filing and then return whatever that 16 determination is to your PCAM for consolidation with the 17 rest -- consideration with the rest of the things in 18 that docket, is that a possibility? 19 MS. McDOWELL: So, Your Honor, I appreciate, 20 you know, the attempt to come up with constructive 21 solutions here. I will say that that solution is not a 22 good one for PacifiCorp. You know, we think even if the 23 issue is narrowed to the Colstrip outage, that issue is 24 still not common among the three utilities. You have 25 the different utilities situated differently in terms of</p>	<p>1 And so, you know, we think in our situation 2 it would be better to set the normal schedule, not an 3 expedited schedule that, you know, works for Avista, but 4 to allow Avista's case to go forward then allow ours to 5 go forward in the normal course. We think our situation 6 is -- you know, we -- we get that there is a common 7 issue that occurred, a common fact that occurred, but we 8 think the utilities all are differently situated on that 9 and all have, you know, a different record that 10 ultimately needs to be developed. And we want a chance 11 to develop ours in the normal course, not in like 12 tomorrow because we've gotten thrown into a proceeding 13 frankly that we didn't expect to be thrown into. 14 So that's -- that's our course. We think -- 15 I mean, ultimately we hope to settle this case. We've 16 generally been able to settle our PCAM filings and -- 17 and we think that's going to be harder to do if we're 18 immediately thrown into litigation and don't have that 19 time to have those sort of discussions. So -- so, you 20 know, as much as we'd like to say yes and, you know, 21 continue with constructive brainstorming that's a 22 solution, I -- I don't think works because we just don't 23 think the commonality exists. 24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I appreciate your input, 25 and you anticipated my comment about we do think that</p>

Page 99	Page 101
<p>1 there -- it's clear that there is some commonality. The 2 extent to which I think everyone can argue about at this 3 point, but there is some commonality here. 4 Ms. Barnett, you've had the -- the benefit 5 of hearing all of my questions before I get to ask them 6 of you. What are your thoughts? 7 MS. BARNETT: And hearing all the answers. 8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. 9 MS. BARNETT: I -- I guess I -- I look at 10 the -- at Staff's motion a little differently. I don't 11 see -- I don't see the proposal as really a narrowing 12 because that's the way I always saw Staff's proposal. I 13 understood. I guess, this is -- having done I guess now 14 15 power cost adjustments without any of them ever being 15 adjudicated, I just assumed this was the only issue. So 16 when they say we're just going to pull out and 17 bifurcate, I guess, this one issue from the PCA, I -- I 18 understood that -- I understood that to be Staff's 19 motion. That is their -- that is their position, is the 20 only issue is the Colstrip outage. 21 So I don't see as severing the -- this one 22 issue, the prudency issue of Colstrip outage replace 23 power costs as a -- as a -- as a more efficient 24 improvement, I guess, or -- or alternative. I think -- 25 I -- I do think it's also not worth the -- I guess I'm</p>	<p>1 ask of Mr. Meyer a question that we've been pondering. 2 We would benefit from Avista agreeing to extend the 3 effective date of its ERM, if we decided these dockets 4 should be consolidated, will Avista agree to extend the 5 effective date of the ERM? 6 MR. MEYER: Would that have the effect of an 7 ERM decision that would extend beyond April 1st of 2020? 8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: To agree to extend the 9 effective date would be to move it beyond 10 April 1st, 2020, yes. 11 MR. MEYER: Then we would not agree to that. 12 We're -- that would prevent the \$30 million bucket from 13 benefitting customers because this issue would still be 14 unresolved. Now, that gives us still five months of 15 good, hard work between now and April 1st, and however 16 the Commission decides to address this, a lot can be 17 done in that period of time. So I'm not trying to be 18 difficult, but I want to preserve the objective. 19 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I understand. And it's 20 worth asking, and perhaps I just ask that you keep it in 21 mind as you discuss more during recess with the other 22 parties. 23 MR. MEYER: Sure. Thank you. 24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Dallas? 25 MR. DALLAS: I just wanted to provide just</p>
Page 100	Page 102
<p>1 uncomfortable with, again, I think I said it before, 2 consolidating multiple companies into what -- into one 3 proceeding, setting that precedent. But not only that, 4 also setting a precedent that it's easy to bifurcate 5 specific issues from a rate case. I mean, that's 6 essentially what we'd be doing, is severing one issue 7 that you don't want to discuss in a rate case and we 8 want to take that offline and separate and -- and join 9 it with another. I think that's -- I think that's a big 10 deal. So I -- I think -- I guess I don't have anything 11 to add except that PSE would not be comfortable with 12 that proposal. 13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. It's about time, I 14 think, for us to have a recess, but I -- 15 MR. DALLAS: And, Your Honor, before we go 16 on recess, can I quickly provide Staff's thoughts on 17 this? 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I want to address one more 19 thing -- 20 MR. DALLAS: Okay. Great. 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: -- before we go back to 22 Staff and -- 23 MR. DALLAS: Great. 24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: -- go to recess. 25 From everything I've heard today, I want to</p>	<p>1 some very quick feedback. Staff's initial position is 2 we -- we agree with PSE that it's just procedurally 3 awkward to sever individual issues. I'm going to 4 consult with my client and get their thoughts on it, but 5 I wanted to reiterate what Donna said. 6 And also I wanted to address Meyer -- 7 Mr. Meyer. Our position, we're coming from a principle 8 position. We have not made a decision on the prudency 9 of cost. At this point, Staff is trying to obtain the 10 information to make that determination. 11 As to what Pacific stated, we agree that 12 there could be different outcomes as to each company, 13 but Staff's position is that it would like to tell one 14 story. We believe it's one set of facts, the characters 15 are the Colstrip owners and Talen, and if each 16 individual Colstrip owner did something different, Staff 17 would certainly make that distinction within one 18 narrative response. 19 So we just want to make it clear that 20 Staff's position is that it will identify if -- if an 21 individual company did something different in its single 22 narrative within the consolidated adjudication to -- to 23 resolve that concern. Thank you. 24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Dallas. 25 It is 11:15 a.m. I don't believe after this</p>

Page 103

1 recess we will have much left to discuss, depending on
2 how the -- the parties do in the recess. Is half an
3 hour or 35 minutes sufficient for the parties to talk --
4 talk to your clients and then for us to come back and
5 have a short chat before we adjourn?
6 MR. DALLAS: Yes, Your Honor.
7 MR. MEYER: Yes for Avista. But I do --
8 after a short break, have the -- have us come back and
9 talk about some discovery options here, see what we can
10 do. And I think if -- if we need more than a half an
11 hour, can we -- well, how about we just call when we're
12 ready for you; would that work?
13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: That -- that would. If I
14 don't hear anything, I'm going to check back in in half
15 an hour, because it is -- I'm aware and conscious of
16 AWEC's availability as we get into the afternoon, and I
17 want to be sensitive to that. So I -- I am going to at
18 least check back in if I don't hear from you. If you
19 would like me to come back before half an hour, 35
20 minutes, yes, please, contact me. And I'm not seeing
21 anyone objecting to that, so with that, we will be off
22 the record in recess. Thank you.
23 (A break was taken from
24 11:18 a.m. to 11:47 a.m.)
25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be on the record.

Page 104

1 Have the parties had a chance to collaborate and did any
2 good ideas come from that?
3 MR. MEYER: Well, before we go there, you
4 had a question pending for -- of Tyler.
5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I do.
6 MR. MEYER: And probably should get that out
7 because that might have a bearing on -- on some of this.
8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Very well.
9 Mr. Pepple, I wanted to check back in with
10 AWEC. Staff made an offer earlier in this hearing that
11 if the -- if everyone -- you know, if we consolidate all
12 of these dockets, the power cost filings, that they were
13 only going to contest a single issue. I'm aware from
14 the contested issues list that you filed in the ERM
15 docket that you have more issues than just that one, and
16 I'd like to hear from you regarding how you feel about
17 whether you can only focus on this one issue or whether
18 there are multiples that you still need to address.
19 MR. PEPPLE: Yeah, thank you, Your Honor.
20 So as I -- I mentioned to -- to some of the parties at
21 the break, you know, AWEC isn't -- isn't willing to give
22 up its issues for the sake of procedural efficiency.
23 You know, we think that there are issues that -- that
24 deserve to be raised. That said, I don't think that any
25 of the issues we raised that we have identified in the

Page 105

1 list, you know, would -- would represent a good reason
2 for the Commission to, you know, either consolidate or
3 not consolidate depending on its position on the
4 Colstrip issue. I think that the issues we raised are
5 relatively narrow and can be dealt with pretty easily.
6 The first issue we -- we raised on is an
7 issue that, you know, we -- we raised in testimony in
8 the Avista remand docket. We feel like we need to raise
9 it in the ERM proceeding as well in order to protect our
10 interest on that issue, but it's an issue that could
11 very well be resolved in the ERM -- or in the remand
12 docket.
13 The third issue we raised is really just a
14 policy issue about, you know, the period over which
15 Avista should amortize the ERM balance, you know, and
16 that's -- I don't think that that's really a big enough
17 issue to -- to influence your decision here.
18 And then the -- the middle issue, the second
19 issue, regarding the -- the interest again, that's, you
20 know -- it's an issue that requires testimony, but
21 probably only a couple of pages to identify it. And,
22 you know, so it's -- again, it's a fairly simple and
23 narrow issue.
24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
25 Before we adjourn, close for the day, I do

Page 106

1 want to give the opportunity to the parties to tell me
2 any -- anything else that we should consider and how we
3 should go forward. The kind of a catchall question for
4 the very end. Before we get to that, which I will allow
5 everyone to have a say, was there collaboration and is
6 there any idea for a resolution that would be acceptable
7 to everyone?
8 MR. MEYER: There is a germ of an idea, but
9 that will not resolve the fundamental question of
10 consolidation or not. The parties are apart on that as
11 I understand the positions, but what I think there may
12 be agreement on is that we've discussed this -- this
13 idea of holes in the discovery responses. We all say
14 the right things that Commission has to have what they
15 need and we all believe it, okay? But we're talking in
16 the abstract, so I -- I think it's time, starting with
17 the three utilities, to sit down, figure out amongst us
18 what we've already produced, because we haven't even
19 done that yet, and then talk amongst ourselves just what
20 is truly confidential, and we'll get into this two level
21 confiden- -- or protective order in just a minute, but
22 decide among ourselves just what the state of discovery
23 is. We can do that in fairly short order. And then sit
24 down with Staff and other interested parties to go over
25 that so we understand and you understand there's common

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 agreement, what's missing, what do you need, and can we 2 give that to you. 3 And we didn't talk about dates. I didn't 4 get the final okay from all parties. I'd like to get 5 all of that done -- that's actually a two-step process, 6 I suppose -- done in the next three to four weeks. And 7 then as a matter of cleanup, it's -- it's apparent that 8 in any event the -- another prehearing in the ERM, 9 Avista ERM docket will be required to reset the 10 schedule, assuming that it is going to proceed on its 11 own course, and that's the issue that has not been 12 resolved. 13 But, you know, I won't speak for how quickly 14 the Commission can turn an order around, so if the 15 hearing that carried into the new year on the ERM docket 16 would allow, I don't know, four to six weeks, seven 17 weeks, whatever the Commission finds necessary, then to 18 write an Avista-specific ERM order that talks about 19 Colstrip and everything else. And then we get to the 20 finish line of April 1st. 21 Now, did someone else want to better 22 articulate this protective order, we can agree on 23 something like that? 24 MR. DALLAS: Yes, thank you. So we had 25 collaborative conversations during our recess. I think</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 that would resolve the issue of judicial economy, but it 2 still would be very procedurally awkward in Staff's 3 opinion. 4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, let me clarify a 5 little bit on that idea, because that thought came about 6 with the understanding that we need to have a decision 7 on the -- at least Avista's part of the 2018 Colstrip 8 outage, the decision-making leading up to the that, and 9 the prudence thereof. We need to have that decision to 10 then reincorporate it into the rest of the ERM to get to 11 the deferral balances. So that procedural idea would 12 have had to look something like severing that one issue 13 and returning it after a decision was made. 14 MR. DALLAS: So -- so I think if the issue 15 is timing, I think Staff's stipulation would -- would 16 resolve that concern. I know AWEC and Public Counsel 17 have some other minor issues, but with that stipulation, 18 I don't think there is going to be a substantive 19 difference in timing if we consolidated the entire 20 dockets -- I'm sorry -- as opposed to severing 21 individual issues because that one issue is the only 22 issue Staff may contest pursuant to its stipulation. So 23 I -- I -- I'm not sure if -- if there is a substantive 24 difference in timing between the two options. 25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. What I'm hearing is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 we -- we do have an agreement as to the two-tiered level 2 of -- of confidentiality. I think what the -- I think 3 the parties can correct me if I'm wrong, but we -- we 4 all agree that there should be at least a common 5 protective order, and that in this protective order, 6 there'd be two layers of confidentiality. One would be 7 confidential, but not confidential among the Colstrip 8 owners because the information relates to the operation 9 and management of Colstrip. And then the other layer 10 would be truly commercially sensitive information that 11 would be confidential as to each individual utility 12 company. 13 I think where the disagreement is, is how do 14 we proceed procedurally. Do we do this in three 15 separate dockets or do we do it in one. Staff's 16 position is that it would promote judicial economy to do 17 this in one as opposed to three because three 18 necessarily means three procedural schedules. 19 The Commission mentioned a -- a solution 20 where we would sever individual issues. Staff's 21 preference would be to consolidate the entire dockets 22 because it's -- it's just odd to us to sever individual 23 issues when the Commission has to approve the entire 24 deferral balances. But as an alternative, we would take 25 that as opposed to leaving these unconsolidated because</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 that all the parties can agree that it would be a good 2 idea, whether consolidated or separate, that we have 3 this -- as we've characterized at this hearing -- a 4 two-tiered level of confidentiality and a protective 5 order. One level of confidentiality where it's not 6 confidential between the Colstrip owners and then 7 another level of confidentiality where essentially the 8 companies can't see the other information of the -- the 9 other companies. Is that -- I'm hearing that that is 10 the one thing that the parties can't agree on. 11 MS. BARNETT: I don't -- this is Donna 12 Barnett from PSE, and I think that offer was -- is a 13 compromise to consolidation. It is not intended to be a 14 support -- PSE does not support consolidation, and if 15 it's a -- I think that was a separate issue. So if it's 16 a two-tiered protective order, that doesn't mean we'd 17 want that in a consolidation as a compromise. 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: So then the idea -- I just 19 want to make sure I understand. The idea then would be 20 to keep the dockets separate, allow this two-tiered 21 level of confidentiality, and that would allow for 22 introduction of certain evidence really to the Colstrip 23 owners and decision-making to be used in each of the 24 dockets? 25 MS. BARNETT: That's right, if it's</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 appropriate. That -- that's right. This would -- 2 that's a -- PSE's and the other parties, my 3 understanding, is the attempt to get to understand what 4 Staff is missing and get them that information, which -- 5 which is the purpose behind their motion the way we 6 understand. If judicial economy is a separate issue, we 7 don't think that judicial economy, the benefits afforded 8 the Commission in judicial efficiency or economy does 9 not outweigh the gray cost in establishing precedent of 10 having multiple power cost proceedings bound together in 11 a consolidated proceeding. 12 To me that just creates a -- a boilerplate 13 power cost rate proceeding that is applied to multiple 14 utilities without looking at every individual utility 15 the way they're filing separately. It's -- so I -- so I 16 think this is -- the offer was to -- as a -- as an 17 attempt to compromise to get Staff what they need and 18 not an acknowledgment or accession to consolidation. 19 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. 20 MR. TEIMOURI: And, your Honor, this is Dan 21 Teimouri. And just to be clear that that is not Staff's 22 position. We do not see it as a compromise, but as a 23 component of a consolidated docket in our preference. 24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: We'll -- we will take that 25 into consideration, and I do want everyone to understand</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 appreciated the suggestions of the tiering from Staff 2 and the individualized modified protective orders from 3 Mr. Pepple. And I think we tried to combine those 4 during the break into something that would work for all 5 of us to really address the discovery issue that you 6 raised and that Staff raised. 7 So we are totally comfortable with a 8 modified protective order being developed and entered in 9 each of the dockets that would have -- identify the 10 tiers and that would have the special language that 11 would allow information produced in one docket, you 12 know, in that, I guess it would be the tier -- the tier 13 two is where we've identified the common information, 14 that that common information would be -- notwithstanding 15 it being designated confidential, it would be -- in this 16 case, be allowed to be used in the three dockets. 17 So that -- that is different than your 18 typical protective order, and we're -- we're comfortable 19 with that, and we think that addresses -- we hope that 20 addresses your concern and also the Commission's concern 21 about how to manage this from an evidence perspective. 22 So -- so we're comfortable with that. I think the 23 distinction between what our perspective and what Staff 24 articulated was just the common protective order that 25 implies that if one protective order in a consolidated</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 that we're going to make a decision soon on this, and 2 it's possible that not everyone will be happy with that 3 decision. Someone's not going to get what they want 4 so... 5 MR. DALLAS: And, Your Honor, I -- I think 6 just to quickly talk about what PSE stated, I think I 7 already made this point, but Staff's position is it's 8 not going to have a boilerplate recommendation in the 9 consolidated adjudication. We believe it's one story, 10 and if every individual utility company did something 11 different, we would identify that. 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Dallas, I -- I 13 understand. 14 MR. DALLAS: Okay. 15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: You've made that point a 16 couple times. 17 MR. DALLAS: Okay. Yeah, yeah -- okay. 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: No, I do recall quite 19 clearly that Staff said that you can do different 20 determinations in a single narrative. 21 MR. DALLAS: Exactly. I just wanted to 22 reconfirm that. 23 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. McDowell. 24 MS. McDOWELL: Thanks. Just trying to get 25 in to clarify one thing, I think that we really</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 proceeding. We still believe that judicial economy is 2 best served by doing this in three separate proceedings 3 and let the cases evolve in -- you know, in the way they 4 have been filed. 5 You know, Avista might be ready to go to 6 hearing in a month, but I don't think PacifiCorp is. We 7 are just now entering the adjudicatory process. We want 8 to engage in this discovery process. We also talked 9 about, you know, informal technical conferences, which 10 could potentially, if we have this kind of protective 11 order placed, the three utility, Staff and other parties 12 where we could do a technical conference that would -- 13 where we could share information informally as a way of 14 getting around a lot of back-and-forth discovery 15 requests. 16 So we're open to all of those ideas, but in 17 our mind, that -- you know, judicial economy is served 18 by getting that -- sharing those facts in an orderly way 19 and then moving into, you know, an adjudicatory process, 20 your typical evidentiary testimony process. And I feel 21 like here we're not going to -- at least for PacifiCorp, 22 if we are, you know, moved and consolidated into 23 Avista's schedule, that's going to be problematic for us 24 to be able to engage in that kind of process. 25 So -- so we think judicial economy is best</p>

Page 115	Page 117
<p>1 served by continuing the cases separate, but doing these 2 innovative approaches to sharing information and also 3 informal sharing of information, both sort of formally 4 through the protective order and then informally through 5 these technical workshops or other proceedings. 6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. 7 Ms. Gafken, do you have any thoughts? 8 MS. GAFKEN: I do feel like I would be 9 repeating a lot of what has already been said, but it 10 sounds to me like there is some agreement on the need to 11 share information and to levelize that information 12 across the three companies and to make sure that 13 everyone has the same information. I think that's 14 really been one of the key concerns. I don't think we 15 have agreement on how to proceed and meet, you know, the 16 deadlines that need to be met. And so I'm afraid we've 17 been unhelpful in that regard. 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: So at this time, I want to 19 give all the parties, including the parties who are on 20 the bridge line, The Energy Project, Sierra Club, 21 Northwest Energy Coalition, AWEC, I want to give all 22 parties a chance and opportunity to provide any 23 additional thoughts on how we should move forward. 24 Let's -- let's start with Staff. 25 Mr. Dallas.</p>	<p>1 it's -- it's certainly -- there was no bad intent to the 2 timing of our motion. We certainly don't want to 3 prejudice any of the companies. We just did -- we just 4 wanted to give PAC a fair opportunity, and I -- I think 5 Staff would be accused of prematurely filing its motion 6 if we filed our motion prior to the workshop. So I just 7 wanted to -- to really state why we filed our motion 8 when we did. It's because we view all these cases as 9 one, which is why we're asking for consolidation. 10 As to the point why we didn't file motions 11 to compel, it -- it -- it didn't make sense to. For 12 instance, we believe the companies are withholding the 13 same document, so if we did a motion to compel with 14 Avista, we would fight that, and then if we won, it 15 would be confidential, and then we would have to try to 16 move that same document into the other three -- the 17 other two cases. 18 So -- so -- so it -- it makes more sense to 19 do this in a context of a consolidated adjudication 20 because we have to fight to get the document, and then 21 the document's going to be confidential, and then we 22 have to fight the designation of confidentiality to get 23 in the other two dockets. So it -- it's really a 24 five-step process to get one document in each 25 administrative record if there is no consolidation. So</p>
Page 116	Page 118
<p>1 MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Your Honor. And 2 like you said, this will be a catchall, so I have a 3 couple points I want to hit. So the compromise that the 4 companies are seeking, we appreciate. I think it would 5 resolve a lot of the confidentiality issues. Staff 6 still has concern about judicial economy. You know, I 7 think Public Counsel stated it best, that it would 8 really limit our participation in all three if we had to 9 adjudicate the same cost three different times. And 10 then the first case wouldn't have the benefit of the 11 information and insight from the latter cases. So as 12 these cases evolve and we become more familiar with 13 these issues, the Commission may enter inconsistent 14 orders based on three serial cases. 15 The next point I want to talk about is the 16 timing of Staff's motion. I think -- you know, I -- I 17 want to explain why we filed it when we did. We've 18 always viewed these cases as one single case, and we 19 filed our motion after the workshop with PAC that took 20 place on September 20th, and we wanted to wait to file 21 our motion until we heard from PAC to give them a fair 22 opportunity. 23 This workshop was on September 20th, and 24 then after this workshop, we sat down with all the 25 information and filed our motion six days later. So</p>	<p>1 we -- we -- we did not pursue the motions for -- motions 2 to compel because it just didn't make sense. It -- it 3 makes sense to -- to -- if we go that route, and we hope 4 we don't, it makes sense to do it within the context of 5 a consolidated adjudication so we can use that one 6 document as to all three companies because we want to 7 provide consistent recommendations. So I -- I just 8 wanted to provide some context on that. 9 And with that, I know it was a catchall. I 10 think those are the points I want to make. I'll move it 11 over to my associate, Dan. 12 MR. TEIMOURI: There were -- thank you, Your 13 Honor. There were a couple of points that were made 14 that Staff and I had a chance to respond to that I'll 15 just briefly touch on and then we'll move quickly 16 through them. 17 But I think first, PAC and PSE said 18 something to the effect that they're still trying to 19 understand what Staff needs, that Puget's not clear on 20 what it has not given. And I think that, you know, 21 Staff would strongly push back on this, we've had 22 several discovery conferences with both parties that 23 made very clear as Your Honor stated at the very 24 beginning of this hearing they were looking for the Q-1 25 contemporaneous decision-making leading up to the</p>

Page 119	Page 121
<p>1 Colstrip outage. So that was conveyed very clearly to 2 all companies, and I don't think there was any -- any 3 lack of clarity there. 4 It was also stated by Mr. Meyer, and I think 5 this appears in all the briefs, that there was thousands 6 of documents, lots of time spent, and by the same token, 7 there was a lot of time spent by Staff receiving those 8 thousands of documents. As you know, thousands of 9 documents a response does not make. And so we wasted a 10 lot of time going through those documents to not get an 11 answer to our questions, so I think shared frustration 12 on both sides. 13 It was said that this was bad precedent. I 14 think that's not true. This is a very narrow situation. 15 As was said, 17 years we haven't had a similar situation 16 where there was three joint owners with one outage. The 17 order could be narrowly crafted around those facts and 18 would not set bad precedent. 19 And lastly, during the break, we went and 20 looked for some precedent to establish that the issuance 21 of bench requests in a -- in a situation like this, 22 would be not be unprecedented, and we have that 23 authority here, and I would like to hand it up to the 24 Bench if you are so inclined to receive it and to share 25 it with the parties.</p>	<p>1 particular issue. Of course each one of the individual 2 companies will have their percentage of ownership and 3 all of those things, but those are merely facts. 4 They're not things that necessitate separate treatment. 5 Public Counsel's preference would be to have 6 a process that has the most efficient path forward. So, 7 you know, fewer times parties need to gear up to address 8 this particular outage, we would prefer that. 9 In terms of consolidating three separate 10 companies into a single proceeding, I think the 11 Commission has broad discretion on that. It really 12 ultimately comes down to what does the Commission feel 13 that it needs to do in order to process these filings 14 and do so in a way that they can make a decision based 15 on all of the facts that they need to have and be the 16 most efficient with it. I think that discretion falls 17 squarely on the decision-makers. 18 I -- I am quite encouraged by the offer 19 to -- one, for the offer of the companies to meet among 20 themselves and then to meet with the rest of the parties 21 to -- to levelize the facts. I think that is very 22 constructive, and we look forward to participating in 23 that process, regardless of whether this ends up being 24 consolidated or not. I think I'll stop there. I don't 25 want to take up much more of the air time, but thank</p>
Page 120	Page 122
<p>1 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And can you share with me 2 just the -- the docket and perhaps if you're -- whatever 3 document you're looking at? 4 MR. TEIMOURI: Yes, it's In re Joint 5 Application for Merger of Qwest Communications 6 International Inc. and US West Inc., Docket No. 7 UT-991358, April 26th, 2000. 8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: April 26th. 9 MR. TEIMOURI: And that's all I have, Your 10 Honor. Thank you. 11 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. 12 Ms. Gafken, does Public Counsel have any 13 other thoughts about how we should move forward? 14 MS. GAFKEN: I will speak briefly, and thank 15 you for the opportunity. From Public Counsel's 16 perspective, it -- it does seem somewhat unnecessary to 17 have three separate proceedings to deal with this 18 particular issue. I think it's -- it's been fairly -- 19 it's been clarified that the Colstrip outage and the 20 events leading up to it really is -- is what we need to 21 grapple with, and we have three common owners. 22 Of course the Commission needs to deal with 23 each one of the filings, but it -- it seems to me to be 24 a bit unnecessary to have three separate proceedings and 25 gear up three separate times to deal with this -- this</p>	<p>1 you. 2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Pepple for AWEC, do 3 you have any additional thoughts you would like to 4 voice? 5 MR. PEPPLER: Just very quickly, Your Honor. 6 AWEC is comfortable with whatever decision you make on 7 whether to consolidate or not consolidate for purposes 8 of the Colstrip outage as long as AWEC's right as a 9 party to raise be -- you know, other issues that it has 10 identified within the scope of the dockets is preserved, 11 so that's all. Thanks. 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Pepple. 13 Mr. Ffitch, for The Energy Project? 14 MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor. We 15 don't have any comments at this time. 16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 17 And Ms. Yarnall Loarie for the Sierra Club? 18 MS. YARNALL LOARIE: Sierra Club also 19 doesn't have anything to add at this time. We still do 20 not oppose the idea of consolidating and severing this 21 issue for the sake of efficiency. 22 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 23 And, Ms. Barlow, for Northwest Energy 24 Coalition? 25 MS. BARLOW: Thank you, Your Honor.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 Northwest Energy Coalition doesn't have anything to add 2 either. Thank you. 3 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 4 I want to return to the companies. For the 5 most part, I want to hear your final thoughts about how 6 we should move forward, but I'd also like to hear more 7 of Mr. Meyer about what would be needed as far as timing 8 if the companies needed to get together. Is that 9 something that can or -- or would be able to go hand in 10 hand with having this two-tiered protective order? 11 Because obviously if we do that, the companies will have 12 to get together. 13 MR. MEYER: Yeah, we'll have to sort the 14 information accordingly, and -- and -- and so we have 15 not talked about timing. I'm happy to send an email 16 around after I confer with my own client before I commit 17 my own client. They -- they don't like that. 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And here's my concern, 19 Mr. Meyer, is that we do expect to issue a decision 20 rather quickly on this, and that is going to have an 21 impact on what we decide to do procedurally with 22 Avista's general rate case. So I just want to 23 understand what sort of timeline we are under and 24 whether -- whether you're going to be able to have those 25 discussions before we issue a decision.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 the works, it's procedural works on its ERM, so that 2 it -- that is going to have to be delayed. We're 3 confident that we can set a new schedule that will still 4 meet that April 1st order, though. 5 So to end on a constructive note, I'll send 6 out something to the -- the utilities to jump start this 7 process, check with your principals, and then we can 8 decide how best to share this and then kick it over to 9 the other parties in terms of what -- what you would 10 like to do to assembly all this. That's the best I've 11 got. 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. McDowell? 13 MS. McDOWELL: Thank you, Your Honor. Let 14 me just conclude by saying we are open to all ideas that 15 parties have on how to share information efficiently and 16 effectively to make sure all parties have the 17 information they need and to make sure the Commission 18 has what it needs to resolve this case. We do strongly 19 object to consolidation of these proceedings. We think 20 it would not promote judicial efficiency. That's the 21 Commission's perspective, and we think it would be 22 prejudicial to Pacific Power, that's our perspective. 23 Utilities are entitled to individualized 24 prudence determinations. So whether or not this case is 25 consolidated, the Commission is going to need to develop</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 MR. MEYER: I would think not, because it 2 envisions an iterative process where we pull stuff 3 together, we look at it, we ask ourselves quite directly 4 and honestly is that really confidential or isn't it, 5 and -- and try and find common ground, hand it off to 6 others to look at and discuss, and then what comes out 7 of that, and this could be three, four weeks down the 8 road is we've identified the following six deficiencies 9 that need further discovery. 10 You know, I was just -- just trying to 11 reflect -- and this will be my last thought unless you 12 have other questions -- is how different today would be 13 if we weren't discussing this whole thing in the 14 abstract. And we all have views of what may or may not 15 be there in discovery once we get our hands on it, what 16 may or not be issues, and that's fair, because we're 17 early in the process with some of these parties. 18 But let's say we were before you today 19 arguing about six specific requests for information, six 20 requests. I think it would be an entirely different 21 discussion today, and I think there would be an order 22 coming, and we wouldn't be talking about consolidating 23 cases. But instead, because it's unfortunately and 24 maybe inevitably, we're discussing this on an abstract 25 basis, what it's done to Avista is that it's gummed up</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 an individualized record. We don't think it makes it 2 easier for the Commission to do that in a consolidated 3 proceeding. We think that creates a risk of a confused 4 record. That leads to my concern about prejudice. We 5 think in a consolidated proceeding, there's a risk that 6 other act- -- other parties' actions could be imputed to 7 us, that we could leave with an unclear, confused 8 record, and that we could be basically assigned a 9 schedule that is problematic for us because of another 10 utility's concerns. 11 So we have -- we do have concerns about 12 consolidation, both from the Commission's perspective 13 and judicial economy and from our perspective in terms 14 of our right to have an individualized determination of 15 our prudence in this case. Thank you. 16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. 17 And, Ms. Barnett? 18 MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor. PSE 19 agrees with PacifiCorp and Avista on this. And I think 20 PSE's concerns were underscored by Staff's final 21 statements and final thoughts mainly when they said that 22 this is -- they viewed these as the same case, these 23 three separate -- three separate issues as the same case 24 and that it's one story. They're -- they're three 25 separate stories, they are three separate cases, they</p>

Page 127

1 are three separate companies with only one fact in
 2 common. Not even one -- not even similar parties are in
 3 common.
 4 I think that -- that idea of creating a
 5 consistent answer or prudence determination for each of
 6 the companies is a mistake. Consistency should not be
 7 the goal. Efficiency should not be the goal. Getting
 8 it right should be the goal. And I think the compromise
 9 that we proposed today will get Staff and the Commission
 10 the information they need to get it right.
 11 And -- and so I don't see a need to
 12 consolidate them if they have the information they need
 13 to get it right. And I think consolidating them, which
 14 would then just be just for judicial consistency and
 15 economy, would be a drastic departure from Commission
 16 precedent and make it easier to do single issue
 17 ratemaking in the future, consolidate totally
 18 inappropriate cases with multiple companies. And -- and
 19 so I think it -- it would be a very big and drastic
 20 departure from the Commission's practice.
 21 So just to end on a -- on a final note, I do
 22 think PSE is committed to getting Staff the information
 23 they need and finding out what that information is and
 24 by -- by working together with the other companies we'll
 25 do that. And I think that solves the -- the issues that

Page 128

1 Staff has brought in its motion. And so I hope the
 2 Commission considers that, but maintaining it as
 3 separate -- separate -- separate cases, not
 4 consolidated.
 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 6 MR. MEYER: May I just tack on? I know I
 7 had my time.
 8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Very briefly, Mr. Meyer.
 9 MR. MEYER: Okay. This process that you
 10 just referred to where we share information, I think if
 11 I were a commissioner, I might want to know whatever
 12 happened there? Did you guys figure this stuff out or
 13 not? It would be helpful I think to the Commissioners
 14 if they're -- if someone -- probably Staff would report
 15 out that there are X, Y, Z as unresolved discovery
 16 issues, and so narrow this thing down at this point.
 17 Otherwise, it's just a -- could be a nebulous exercise
 18 and we're back here again.
 19 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, considering
 20 that, Mr. Dallas, Mr. Teimouri, Staff has the proponent
 21 of the motion, last word?
 22 MR. DALLAS: I think Staff would just stand
 23 on its brief. I think, you know, consolidation can
 24 resolve the confidentiality issues in one protective
 25 order, and Staff's position is that the Commission has

Page 129

1 sufficient information to make -- to render fair, just,
 2 and reasonable rates, and we also believe that
 3 consolidation would promote judicial economy and avoid
 4 wasting the Commission's resources on hearing the same
 5 case three separate times. And I guess with that, I
 6 would just stand on our brief.
 7 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Is there anything
 8 else from the parties that we need to discuss at this
 9 hearing? Not seeing anything in the room, I'm not
 10 hearing anything from the bridge line. So with that, we
 11 will adjourn this hearing. We will take into
 12 consideration what's been said, and with that, we will
 13 be off the record.
 14 (Adjourned at 12:35 p.m.)
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 130

1 C E R T I F I C A T E
 2
 3 STATE OF WASHINGTON
 4 COUNTY OF THURSTON
 5
 6 I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand
 7 Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
 8 certify that the foregoing transcript is true and
 9 accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
 10
 11
 12 
 13 Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

A				
a.m 47:16 51:2 102:25 103:24,24	adequacy 69:3,6	agrees 126:19	85:15	82:21
ability 59:1 88:17 88:18 130:9	adjourn 103:5 105:25 129:11	aimed 66:18	apply 83:4	assumed 99:15
able 79:18 81:17 83:8 98:16 114:24 123:9,24	Adjourned 129:14	air 121:25	appreciate 79:15 79:20 80:6 87:21 91:5 96:19 98:24 116:4	assuming 76:3,4 107:10
absolutely 92:3 97:8	adjudic- 84:25	Ajay 48:16 52:6	appreciated 113:1	assurance 89:14,14
abstract 106:16 124:14,24	adjudicate 116:9	ajay.kumar@pa... 48:19	approach 67:9 83:20	attempt 63:23 96:20 111:3,17
acceptable 106:6	adjudicated 99:15	alignment 79:9	approaches 115:2	attempted 82:8
accession 111:18	adjudication 56:18 59:16 61:2,22,24 62:13 72:1 81:9 81:14 82:18 84:5 84:23 102:22 112:9 117:19 118:5	Alliance 52:18	appropriate 65:13 89:3 111:1	Attorney 49:10,11 50:3
accomplish 59:24 91:22	adjudicative 81:7 84:25 85:6 86:9 88:5 97:16,17	allow 55:8 56:24 64:4 70:9 81:9 82:5 83:21 88:17 98:4,4 106:4 107:16 110:20,21 113:11	appropriately 89:2 94:25	availability 94:12 94:17 103:16
accruing 75:23	adjudicatory 81:4 81:20 114:7,19	allowed 113:16	approve 108:23	available 72:25 85:1,5,6
accurate 130:9	adjustment 75:13	allowing 84:14	approximately 51:7 66:1 76:5	Avenue 47:22 48:8 48:13 49:12
accused 117:5	adjustments 99:14	alternative 70:12 75:6 85:5 99:24 108:24	April 56:14,16 61:22 72:2 75:20 76:15,15 87:13 92:13 101:7,10,15 107:20 120:7,8 125:4	Avista 47:7,8 48:5 48:7 51:25 52:2 53:22 54:12 56:1 56:2,12 61:21 66:3 68:1 72:15 72:22 73:12,21 74:20 75:20 76:17 77:18 78:7,14 83:6,7 85:20 86:7 87:8,9,17 88:9,22 89:8,19 95:23 97:22 98:3 101:2 101:4 103:7 105:8 105:15 107:9 114:5 117:14 124:25 126:19
acknowledge 59:9	administrative 47:13 48:2 51:11 58:7 59:4 63:7,13 63:24 67:11 117:25	alternatives 70:3 84:17,18	argue 83:3 94:22 99:2	Avista's 51:13,15 54:9 55:19,21 56:11 57:9 62:7 65:14 68:6 75:14 80:11 87:3 88:6 88:17 89:10 93:7 93:10,14 97:10 98:4 109:7 114:23 123:22
acknowledged 58:19,20,23	admission 81:7 84:25 85:6 86:9 88:5 97:16,17	amortize 105:15	argued 78:3	Avista-specific 107:18
acknowledges 81:16	admittedly 84:9	amounts 97:1	arguing 78:10 94:13 124:19	
acknowledgment 111:18	adverse 82:25	Andrew 47:13 48:3 51:10	arguments 92:16	
act- 126:6	advocacy 65:13	angst 73:25	article 73:1	
actions 126:6	Affairs 48:7	answer 85:12 86:21 119:11 127:5	articulate 107:22	
add 84:21 86:4 100:11 122:19 123:1	afforded 81:9 111:7	answers 99:7	articulated 113:24	
additional 84:2 115:23 122:3	afraid 87:8 115:16	anticipated 94:18 98:25	aside 74:5	
address 53:17,18 55:12,12 65:2,12 66:13 71:20 85:25 87:18 95:18 100:18 101:16 102:6 104:18 113:5 121:7	afternoon 103:16	anticipating 66:6	asked 54:10 78:16 78:18	
addressed 84:24 87:15	ago 73:8 79:2 84:3	anyway 68:20 71:15	asking 60:8 101:20 117:9	
addresses 113:19 113:20	agree 82:5,10 84:22 86:4 89:18 101:4 101:8,11 102:2,11 107:22 108:4 110:1,10	apart 106:10	aspect 61:9 88:8	
addressing 65:15	agreed 75:3	apparent 53:11 107:7	assembly 125:10	
	agreeing 101:2	appear 93:21	asserted 58:12	
	agreement 76:18 76:23 106:12 107:1 108:1 115:10,15	appearance 68:24	assigned 93:9 126:8	
		appearances 51:24 51:24	assist 79:12	
		appears 119:5	Assistant 49:4,10	
		Application 120:5	associate 118:11	
		applied 111:13	associated 71:3	
		applies 70:8 83:9		

avoid 82:20 129:3	bearing 104:7	86:2 100:9 105:16	candidly 73:24	chances 55:2
aware 54:1 62:11	bed 95:23	127:19	capital 78:6,7,11,11	characterized
69:9 78:18 87:16	beginning 118:24	bit 62:6 67:10	careful 70:25	110:3
90:19 93:11	behalf 52:5,6,8,12	77:10 92:7 109:5	carried 107:15	characters 102:14
103:15 104:13	52:13,16 95:4	120:24	case 51:13,15 53:24	chat 103:5
AWEC 49:20 52:19	behave 94:6	boat 92:25	54:9,13 55:19,21	check 69:14 103:14
52:20 62:11,20	believe 53:7 55:13	body 78:17	60:6 66:8 74:22	103:18 104:9
96:6 104:10,21	56:13,18 59:23	boilerplate 111:12	75:9,14,18 76:13	125:7
109:16 115:21	60:15 61:2,6,23	112:8	76:19,22 78:1,1	Chief 48:6
122:2,6	66:3 67:19 68:11	bound 88:23	82:24 83:6,8,13	chime 92:18
AWEC's 103:16	71:18,23 73:13,15	111:10	85:21 87:10,17	choice 56:22
122:8	75:12,24 76:19	Box 48:8 49:5	88:7,9,17 89:10	circumstance 67:18
awkward 58:10	78:16 81:4 102:14	brainstorming	93:10 94:13,22	circumstances 89:5
82:16 102:3 109:2	102:25 106:15	84:16 98:21	95:18 98:4,15	cite 83:1
	112:9 114:1	break 79:8 103:8	100:5,7 113:16	clarified 120:19
	117:12 129:2	103:23 104:21	116:10,18 123:22	clarify 109:4
B		113:4 119:19	125:18,24 126:15	112:25
back 60:4 64:23	believes 57:8,24	bridge 69:10 79:17	126:22,23 129:5	clarity 89:23 90:6
72:7 77:25 87:24	59:10 81:8	115:20 129:10	cases 54:1,14 69:4	119:3
90:23 95:2 100:21	Bellevue 48:23	brief 128:23 129:6	76:25 78:2 82:1	cleanest 84:8
103:4,8,14,18,19	belong 76:7	briefly 65:12	82:20 83:11,14	cleanup 107:7
104:9 118:21	bench 64:8 77:22	118:15 120:14	85:20 88:12,16	clear 59:2 68:3 96:4
128:18	85:1 86:14,21	128:8	89:2 94:5 97:12	99:1 102:19
back-and-forth	87:22 88:4,18	briefs 119:5	114:3 115:1	111:21 118:19,23
114:14	89:8,13,20,25	bring 62:7 70:16	116:11,12,14,18	clearly 87:1 112:19
background 77:9	90:3 119:21,24	79:9 90:10	117:8,17 124:23	119:1
bad 70:5 117:1	beneficial 79:19	bringing 87:22	126:25 127:18	Cleve 49:22
119:13,18	benefit 99:4 101:2	broad 95:11 121:11	128:3	client 91:17,24
Bainbridge 49:18	116:10	brought 128:1	catchall 106:3	102:4 123:16,17
balance 93:15	benefits 111:7	brush 95:11	116:2 118:9	clients 103:4
105:15	benefitting 101:13	bucket 75:22,23,25	caused 67:6 75:10	clock 74:21
balances 71:7,10,24	best 51:23 53:13	76:1,5,6,21,24	CCR 47:20 130:13	close 105:25
108:24 109:11	59:25 66:22 114:2	77:8 101:12	certain 64:19 68:7	closing 83:23
Barlow 50:8 53:4,4	114:25 116:7	Buell 47:21	78:19 110:22	Club 50:2,3 52:24
122:23,25	125:8,10 130:9	build 97:11	certainly 69:19	53:1 115:20
Barnett 48:21 52:8	better 56:23 64:19	Building 48:22	71:19 78:14 81:21	122:17,18
52:8 84:12,13	72:18 90:14 94:17	burden 54:12,13	83:1 85:4 91:6	co-owners 53:23
89:17,18 99:4,7,9	94:17 95:15 98:2		94:20 102:17	56:3 82:11 88:8
110:11,12,25	107:21		117:1,2	co-presiding 51:12
126:17,18	beyond 78:4 101:7		Certified 130:6	Coalition 50:7 53:3
based 58:7,12 59:3	101:9	C	certify 130:8	53:5 115:21
61:1 63:10 116:14	bias 65:16	C 48:1 49:1,21 50:1	challenges 82:21	122:24 123:1
121:14	bifurcate 99:17	51:4 130:1,1	chance 69:15 79:10	Coie 48:22
basically 126:8	100:4	California 50:4	98:10 104:1	collaborate 56:25
basis 95:14 124:25	big 60:12 67:6 74:3	call 103:11	115:22 118:14	104:1
battle 63:12	74:4 85:19,23	called 74:22		
battles 68:18		CAMERON-RU...		
		49:4		

collaboration 106:5	59:25 61:10 63:4	companies 51:25	concern 54:21	90:23 93:6 96:17
collaborative 82:19	64:5,7,20 66:10	53:22 54:14,18	91:12 102:23	111:25 129:12
107:25	67:5,7 68:6,8 69:7	56:20 57:5 58:1	109:16 113:20,20	considered 57:25
Colstrip 53:19,23	70:13 71:6,9,15	59:5,7 60:20	116:6 123:18	93:13
53:25 54:5,12	74:7,25 75:15	63:10 64:4,9 65:4	126:4	considering 128:19
55:5,23 56:3,6	76:24 77:15 79:23	65:9,20 68:4	concerned 54:15,23	considers 128:2
57:18 58:1,3,6	81:11 82:22 84:9	70:18,20,21 71:11	concerning 58:10	consistency 127:6
59:17,19,22 61:13	84:19 86:1,12	71:14 72:11,15,23	concerns 51:21	127:14
61:25 62:9,16	88:1,1,10,18	78:19 79:9,10	68:2,10 71:20,21	consistent 118:7
63:4 66:10 67:23	89:14,21,24 90:4	86:12,15 91:4	81:25 87:25	127:5
69:22 70:8,11	91:18,22 92:17	93:6 95:7 96:11	115:14 126:10,11	consolidate 51:16
71:4 72:3 73:7	94:3,9,15 97:5	100:2 110:8,9	126:20	56:9 57:9 60:5
76:9,13 78:1,4	101:16 105:2	115:12 116:4	conclude 125:14	63:21 66:22 70:13
85:15 87:1,5	106:14 107:14,17	117:3,12 118:6	conducted 58:19	71:5,15 80:4
92:19,24 93:12	108:19,23 111:8	119:2 121:2,10,19	64:20,21	85:19 86:13
94:9,16,23 95:17	116:13 120:22	123:4,8,11 127:1	confer 123:16	104:11 105:2,3
95:20 96:6,7,13	121:11,12 125:17	127:6,18,24	conference 114:12	108:21 122:7,7
96:23 99:20,22	125:25 126:2	companies' 54:1	conferences 91:10	127:12,17
102:15,16 105:4	127:9,15 128:2,25	60:1 63:17 71:20	114:9 118:22	consolidated 47:4
107:19 108:7,9	Commission's	company 58:11,13	confiden- 106:21	59:15 61:2,22,23
109:7 110:6,22	65:24 71:20	58:14,17,18,20,22	confident 125:3	62:13 64:21,25
119:1 120:19	113:20 125:21	60:12 73:22,25	confidential 57:22	66:12 67:10,15
122:8	126:12 127:20	74:2,8 77:20	57:25 58:15,25	68:22 69:4 70:12
combine 113:3	129:4	91:20 94:5 102:12	59:16,17,22 60:7	71:2,17,25 75:14
come 55:10 68:17	commissioner	102:21 108:12	60:24 63:17 82:5	90:21 97:8 101:4
69:7 72:7 76:15	128:11	112:10	82:6 83:21 106:20	102:22 109:19
79:14 84:15,16	Commissioners	company-by-co...	108:7,7,11 110:6	110:2 111:11,23
89:2,5 96:20	51:13 53:14	95:13	113:15 117:15,21	112:9 113:25
97:24 103:4,8,19	128:13	comparison 62:15	124:4	114:22 117:19
104:2	commit 123:16	compel 73:15,21	confidentiality	118:5 121:24
comes 121:12 124:6	committed 127:22	77:17,17,19 85:2	58:12 59:15,20,24	125:25 126:2,5
comfortable 97:15	committee 95:8	117:11,13 118:2	61:3 63:3,16	128:4
100:11 113:7,18	common 65:1,1	Complainant 47:5	64:12 65:3,7	consolidating 54:25
113:22 122:6	66:25 67:22 72:3	complete 58:3	68:14,16 73:3	64:17 72:19 85:21
coming 102:7	77:25 78:11 83:21	59:11 68:7 89:10	78:12 88:23 91:7	88:11 90:16 100:2
124:22	88:21 96:24 98:6	completely 58:6	108:2,6 110:4,5,7	121:9 122:20
comment 91:4	98:7 106:25 108:4	63:9 67:9	110:21 116:5	124:22 127:13
98:25	113:13,14,24	complex 84:8,9	117:22 128:24	consolidation 57:12
comments 122:15	120:21 124:5	97:8	confidentially	61:20,23 64:19
commercially	127:2,3	component 111:23	59:21	66:14 67:19 68:12
59:21 60:2 108:10	commonality 54:3	compromise 110:13	confused 126:3,7	70:3 78:12 82:17
Commission 47:2,4	54:7 65:19 71:21	110:17 111:17,22	confusion 67:3	84:17 85:18 86:2
47:18 49:2 51:12	98:23 99:1,3	116:3 127:8	conscious 103:15	96:16 106:10
51:18 53:20 54:20	Communications	concept 65:16	consider 106:2	110:13,14,17
55:6 57:20 59:10	120:5	concepts 65:15	consideration	111:18 117:9,25

125:19 126:12 128:23 129:3 constraints 91:13 constructive 80:19 80:21 81:6 96:20 98:21 121:22 125:5 constructively 81:25 consult 91:17,24 102:4 Consumes 52:19 Cont 49:1 50:1 contact 103:20 contemporaneous 118:25 contest 71:2 104:13 109:22 contested 62:8 71:17 104:14 context 117:19 118:4,8 continue 65:9 74:4 80:22 81:1 88:4 98:21 continuing 115:1 controversy 97:2 conversations 82:4 107:25 conveyed 119:1 Corporation 47:7 48:7 correct 56:13,15 108:3 corrected 73:12 cost 59:4 61:13 63:25 70:9 71:3 72:4 85:22 94:2 99:14 102:9 104:12 111:9,10 111:13 116:9 costs 53:24,25 54:17 71:23 81:12 95:6 99:23 Counsel 48:6 49:9	49:11 52:15,17 62:12,20 64:14,15 68:24 91:12 92:23 96:3 109:16 116:7 120:12 Counsel's 65:13 67:24 92:19 95:16 120:15 121:5 countless 73:11 COUNTY 130:4 couple 80:8 84:3 97:19 105:21 112:16 116:3 118:13 course 69:3 77:18 78:5 79:22 97:13 98:5,11,14 107:11 120:22 121:1 crafted 119:17 creates 82:23 111:12 126:3 creating 127:4 creative 84:16 curious 67:2 69:16 86:11 96:3 customers 76:8,15 77:6 101:13 cut 80:16 <hr/> D D 51:4 d/b/a 47:7 D3 49:17 Dallas 49:3 52:12 52:12 57:14,15 60:11 61:19 62:10 62:25 63:22 64:11 70:19,24 71:18 72:9,11 91:3 92:3 100:15,20,23 101:24,25 102:24 103:6 107:24 109:14 112:5,12 112:14,17,21 115:25 116:1 128:20,22	Dan 64:6 111:20 118:11 Daniel 49:3 52:13 daniel.teimouri... 49:7 data 80:19 date 56:11,13 62:3 75:12,20,21 76:12 78:5 92:10,14 101:3,5,9 dates 75:8 107:3 David 48:6 52:3 david.meyer@av... 48:10 Davison 49:22 day 75:19 94:19 105:25 days 51:20 116:25 dbarnett@perki... 48:24 deadlines 115:16 deal 61:2 63:3 65:5 66:11 67:21 68:17 83:12,13 85:19,24 92:17 100:10 120:17,22,25 dealing 64:2 69:6 84:8 87:10 deals 92:16 dealt 105:5 December 75:7 decide 51:18 53:13 54:6 86:13 89:10 106:22 123:21 125:8 decided 67:5 83:6 101:3 decides 71:15 101:16 deciding 83:12 decision 53:21 54:10,21 55:25 56:2 61:16 62:24 68:9 72:25 80:1,2 82:23 83:9 88:2	90:18,21 91:1,19 93:17 95:12,22 96:12,14 101:7 102:8 105:17 109:6,9,13 112:1 112:3 121:14 122:6 123:19,25 decision-makers 121:17 decision-making 53:19 54:5,11 55:4,22 56:6 62:8 67:12 90:16 93:12 96:13 109:8 110:23 118:25 decisional 65:23 decisions 78:7,11 89:4 decoupling 64:24 dedicating 73:23 deep 78:15 deeper 84:4 deferral 71:7,10,24 93:15 108:24 109:11 deficiencies 124:8 defined 95:20 delay 75:10 delayed 125:2 departure 127:15 127:20 depending 68:19 75:15 103:1 105:3 depositions 85:3 describe 95:4 described 90:19 deserve 104:24 designated 113:15 designation 58:25 63:6,23 117:22 designations 65:7 detailed 81:10 determination 54:16 56:8 57:6 61:11 72:17 90:20	93:11,16 96:16 102:10 126:14 127:5 determinations 56:4 97:6 112:20 125:24 determine 54:24 56:23 60:19 determined 53:12 develop 88:13 98:11 125:25 developed 97:11 98:10 113:8 development 97:21 dialogue 80:17 difference 89:25 109:19,24 different 54:2 56:4 58:6,7,17 59:8 61:1 63:9 89:3,4,5 96:25 98:9 102:12 102:16,21 112:11 112:19 113:17 116:9 124:12,20 differently 89:7 96:25 98:8 99:10 difficult 53:11 61:18 101:18 difficulties 56:19 90:19,25 difficulty 87:17 direction 93:22 directional 65:16 directly 64:8,9 124:3 disagree 59:5 disagreement 108:13 disallowance 94:1 disappointing 53:12 discomfort 65:3 discovery 68:18 69:1 73:9,14,19 73:19 74:10 77:16
---	--	--	--	--

78:15,17 79:4 81:8 82:2,5 83:24 83:25 84:4 85:13 103:9 106:13,22 113:5 114:8,14 118:22 124:9,15 128:15 discretion 121:11 121:16 discuss 55:14 62:13 79:11 92:2 100:7 101:21 103:1 124:6 129:8 discussed 106:12 discussing 74:25 81:21 124:13,24 discussion 69:13,17 69:20 124:21 discussions 98:19 123:25 disparate 82:17 dispatch 94:6 disputes 79:5 distinction 59:9 102:17 113:23 distinctions 94:4 95:9 distinguished 83:2 disturbed 75:7 disturbing 75:17 dive 92:14 doc- 58:11 docket 56:1 57:23 58:8,10 60:22,23 64:22,24 70:9,11 71:7,8 94:10 96:7 96:18 104:15 105:8,12 107:9,15 111:23 113:11 120:2,6 dockets 47:4 54:25 55:20 57:12,19 58:5,16 59:2,12 63:25 64:24 67:1 68:25 70:14 71:1	71:6 72:23 77:12 77:13 83:22 86:13 90:18,24 92:24 93:18 101:3 104:12 108:15,21 109:20 110:20,24 113:9,16 117:23 122:10 document 58:11,12 58:13,14 60:6 85:24 117:13,16 117:20,24 118:6 120:3 document's 117:21 documentation 58:22 documents 58:24 73:11 85:2 119:6 119:8,9,10 doing 74:11 83:19 85:23 100:6 114:2 115:1 dollars 75:23 76:10 94:2 95:23 Donna 48:21 52:8 102:5 110:11 drain 91:21 drastic 82:16 88:11 127:15,19 due 77:18 dueling 80:19 dumped 76:6,24 77:8 duties 95:7	easy 95:11 100:4 economy 61:8,16 64:2 65:4 91:8 108:16 109:1 111:6,7,8 114:1 114:17,25 116:6 126:13 127:15 129:3 effect 75:21 101:6 118:18 effective 56:11 101:3,5,9 effectively 125:16 efficiency 104:22 111:8 122:21 125:20 127:7 efficient 64:3 67:20 77:5 97:14 99:23 121:6,16 efficiently 55:6 56:8 125:15 effort 74:1 either 78:16 79:17 105:2 123:2 elephant 53:17 55:4 elongates 92:12 93:4 email 123:15 emphasize 73:7 empty 75:22 76:1 encouraged 121:18 ends 121:23 Energy 48:20 49:15 50:7 52:9,19,21 52:23 53:2,5 72:16 84:12 93:8 115:20,21 122:13 122:23 123:1 Energy's 51:16 engage 114:8,24 engaged 68:25 83:24 engagement 69:1 enter 116:13	entered 81:19 113:8 entering 114:7 entertain 91:23 entire 71:5,6,9 108:21,23 109:19 entirely 124:20 entitled 125:23 envision 57:13 64:16 envisions 124:2 episode 94:19 ERF 64:24 ERM 51:14,15 54:10 55:19,21 56:1,9,11 57:9 62:14 65:14,18 66:11 68:1,6 73:8 74:23 75:9,23,25 76:3,20 86:25 87:1,3,8,12 91:14 92:21 93:7,14 94:9,10 95:19,23 96:5,7 101:3,5,7 104:14 105:9,11 105:15 107:8,9,15 107:18 109:10 125:1 ERM-related 76:10 especially 97:22 ESQ 48:6 essentially 75:2 78:18,21 100:6 110:7 establish 119:20 establishing 111:9 evaluations 56:4 event 79:3 87:7 107:8 events 67:23 97:13 120:20 evidence 110:22 113:21 evidentiary 114:20 evolve 114:3	116:12 exactly 90:6 97:19 112:21 example 67:6 exchange 70:10 Excuse 64:6 exercise 95:7 128:17 exercising 94:3 exhausted 74:7 exhibits 66:2 exist 58:13 existing 87:2 exists 58:14 98:23 expect 98:13 123:19 expedite 96:14 expedited 62:2 90:22 97:17 98:3 expended 74:1 explain 57:8 116:17 explore 79:8 explored 95:13 expressed 68:2 extend 101:2,4,7,8 extended 74:9 extensive 73:9,19 extent 88:21,25 99:2 extraordinary 94:6 eye 73:17
				F
				F 130:1 facilitate 79:18 fact 58:19 61:6 62:18 94:12 98:7 127:1 factor 94:12 facts 97:3 102:14 114:18 119:17 121:3,15,21 fair 59:12 91:19 116:21 117:4 124:16 129:1 fairly 82:16 96:4

105:22 106:23 120:18 faith 73:1 falls 121:16 familiar 93:10 116:12 far 85:20 123:7 feedback 102:1 feel 56:21 68:5 72:13,23 80:20 104:16 105:8 114:20 115:8 121:12 feels 72:22 fewer 121:7 ffitch 49:16,16 52:22,22 122:13 122:14 fiduciary 95:7 fight 63:5,23 65:7 117:14,20,22 figure 63:3 76:10 106:17 128:12 file 65:24 69:21 74:16,18 86:6 97:25 116:20 117:10 filed 53:24 66:5 68:24 73:8 74:14 74:23 81:18 83:13 84:2 87:6 104:14 114:4 116:17,19 116:25 117:6,7 filing 59:4 60:13 64:23 66:6 68:1 70:25 71:22 76:3 80:10 86:25 93:7 93:14 96:15 111:15 117:5 filings 54:8 55:24 72:4 92:17 93:8 98:16 104:12 120:23 121:13 filled 86:20 final 107:4 123:5	126:20,21 127:21 find 53:9 73:1 78:10 83:18 124:5 finding 127:23 finds 107:17 fine 70:6 finish 92:9 107:20 first 53:17 55:18 57:3 59:16 70:2 72:21 81:3,13 83:7,13 84:14 86:8 89:10 91:4 105:6 116:10 118:17 five 66:2 73:18 74:12 79:2 101:14 five-step 117:24 flawed 67:8 flaws 55:18 fleshed 88:9 fly 70:5 focus 62:16 92:19 104:17 focused 55:4,11 61:24 72:1 79:23 80:7,23 follow-on 87:10 follow-up 84:2 following 124:8 foregoing 130:8 foreseeable 60:16 60:17 61:7 formally 115:3 forward 53:14 55:16 68:19 69:5 84:4 88:7,17 98:4 98:5 106:3 115:23 120:13 121:6,22 123:6 foster 65:4 found 78:13 four 107:6,16 124:7 Fourth 47:22 48:23 frame 92:7 frank 67:9	frankly 73:25 74:8 82:20 97:14 98:13 front 67:4 frustration 119:11 full 68:3 fully 67:17 69:4 88:9 fundamental 106:9 further 124:9 future 86:2 127:17	<hr/> G <hr/> G 51:4 Gafken 49:10 52:16,16 64:14,18 66:17,20 67:8 92:4,6 115:7,8 120:12,14 gained 80:25 gap 60:12,14 gaps 88:6,19 Garlinghouse 47:20 130:6,13 gear 120:25 121:7 gearing 86:6 general 49:4,10 51:13,15 54:9 55:19,21 60:9 75:9,14,18 123:22 General's 49:11 generally 64:15 98:16 generating 94:24 germ 106:8 getting 54:22 57:13 64:16 77:23 78:24 79:16 87:25 114:14,18 127:7 127:22 Gibson 48:13 give 57:7 59:25 104:21 106:1 107:2 115:19,21 116:21 117:4 given 61:6 72:2 85:11 118:20	gives 77:2 101:14 giving 59:24 go 52:2 62:22 63:5 65:17 66:2 68:19 69:4 75:21 76:6 76:13 83:7 88:17 98:4,5 100:15,21 100:24 104:3 106:3,24 114:5 118:3 123:9 goal 59:24 127:7,7 127:8 goes 68:9 75:16 83:2 87:24 88:7 going 53:14 54:10 54:24 60:25 61:25 63:5 67:17 69:12 71:16 72:6,12 73:5 74:21 77:11 79:24 81:14 88:14 89:6,15 93:10 95:9 96:2,8 98:17 99:16 102:3 103:14,17 104:13 107:10 109:18 112:1,3,8 114:21 114:23 117:21 119:10 123:20,24 125:2,25 good 51:6 68:17 86:22 94:12 96:22 101:15 104:2 105:1 110:1 goodwill 74:7 gotten 81:15 98:12 Governmental 48:7 grapple 120:21 gray 111:9 GRC 62:4,7 65:14 65:17,25 66:10 86:6 87:3 Great 100:20,23 greater 94:17 ground 124:5 guess 60:8 69:19,20	70:1 73:17,24 83:17,23 99:9,13 99:13,17,24,25 100:10 113:12 129:5 guessing 79:2 gummed 124:25 guys 128:12
<hr/> H <hr/>					
half 76:9 103:2,10 103:14,19 hand 64:22 95:2 119:23 123:9,10 124:5 hands 124:15 happen 94:23,23 happened 57:18,22 58:4 59:7 60:15 60:23 61:4,25 65:2 93:25 128:12 happening 74:9 happy 69:19 112:2 123:15 Harbor 49:22 hard 67:15 101:15 harder 98:17 hassles 67:11 hate 74:9 hear 59:11 65:6 66:23 70:21 71:11 80:2 90:9 96:9 103:14,18 104:16 123:5,6 heard 67:4 79:6 90:10 100:25 116:21 hearing 47:11 51:14,21 53:13 54:3,4,19 55:3,10 55:13 56:21,23 57:2 60:4 65:1 67:1 69:11 71:22 75:8 82:1 87:10 90:13 99:5,7 104:10 107:15					

109:25 110:3,9 114:6 118:24 129:4,9,10,11 hearings 87:9 91:9 heartened 95:15 held 64:25 help 53:13 79:12 helpful 128:13 helps 65:8 High 49:17 hit 116:3 hold 71:16 holding 54:3,4 holes 86:19,20 106:13 honestly 124:4 Honor 52:1 56:15 57:15 62:11 64:6 69:18 70:19 72:21 91:3 96:19 100:15 103:6 104:19 111:20 112:5 116:1 118:13,23 120:10 122:5,14 122:25 125:13 126:18 hope 77:2 98:15 113:19 118:3 128:1 hopes 81:19 hoping 79:16 80:20 80:21 hour 74:13 78:15 103:3,11,15,19 hours 73:12 huge 60:14 hundred 73:10 hundreds 73:11	106:8,13 109:5,11 110:2,18,19 122:20 127:4 ideal 90:7 ideas 104:2 114:16 125:14 identical 62:19 63:7,13,24 identified 104:25 113:13 122:10 124:8 identify 89:24 90:5 102:20 105:21 112:11 113:9 II 47:11 illusory 67:10 93:23 illustrate 58:18 immediately 72:14 86:16 98:18 impact 76:21 123:21 impacts 97:2 imperative 97:21 implies 113:25 important 61:21 62:2 77:5,5,6 importantly 88:1 improper 94:7 improve 71:6,9 improvement 99:24 imprudent 60:18 71:24 imputed 126:6 in-camera 85:2 inappropriate 127:18 inclined 119:24 included 71:23,23 including 53:25 93:14 115:19 incongruity 58:16 61:1 inconsistency 78:18	inconsistent 65:9 116:13 increased 54:17 incurred 54:18 independent 97:6 indicate 69:24 indicated 69:11 81:7 individual 59:3,7 60:1 63:6,23 71:8 83:22 97:3,12 102:3,16,21 108:11,20,22 109:21 111:14 112:10 121:1 individualized 97:6 113:2 125:23 126:1,14 inevitably 124:24 influence 105:17 informal 69:1 81:3 89:22 90:5 114:9 115:3 informally 114:13 115:4 information 53:11 53:20 54:15,20,22 54:23,25 55:6 56:22 57:4,13,22 57:24 58:2,15 59:1,17,21,25 60:2,8,16,19,21 60:22,24 61:4 62:23,24 63:18,21 64:5,8,10,16 65:10 68:8 70:10 72:17,24 74:3 77:3,23 79:24 80:1,3,13,25 81:1 81:10,17 82:11,11 83:21 85:9,9,25 86:14,15,19 87:25 88:2,21,22,25 91:18 102:10 108:8,10 110:8	111:4 113:11,13 113:14 114:13 115:2,3,11,11,13 116:11,25 123:14 124:19 125:15,17 127:10,12,22,23 128:10 129:1 informative 65:22 initial 60:13 87:24 102:1 innovative 83:20 115:2 input 51:22 55:9 98:24 insight 116:11 instance 117:12 intact 65:19 intend 62:7 69:21 72:7 intended 69:23 110:13 intent 117:1 interest 105:10,19 interested 66:23 69:20 90:13 96:9 106:24 interesting 93:2 International 120:6 intriguing 85:16 92:6,14 introduction 110:22 investigation 58:20 58:21,23,24 invitation 79:1 involved 73:10 involves 78:5 Island 49:18 issuance 119:20 issue 53:18 54:5 55:22,23 56:5 61:24 62:15 64:7 67:7 68:14 69:3,6 71:2,16 72:1,3 73:7 76:13 77:19	82:3 83:5,12 84:9 86:14 87:1,5,12 87:22 88:18 89:25 90:20 91:6,7 92:8 92:16,22,23,25 93:24 95:1,17,17 95:21 96:23,23 97:1 98:7 99:15 99:17,20,22,22 100:6 101:13 104:13,17 105:4,6 105:7,10,10,13,14 105:17,18,19,20 105:23 107:11 109:1,12,14,21,22 110:15 111:6 113:5 120:18 121:1 122:21 123:19,25 127:16 issued 70:8 issues 54:2,4 61:3 62:8,12,14,18 64:12 66:5,11 68:13,17 71:8 73:3 76:4,4 77:25 82:2,2,22 83:11 84:24 86:23 88:23 90:24 92:9 93:21 95:19 96:5,7 100:5 102:3 104:14,15,22,23 104:25 105:4 108:20,23 109:17 109:21 116:5,13 122:9 124:16 126:23 127:25 128:16,24 It'd 61:9 items 67:4 73:9 iterative 124:2
I				J
Idaho 78:7 idea 63:20 64:18,20 65:8,11 68:16 70:4,5 86:10 90:15 92:6,15 93:2 97:16 106:6				J 48:3,6 49:3,16 JENNIFER 49:4 jennifer.cameron... 49:7

Jessica 50:3 52:25 jessica.yarnall@s... 50:5 job 73:23 74:4,4 Joe 49:3 52:12 67:16 95:4 joe.dallas@utc.w... 49:6 join 100:8 joined 86:23 joint 58:1 74:21 90:21 119:16 120:4 jointly 78:8 judge 47:13 48:2 51:6,11 52:10,15 52:18,21,24 53:2 53:6 56:17 60:3 61:15 62:5,21 63:19 64:13 66:16 66:18,21 69:8 70:15,22 71:13 72:5,10 79:15 80:5 84:11,13 86:10 87:16,20,21 89:17 90:8 92:1,4 93:5,7,9 95:25 98:24 99:8 100:13 100:18,21,24 101:8,19,24 102:24 103:13,25 104:5,8 105:24 109:4,25 110:18 111:19,24 112:12 112:15,18,23 115:6,18 120:1,8 120:11 122:2,12 122:16,22 123:3 123:18 125:12 126:16 128:5,8,19 129:7 judicial 61:8,16 64:2 65:4 91:8 108:16 109:1 111:6,7,8 114:1	114:17,25 116:6 125:20 126:13 127:14 129:3 jumbled 97:9 jump 125:6 jurisdictions 78:3 <hr/> K K 48:16 Katherine 48:12 52:4 katherine@mrg-... 48:15 keen 77:3 keep 54:16 55:18 55:19 65:19 66:10 74:21 76:16 88:12 88:16 94:25 101:20 110:20 keeping 55:21 67:1 67:14 77:3 key 115:14 kick 125:8 kind 65:19 78:6 82:19 92:11,25 95:1 106:3 114:10 114:24 kinds 81:17 know 64:1 67:1,13 68:1,10,23 69:24 70:1,3 71:19 72:22 73:14,18 77:12,15,20 78:20 78:24 79:1,1,25 80:5,8,12,19,22 80:25 81:13,16,24 82:10,20,24 83:14 83:24,25 84:3 87:24 88:6,10,20 88:20,25 89:3 90:2 92:10,19,20 93:7 94:2 95:3,5,9 96:20,22 97:15,18 97:20,22 98:1,3,6 98:9,20,20 104:11 104:21,23 105:1,2	105:7,14,15,20,22 107:13,16 109:16 113:12 114:3,5,9 114:17,19,22 115:15 116:6,16 118:9,20 119:8 121:7 122:9 124:10 128:6,11 128:23 knowing 88:3,6 knowledge 130:9 Kumar 48:16 52:6 52:6 79:22 <hr/> L L 48:21 Lacey 47:19 51:1 lack 53:11 54:7 119:3 lacking 57:4 lacks 67:16 lagging 85:10 90:3 language 113:10 large 54:6 lastly 119:19 late 75:11 law 47:13 48:2 49:16 51:11 62:18 layer 59:20 108:9 layers 108:6 laying 75:5 lead 58:16 87:12 leading 53:19 54:11 55:5,22 56:7 57:18 62:8 67:24 90:17 93:12 97:3 109:8 118:25 120:20 leads 126:4 leave 126:7 leaving 108:25 left 77:14 78:22 83:13 103:1 legal 62:17 64:1 lends 95:21 let's 51:7,23,25	53:17,17 55:17 62:5 64:13 71:14 80:1 82:3 97:23 97:23 103:25 115:24,24 124:18 letter 66:4 78:17 level 59:15,23 63:16 106:20 108:1 110:4,5,7 110:21 levelize 115:11 121:21 lid 76:1,1,11,19 lighter 69:2 limit 116:8 limitations 82:13 limits 58:25 line 69:10 79:17 96:1 107:20 115:20 129:10 Lisa 49:10 52:16 95:18 lisa.gafken@atg.... 49:13 list 104:14 105:1 litigation 98:18 little 54:2 62:6 67:9 72:13 78:12 92:7 99:10 109:5 LLC 47:21 Loarie 50:3 52:25 53:1 122:17,18 lockstep 77:4 long 77:7 95:22 122:8 longer 54:21 look 67:14 84:4 94:20 99:9 109:12 121:22 124:3,6 looked 71:22 119:20 looking 67:16 87:7 87:9 92:23 111:14 118:24 120:3 Loop 47:18	lost 74:19,20 75:2 lot 60:4 67:20 68:12,21 69:2 73:25 84:21 86:18 101:16 114:14 115:9 116:5 119:7 119:10 lots 119:6 <hr/> M maintaining 128:2 making 55:25 56:2 67:3 manage 113:21 managed 94:24 management 58:3 59:18 95:8 108:9 marching 77:4 Marie 50:8 53:4 marie@sanger-la... 50:10 married 87:3 masterful 73:23 material 81:16 matter 75:13 76:12 89:15 107:7 matters 75:19 McDOWELL 48:12,13 52:4,4 79:22 80:5 84:22 86:4 87:20,21 90:4 96:19 112:23 112:24 125:12,13 mean 72:3 82:21 83:10 85:5 89:5 95:6,20 98:15 100:5 110:16 means 108:18 mechanism 75:25 meet 97:22 115:15 121:19,20 125:4 mention 62:10 mentioned 68:23 72:6 77:22 81:23 95:18 104:20 108:19
--	--	---	---	---

merely 121:3	79:7 81:23 93:20	NE 48:17,23	115:21 122:23	objected 73:13,16
Merger 120:5	motion 51:15,19	nebulous 128:17	123:1	objecting 103:21
messy 88:15	53:10 73:15 77:19	necessarily 70:12	note 125:5 127:21	objective 101:18
met 115:16	81:6 99:10,19	89:6 97:20 108:18	notice 51:20	obtain 81:9 102:9
method 68:16	111:5 116:16,19	necessary 53:13	notices 68:24	obvious 55:17 80:9
Meyer 48:6 52:1,3	116:21,25 117:2,5	55:14 57:13 66:15	notwithstanding	obviously 123:11
56:15 72:20,21	117:6,7,13 128:1	74:3 77:18 81:10	113:14	occur 58:21
79:16,25 84:22	128:21	107:17	November 75:11	occurred 98:7,7
85:8 86:18 87:19	motions 73:20	necessitate 121:4	87:6	October 47:15 51:1
93:19,20 101:1,6	77:17,17 117:10	need 54:20 55:7	nuances 95:12	51:9 66:5 74:14
101:11,23 102:6,7	118:1,1	56:23 57:5 60:10	number 51:21 69:9	74:16,23
103:7 104:3,6	Mountain 48:17	60:18 62:24 74:16	numbers 64:22	odd 108:22
106:8 119:4 123:7	move 81:4 101:9	79:24 81:18 83:1	NW 50:7	odds 97:25
123:13,19 124:1	115:23 117:16	83:3 84:19 85:17		offer 69:15 71:14
128:6,8,9	118:10,15 120:13	89:16,21,23,24	O	96:10 104:10
mic 52:2	123:6	91:16 94:20 95:13	O 51:4	110:12 111:16
middle 105:18	moved 114:22	103:10 104:18	o'clock 51:8	121:18,19
million 75:23 76:2	moving 55:16	105:8 106:15	O'Connell 47:13	offered 96:5
76:5,9,10 77:1	93:22 97:16,17	107:1 109:6,9	48:3 51:6,10	offering 65:22
101:12	114:19	111:17 115:10,16	52:10,15,18,21,24	Office 49:11,16
mind 54:16 67:10	MSC-27 48:8	120:20 121:7,15	53:2,6 56:17 60:3	offline 100:8
92:11 101:21	multiple 55:2 72:6	124:9 125:17,25	61:15 62:5,21	okay 51:6 64:13
114:17	73:20 85:22 100:2	127:10,11,12,23	63:19 64:13 66:16	66:20 69:8 76:15
minor 109:17	111:10,13 127:18	129:8	66:18,21 69:8	90:8 92:4 94:14
minute 77:25	multiples 104:18	needed 64:16 123:7	70:15,22 71:13	95:2,24 100:13,20
106:21	Multnomah 48:17	123:8	72:5,10 79:15	105:24 106:15
minutes 103:3,20	Myer 86:17	needs 53:20 54:22	84:11,13 86:10	107:4 109:25
mirror 85:8		59:10 62:23 67:22	87:16,20,21 89:17	111:19 112:14,17
missing 107:1	N	68:8 71:9 75:14	90:8 92:1,4 93:5	112:17 122:16,22
111:4	N 48:1 49:1 50:1	80:13 84:19 88:2	95:25 98:24 99:8	123:3 128:9,19
Mission 48:8	51:4	90:4 93:13 97:23	100:13,18,21,24	129:7
mistake 127:6	name 51:10	98:10 118:19	101:8,19,24	Olympia 47:23
mistaken 56:13	narrative 57:17,20	120:22 121:13	102:24 103:13,25	49:5
mitigate 76:21	57:21 58:4 59:6	125:18	104:5,8 105:24	once 84:4 92:13
mitigation 76:14	59:11 85:4 88:19	never 76:18 85:23	109:4,25 110:18	124:15
modified 81:21	102:18,22 112:20	new 75:21 107:15	111:19,24 112:12	ones 55:17 59:8
82:18 113:2,8	narrow 72:1 105:5	125:3	112:15,18,23	ongoing 73:19
moment 60:4	105:23 119:14	news 97:18	115:6,18 120:1,8	open 81:21 114:16
monitor 95:7	128:16	noise 80:16	120:11 122:2,12	125:14
month 84:1 114:6	narrowed 96:23	normal 82:12 83:10	122:16,22 123:3	open-ended 80:18
months 73:8,18	narrower 93:21	88:5 97:13 98:2,5	123:18 125:12	opened 84:6
74:12 80:8,11	narrowing 99:11	98:11	126:16 128:5,8,19	opening 81:20
94:16 97:19	narrowly 61:24	normally 82:21	129:7	operated 94:11,16
101:14	119:17	Northeast 49:17	ooo-- 51:3	operating 61:17
morning 51:6,8	National 47:24	Northwest 53:2,5	Oakland 50:4	operation 58:2
	navigate 73:2,2		object 73:14 125:19	

59:18 108:8 opinion 109:3 opportunities 72:7 opportunity 56:25 57:7 66:7 74:19 74:20 84:15 85:4 106:1 115:22 116:22 117:4 120:15 oppose 122:20 opposed 61:11 108:17,25 109:20 option 53:13 56:24 57:1 63:22 66:23 85:14 90:14 options 55:16 90:11 103:9 109:24 order 57:5,16 62:23 63:2,2,15 64:4 68:8 70:7 76:23 79:13,25 81:5,19 81:21 82:13,19 83:20 84:5 85:2 85:15 87:12 105:9 106:21,23 107:14 107:18,22 108:5,5 110:5,16 113:8,18 113:24,25 114:11 115:4 119:17 121:13 123:10 124:21 125:4 128:25 orderly 114:18 orders 67:13 91:10 113:2 116:14 ordinary 94:21 Oregon 48:14,18 49:23 50:9 ought 71:23 outage 53:19,25 54:5,12,18 55:5 55:23 56:7 57:19 58:4 60:13,15,16 60:17,20 61:5,6,6 62:1,9,16 67:23	67:24 69:22 70:8 70:11 71:4 80:24 90:17 93:12,25 94:11 95:5 96:6,7 96:13,23 97:4 99:20,22 109:8 119:1,16 120:19 121:8 122:8 outcome 89:7 97:24 outcomes 58:17 102:12 outline 57:4 outlined 56:24 66:4 outlining 66:5 outset 86:11 outweigh 54:7 111:9 overcome 56:20 overlapping 82:1 82:20 83:11 oversees 95:8 overture 82:9 owner 58:7 102:16 owners 58:1 59:18 59:22 61:14 63:4 78:9 82:6 88:22 102:15 108:8 110:6,23 119:16 120:21 ownership 56:6 97:1 121:2 <hr/> P P 48:1,1 49:1,1 50:1,1 51:4 p.m 129:14 P.O 48:8 PAC 116:19,21 117:4 118:17 Pacific 48:11,16 51:17 52:5,6 53:22 55:23 56:3 57:9 72:16 79:21 96:12,15 102:11 125:22 PacifiCorp 69:2	77:12 81:18,18 82:6 89:19 93:8 96:22 114:6,21 126:19 pages 47:12 66:2 105:21 paint 95:10 part 80:10 81:19 94:1 95:8 109:7 123:5 participate 69:4 participated 91:14 participating 69:12 69:16,20 121:22 participation 116:8 particular 90:15 120:18 121:1,8 particularly 65:8 parties 51:19,22 55:2,3,9,11,13 56:25 61:13 62:7 69:10 72:23 73:10 74:8,15 76:18,23 79:7,17 80:9 83:13 90:11 94:4 101:22 103:2,3 104:1,20 106:1,10 106:24 107:4 108:3 110:1,10 111:2 114:11 115:19,19,22 118:22 119:25 121:7,20 124:17 125:9,15,16 127:2 129:8 parties' 90:14 126:6 party 53:8,9 72:6 78:2 122:9 passed 77:7 patch 74:10 path 121:6 pay 54:17 PC 48:13 49:22 50:8	PCA 51:16 56:10 57:9 99:17 PCAM 51:17 56:10 57:10 96:16 98:16 pending 104:4 Pepple 49:21 52:20 52:20 69:14,18 95:25 104:9,19 113:3 122:2,5,12 Pepple's 85:14 perceived 86:19 percent 94:11 percentage 121:2 percentages 97:1 period 80:24,24 86:25 101:17 105:14 Perkins 48:22 permission 65:24 permit 53:15 55:15 person 79:18 perspective 61:10 67:25 94:14 95:1 95:16 113:21,23 120:16 125:21,22 126:12,13 pertaining 57:21 58:24 60:14,22 61:4 62:13 63:25 phone 49:4,16 50:3 50:8 pickle 87:14,14 piece 65:12,16,23 66:9 85:24 93:13 96:14 pieces 76:16,20 pinched 75:13 place 50:9 80:12 81:5 84:5 116:20 placed 114:11 plan 76:20 plant 94:11,24 play 75:5 please 103:20 pleased 53:9	plenty 66:7 79:3 plethora 54:1 plug 74:13 PO 49:5 pockets 76:7 point 58:18 74:12 77:1 78:13 79:7 79:13 80:9 87:24 93:24 95:2 96:8 99:3 102:9 112:7 112:15 116:15 117:10 128:16 pointed 56:20 points 116:3 118:10 118:13 policy 105:14 pondering 93:3 101:1 portion 66:1 Portland 48:14,18 49:23 50:9 pose 67:11 posed 78:21 position 57:17 59:6 60:18 61:19 69:24 71:19 91:17 94:23 96:10 99:19 102:1 102:7,8,13,20 105:3 108:16 111:22 112:7 128:25 positions 106:11 possess 90:1 possibility 96:18 possible 64:1 70:7 79:8 112:2 post 80:24 posture 77:13 potential 93:16 potentially 65:17 88:8 114:10 power 48:11,16,17 52:5,7 53:22,24 54:17 56:3 59:4 70:9 71:3 72:4,16
---	---	--	--	---

79:21 85:22 94:2 95:5 96:12 97:2 99:14,23 104:12 111:10,13 125:22 Power's 51:17 55:24 57:10 96:15 practice 74:6 127:20 practitioners 74:17 77:14 pre-outage 80:24 precedent 83:1,4,6 83:14 86:2 100:3 100:4 111:9 119:13,18,20 127:16 preceding 83:14 precise 73:6 prefer 53:14 121:8 preference 63:1 108:21 111:23 121:5 prefiled 94:8 prefiling 87:11 prehearing 107:8 prejudice 61:20 66:8 117:3 126:4 prejudiced 66:3 prejudicial 125:22 prematurely 117:5 preparation 71:21 prepare 96:1 present 69:10 presentation 86:20 presented 57:16 86:24 presents 56:11 preserve 101:18 preserved 122:10 preserving 60:1 preside 53:15 presiding 51:14 presumably 83:7 94:1 pretend 77:15	pretty 68:2 69:5 94:12 105:5 prevent 101:12 primarily 79:23 principals 125:7 principle 102:7 principles 62:18 prior 61:5 87:13 117:6 privilege 58:12 probably 95:13 104:6 105:21 128:14 problem 56:1 problematic 114:23 126:9 problems 55:20 67:20 procedural 66:25 74:21 77:13 87:2 87:14,17 91:9 104:22 108:18 109:11 125:1 procedurally 102:2 108:14 109:2 123:21 proceed 107:10 108:14 115:15 proceeding 55:8 61:3,11,17 62:2 65:5 66:11 85:6 85:22 88:14 92:8 97:9 98:12 100:3 105:9 111:11,13 114:1 121:10 126:3,5 proceedings 56:5 61:12 64:20 68:20 77:4 82:17 91:21 111:10 114:2 115:5 120:17,24 125:19 proceeds 76:6 process 65:1 74:10 75:4,6 78:15 79:9	81:3,4,8,8,20 82:10,19 83:10,16 83:25 84:4,6,25 85:13 86:9 88:5 89:8,9,13 97:14 97:16,18 107:5 114:7,8,19,20,24 117:24 121:6,13 121:23 124:2,17 125:7 128:9 produce 67:13 produced 106:18 113:11 production 73:11 Project 49:15 52:21 52:23 115:20 122:13 promote 108:16 125:20 129:3 proponent 66:21 74:2 128:20 proposal 99:11,12 100:12 propose 59:14 71:25 79:8 proposed 71:12 127:9 proposition 70:20 propositions 78:6 protect 63:17 105:9 protective 63:1,2 63:15 64:3 70:7 81:5,19,21 82:13 82:18 83:20 84:5 85:15 106:21 107:22 108:5,5 110:4,16 113:2,8 113:18,24,25 114:10 115:4 123:10 128:24 protects 64:4 provide 57:21 58:3 58:21 59:12 63:10 63:11 66:9 73:21 80:14 81:1,10	88:23,24 89:13 92:21 94:14 100:16 101:25 115:22 118:7,8 provided 58:23 78:25 provides 58:14 providing 65:10 prudence 81:11 125:24 prudency 54:11,13 54:14,16 56:5 57:6 71:3 72:17 90:16,17,20,22,25 93:11,16 96:12 99:22 102:8 109:9 126:15 127:5 prudent 74:17 PSE 48:22 53:23 55:23 56:2 84:14 100:11 102:2 110:12,14 112:6 118:17 126:18 127:22 PSE's 51:16 57:9 111:2 126:20 public 49:9,11 52:15,16 62:12,20 64:14,15 65:13 67:16,24 68:11,24 91:12 92:19,23 95:16 96:3 109:16 116:7 120:12,15 121:5 Puget 48:20 51:16 52:9 64:23 68:25 72:16 77:11 83:8 84:12 85:8,10 90:1 93:8 Puget's 80:11 83:8 89:11 97:10 118:19 pull 99:16 124:2 pulled 74:13 purely 69:2	purpose 111:5 purposes 65:23 122:7 pursuant 109:22 pursue 118:1 push 118:21 put 57:3 95:22 <hr/> Q <hr/> Q-1 58:20 118:24 question 55:11 57:16 66:14,24 69:21 70:2 78:21 80:6,7 93:4,15 95:5 96:2 101:1 104:4 106:3,9 questions 51:22 57:3 64:14 88:7 99:5 119:11 124:12 quick 102:1 quickly 100:16 107:13 112:6 118:15 122:5 123:20 quite 81:6 95:3 112:18 121:18 124:3 Qwest 120:5 <hr/> R <hr/> R 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:4 130:1 Rackner 48:13 raise 105:8 122:9 raised 104:24,25 105:4,6,7,13 113:6,6 rate 51:13,15 54:9 55:19,21 74:22 75:9,14,18 76:20 76:21 78:1,1,2 85:21 87:10 95:18 97:2 100:5,7 111:13 123:22 ratemaking 127:17
--	--	--	---	---

ratepayer 91:20	85:14	relevant 64:5	resource 61:10 69:3	78:8 129:9
ratepayers 54:17	recommendation	relitigating 83:5	69:6 91:13	roughly 76:9
95:24	59:3,10 60:1	remain 75:14	resources 68:21	rounds 73:20
rates 75:21 129:2	81:11 84:20 112:8	remand 105:8,11	73:23 77:6 91:21	route 63:5 118:3
reader 73:17	recommendations	remedy 93:25 94:3	129:4	rule 51:19 74:25
ready 67:25 74:18	58:6 60:25 63:10	remember 79:10	respect 67:23 68:4	
103:12 114:5	118:7	remind 94:15	68:6 77:19	S
readymade 77:21	reconfirm 112:22	render 129:1	respond 66:7 72:14	S 48:1 49:1 50:1
real 93:24	record 51:7 60:12	repeating 115:9	75:11 81:25	51:4
really 60:11 61:13	60:14 61:1 67:21	replace 99:22	118:14	sake 104:22 122:21
62:16,25 65:21	70:23,25 82:23	replacement 71:3	Respondent 47:9	Sanger 50:8
68:9 69:12 73:22	88:10 89:10,15	94:2 95:6 97:2	response 58:15,25	sat 116:24
75:24 80:6,17,22	97:11 98:9 103:22	report 128:14	68:23 70:2 75:12	saw 99:12
81:17 83:18 86:23	103:25 117:25	REPORTED 47:20	78:17,20 81:24	saying 53:8 65:6
87:25 91:5 92:22	126:1,4,8 129:13	Reporter 130:7	82:3,8,15 102:18	125:14
95:17 97:23 99:11	records 58:7 59:4	Reporting 47:21	119:9	says 62:23 79:25
105:13,16 110:22	63:7,13,24 88:12	represent 105:1	responses 56:21	schedule 66:25
112:25 113:5	88:13 97:7	representative 53:7	72:12 73:16 78:23	74:22 75:3 87:2
115:14 116:8	recover 53:24	representing 52:22	78:25,25 80:20	90:22 97:19 98:2
117:7,23 120:20	reference 57:25	represents 58:13,14	82:14 84:2 91:5	98:3 107:10
121:11 124:4	referenced 87:23	request 55:15 89:9	97:3 106:13	114:23 125:3
Realtime 47:21	referencing 57:22	89:13,25 90:3	rest 54:7 90:23 92:9	126:9
reargue 73:5	referred 128:10	requested 56:10	93:14 96:17,17	schedules 53:15
reason 75:4 79:13	reflect 124:11	64:10 72:12 85:9	109:10 121:20	91:9 108:18
88:4 91:13 105:1	refuse 63:11	requests 64:8 77:22	result 59:12	School 49:17
reasonable 59:13	regard 115:17	80:19 85:1 86:15	resulting 54:18	scope 122:10
78:5 82:10 91:19	regarding 54:11	86:21 87:23 88:4	return 90:8,18	SE 50:9
129:2	92:21 104:16	88:18 89:20	93:17 96:11,15	Seattle 47:22,23
reasonableness	105:19	114:15 119:21	123:4	49:12
94:7	regardless 121:23	124:19,20	returning 109:13	second 56:9 57:7
reasons 60:5 94:5	regularly 83:11	require 85:17	revealing 60:7	59:20 62:11 66:13
rebuttal 86:21,25	regulatory 48:6	required 88:14	review 67:6 70:25	105:18
87:5	68:10	107:9	85:2	secret 78:22
recall 62:6 69:15	reincorporate	requires 105:20	right 60:11,21	see 54:9 55:16,20
96:6 112:18	109:10	reset 107:9	72:12,25 80:1,1,2	74:9 76:14 82:4
receive 119:24	reincorporated	resolution 56:12	81:3 87:18 88:2	86:23 90:11 92:22
received 85:12	90:23	79:19 106:6	92:1 93:22 97:24	97:7,7 99:11,11
receiving 119:7	reiterate 102:5	resolve 51:23 64:12	106:14 110:25	99:21 103:9 110:8
recess 55:13 79:12	reject 71:14	68:12 79:4 90:25	111:1 122:8	111:22 127:11
90:12 92:2 96:3,8	related 53:25 55:10	91:6,7,11 102:23	126:14 127:8,10	seeing 103:20 129:9
100:14,16,24	62:19 70:10	106:9 109:1,16	127:13	seeking 53:24
101:21 103:1,2,22	relates 58:2 108:8	116:5 125:18	risk 126:3,5	88:21 116:4
107:25	relating 59:18 64:8	128:24	road 49:17 124:8	send 123:15 125:5
recognized 77:16	relatively 62:15	resolved 56:7 72:2	Rocky 48:17	Senior 50:3
recommenda-	65:25 105:5	105:11 107:12	room 53:18 55:4	sense 63:9 71:7
				86:5 93:22 117:11

117:18 118:2,3,4 sensibly 79:4 sensitive 59:21 60:2 103:17 108:10 sentiment 79:20 separate 53:24 55:20 56:5 58:5 61:12 66:11 67:2 67:4,14 68:20 73:9 86:7 87:11 88:16 90:18 92:8 93:17 100:8 108:15 110:2,15 110:20 111:6 114:2 115:1 120:17,24,25 121:4,9 126:23,23 126:25,25 127:1 128:3,3,3 129:5 separated 65:18 66:25 68:21 separately 92:9 111:15 September 116:20 116:23 sequentially 97:10 serial 116:14 serious 68:2 69:6 served 114:2,17 115:1 session 84:16 89:22 set 80:16 98:2 102:14 119:18 125:3 sets 87:9 setting 86:1 100:3,4 settle 98:15,16 settlement 91:10 seven 51:20 107:16 sever 51:15 56:9 65:23 66:8 71:8 87:8,15 92:15 93:16 96:14 102:3 108:20,22 severed 66:12	severing 90:15,20 90:25 99:21 100:6 109:12,20 122:20 share 54:2 114:13 115:11 119:24 120:1 125:8,15 128:10 shared 53:12 82:7 83:22 119:11 sharing 66:25 114:18 115:2,3 shelf 74:18 short 51:24 55:13 65:25 86:1 103:5 103:8 106:23 shortcoming 78:19 Shorthand 130:6 show 54:13,14 shows 60:16 shrinkage 75:10 side 67:12 sides 74:8 119:12 Sierra 50:2,3 52:24 53:1 115:20 122:17,18 similar 119:15 127:2 similarly 80:10 85:8 Simon 49:16,16 52:22 simon@ffitchlaw... 49:19 simple 105:22 simplify 96:5 simply 93:4 simultaneously 64:21,25 single 56:8 59:9 60:6,6 88:13 102:21 104:13 112:20 116:18 121:10 127:16 sit 79:3 106:17,23 situated 80:10 89:7	96:25 98:8 situation 53:9 88:20 98:1,5 119:14,15,21 six 73:8 79:2 107:16 116:25 124:8,19,19 sketch 92:11 skill 130:9 slimmed 95:3 small 62:15 solution 83:18 91:16,22 96:21 98:22 108:19 solutions 91:6,8 96:21 solve 67:20 solves 127:25 somebody 77:22 Someone's 112:3 somewhat 65:9 74:6 87:11 93:9 120:16 soon 112:1 sorry 109:20 sort 95:21 98:19 115:3 123:13,23 Sound 48:20 51:16 52:9 72:16 84:12 93:8 sounds 115:10 Southeast 47:18 space 83:18 speak 55:3 62:20 69:16 72:7 73:24 77:11 107:13 120:14 special 113:10 specific 74:20 85:9 89:1 100:5 124:19 specifically 60:7,9 61:5 85:12 specifics 59:14 spending 78:3,7 spent 119:6,7	Spokane 48:9 spread 57:19 59:11 Square 47:18 squarely 121:17 Staff 49:2 52:11,12 52:14 54:21 56:10 57:2,3,4,7,12,19 57:20,24 58:3 59:2,8,10,14,24 62:2,21,23 63:8,8 63:20 64:4,7 65:6 66:19 68:1 70:20 70:25 71:5,16,22 72:8 73:10,12 74:8 78:18,22 80:13,14,17 81:1 81:7,9,15,22 82:1 82:25 83:3 84:1 84:18 85:5 86:1,5 86:10 87:23,24 89:22 90:9,9,19 91:2,23 93:1 95:4 96:3,4 100:22 102:9,16 104:10 106:24 109:22 111:4,17 112:19 113:1,6,23 114:11 115:24 116:5 117:5 118:14,19 118:21 119:7 127:9,22 128:1,14 128:20,22 Staff's 51:14,19 53:10 57:17 58:25 59:5 60:17 61:19 62:14 68:15 71:11 71:19 80:23 81:6 90:9 91:17 93:24 97:23 99:10,12,18 100:16 102:1,13 102:20 108:15,20 109:2,15 111:21 112:7 116:16 126:20 128:25 stand 73:12 128:22	129:6 standard 62:17,17 64:1 start 53:8 55:17 57:2 73:1 83:15 115:24 125:6 starting 106:16 state 106:22 117:7 130:3,7 stated 91:4 102:11 112:6 116:7 118:23 119:4 statements 126:21 stay 55:3,11 67:4 87:2 staying 65:17 step 80:21 81:4,13 81:15,16 82:17 88:11 steps 86:8 stipulate 71:1 stipulation 71:4,12 109:15,17,22 stop 60:3 66:17 121:24 stories 126:25 story 63:8,16 67:22 67:25 68:3,3,5,7 97:24 102:14 112:9 126:24 strategies 97:2 Street 48:17,23 50:4 strictly 95:20 strongly 118:21 125:18 struggling 78:11 stuff 124:2 128:12 submitted 60:12,13 substantive 92:22 92:23 109:18,23 subtract 76:8 sufficient 51:24 54:15,23,25 73:16 91:18 103:3 129:1
---	---	---	---	--

suggestion 66:24	124:22	123:2,3 125:13	119:2,4,11,14	THURSTON 130:4
suggestions 75:6	talks 107:18	126:15,16,18	120:18 121:10,16	tier 59:16 113:12
86:11 113:1	targeted 92:10	128:5	121:21,24 124:1	113:12
Suite 47:22 48:13	Taylor 47:20 130:6	Thanks 112:24	124:20,21 125:19	tiering 113:1
48:17,23 49:12,17	130:13	122:11	125:21 126:1,3,5	tiers 81:22 113:10
49:22 50:4	tcp@dvclaw.com	thereof 109:9	126:19 127:4,8,13	tight 56:12 61:18
support 110:14,14	49:24	thing 100:19	127:19,22,25	time 51:7 57:3,8
suppose 107:6	technical 114:9,12	110:10 112:25	128:10,13,22,23	58:5 63:18 69:22
sure 52:2 64:11	115:5	124:13 128:16	thinks 63:8	73:12 74:24 75:10
65:8 67:3,17	Teimouri 49:3	things 68:15,19	third 105:13	78:13 79:3 82:22
74:18 89:9 91:18	52:13,13 64:6,7	69:7 74:10 94:23	Thompson 50:8	87:1 90:22 92:7
91:20 92:12	111:20,21 118:12	94:23 96:17 97:9	thought 62:21 81:6	97:12 98:19
101:23 109:23	120:4,9 128:20	106:14 121:3,4	82:18,18 85:16	100:13 101:17
110:19 115:12	tell 57:20 59:6 63:7	think 60:10 61:8	109:5 124:11	106:16 115:18
125:16,17	63:16 67:25 68:5	63:12,14 66:6,16	thoughtful 91:5	119:6,7,10 121:25
surely 74:14	102:13 106:1	66:22 67:2,8,15	thoughts 70:21	122:15,19 128:7
surprised 78:13,14	tells 94:8,9	68:15 70:15 72:11	71:11 90:9,14	time's 77:7
suspect 72:22 74:4	tempting 95:10	73:3,22 74:5,15	92:5 99:6 100:16	timeline 56:12,19
74:24 86:19	ten 66:1	76:22 79:6,13	102:4 115:7,23	61:17 123:23
suspension 62:3	termination 78:5	80:3,18,23 81:13	120:13 122:3	times 112:16 116:9
sustain 78:4	terms 66:14 67:12	81:15,24 82:8,12	123:5 126:21	120:25 121:7
SW 48:13 49:22	68:14 73:21 79:14	82:16 83:19 84:6	thousands 119:5,8	129:5
system 68:10	83:17 96:25 121:9	84:7,17,23,24	119:8	timing 53:10
	125:9 126:13	85:7,13,19,25	three 53:22 56:4,5	109:15,19,24
T	tested 78:6	86:3,12 87:23	57:2,19 58:5,16	116:16 117:2
T 130:1,1	testimony 60:13	88:3,10 89:3,8,13	59:12 61:12 63:6	123:7,15
tack 128:6	65:21,24 66:1,4,9	89:19,21,23 90:3	63:9,13,24,24	tip 75:25
take 51:23 57:16	69:21 74:13,14,17	90:5,12 91:5,12	65:19 66:12 67:13	tipping 77:1
68:21 86:4 90:12	74:22,23 86:6	91:16,23 92:13,25	67:21 68:4,20	today 51:21 53:18
96:2,8 97:10,10	87:5 94:8 97:25	93:3,22 96:22	69:3 72:3,4 75:2	75:1 79:14 100:25
97:10 100:8	105:7,20 114:20	97:14 98:1,5,8,14	76:9 88:12,13	124:12,18,21
108:24 111:24	thank 51:19 52:1	98:17,22,23,25	91:9,9,10,10	127:9
121:25 129:11	52:10 53:6 56:17	99:2,24,25 100:1	92:24 95:6 96:24	token 119:6
taken 103:23	57:15 69:8,11,18	100:9,9,10,14	97:5,6 106:17	told 67:22 74:15
takes 82:22	70:15 72:5,9,21	103:10 104:23,24	107:6 108:14,17	tomorrow 98:12
Talen 58:19 60:19	79:20 84:9,11,13	105:4,16 106:11	108:17,18 113:16	tool 77:21 86:22,22
61:5 78:8 95:8	84:14 87:19 89:18	106:16 107:25	114:2,11 115:12	87:22,23 88:3,11
102:15	91:3 101:23	108:2,2,13 109:14	116:8,9,14 117:16	89:20
talk 55:17 70:16	102:23,24 103:22	109:15,18 110:12	118:6 119:16	tools 77:16,16
93:20,24 103:3,4	104:19 105:24	110:15 111:7,16	120:17,21,24,25	topics 55:12 60:9
103:9 106:19	107:24 115:6	112:5,6,25 113:3	121:9 124:7	totally 113:7
107:3 112:6	116:1 118:12	113:19,22 114:6	126:23,23,24,25	127:17
116:15	120:10,11,14	114:25 115:13,14	127:1 129:5	touch 118:15
talked 77:14 114:8	121:25 122:12,14	116:4,7,16 117:4	three-week 75:10	track 87:11
123:15	122:16,22,25	118:10,17,20	thrown 98:12,13,18	transcript 130:8
talking 85:3 106:15				

transmittal 78:16	typical 113:18	unwieldy 58:9	57:2,3,4,7 61:20	77:23 79:11 80:3
transparency 67:16	114:20	update 92:21	62:12,16,16 65:12	80:15 89:12
68:11		uphill 63:12	66:13,17 69:14,15	we'll 74:10,11
Transportation	U	urgency 86:5	70:13,17,17,22	106:20 111:24
47:2,4,18 51:12	UE-190222 47:4	use 59:1 70:10 77:5	71:19 72:15,24	118:15 123:13
treatment 121:4	UE-190334 47:4	95:23 118:5	73:7 75:8,22	127:24
tried 80:15 81:24	UG-190335 47:4	useful 77:2 86:22	76:12 80:2 81:2	we're 53:8 54:3,4
84:23 113:3	ultimately 71:9	usually 80:18 83:12	85:7 86:13,14	54:24 61:17 63:5
triggered 73:8	84:7 97:5 98:10	83:15,19	90:9,10,12,13	64:1 65:22 67:25
trip 76:1,11,18	98:15 121:12	UT-991358 120:7	91:17 92:18,20	69:19 73:5 74:25
trouble 67:3	unanswered 78:22	utilities 47:2,4,8,18	93:23 94:4,22	75:12 76:16 77:3
troubles 77:10	unclear 85:10	51:11 85:22 89:1	98:10 100:7,8,18	78:10 79:23,23,24
troubling 74:6	126:7	89:4 96:24,25	100:25 101:18	81:2 82:10 85:3,7
true 119:14 130:8	uncomfortable	98:8 106:17	102:19 103:17	87:7,13,13,13,16
truly 106:20 108:10	100:1	111:14 125:6,23	106:1 107:21	89:7 92:25 93:22
trust 68:11	uncommon 77:25	utility 82:23,24,25	110:17,19 111:25	98:17 99:16
try 63:13 82:9 86:7	unconsolidated	83:2 97:12 108:11	112:3 114:7	101:12 102:7
88:4 92:8 97:22	108:25	111:14 112:10	115:18,21 116:3	103:11 106:15
117:15 124:5	underscored	114:11	116:15,17 117:2	112:1 113:18,18
trying 76:16 80:12	126:20	utility's 70:9	118:6,10 121:25	113:22 114:16,21
83:5,18 88:12,13	understand 67:15	126:10	123:4,5,22 128:11	117:9 124:16,24
92:11 94:13	67:17 80:13,22,23	V	wanted 80:2 101:25	125:2 128:18
101:17 102:9	95:15 97:21,23	valuable 89:20,22	102:5,6 104:9	we've 73:18 75:2
112:24 118:18	101:19 106:11,25	Van 49:22	112:21 116:20	75:23 76:19 80:25
124:10	106:25 110:19	vectoring 73:6	117:4,7 118:8	84:2 87:3 95:20
Tuesday 51:8	111:3,6,25 112:13	versus 65:14,17	wanting 66:22	98:12,15 101:1
turn 64:14 70:17	118:19 123:23	90:2 92:12	Washington 47:1,4	106:12,18 110:3
70:20 79:21 93:5	understanding	view 78:4 93:24	47:18,19,22 48:9	113:13 115:16
107:14	62:14 109:6 111:3	117:8	48:23 49:5,11,12	116:17 118:21
two 56:24 59:1	understood 74:2	viewed 116:18	49:18 51:1,11	124:8
60:23 68:25 77:3	99:13,18,18	126:22	130:3,7	Webster 50:4
77:13 87:9 91:15	uneconomic 58:9	views 124:14	wasn't 73:14	week 75:1 97:25
91:23 106:20	unfair 72:13	virtually 74:12	wasted 119:9	weeks 75:3 79:2
108:6 109:24	unfortunately	voice 122:4	wasting 129:4	84:3 107:6,16,17
113:13 117:17,23	56:12 124:23	voiced 91:12	way 49:22 54:24	124:7
two-month 94:11	unhappy 78:23	VOLUME 47:11	57:11 64:15 69:5	welcome 97:20
two-step 107:5	unhelpful 115:17	VP 48:6	69:24 72:18,18,22	went 82:16 119:19
two-tier 63:15	uniformity 89:6	vs 47:6	72:24 73:2 75:15	weren't 76:25
two-tiered 59:15,23	Unit 49:11	W	77:9 78:23 80:18	85:20 124:13
63:15 68:16 108:1	units 97:1	W 49:10	80:18 83:3,19	West 120:6
110:4,16,20	unnecessary	wait 116:20	84:8 87:18 95:3	Western 52:19
123:10	120:16,24	waiving 51:20	99:12 111:5,15	wildly 60:25
two-year 76:20	unprecedented	want 51:22 52:1	114:3,13,18	willing 71:1 82:14
Tyler 49:21 52:20	119:22	53:8,18 55:3,11	121:14	91:23 104:21
104:4	unresolved 101:14		ways 73:3 75:16,17	withholding 117:12
	128:15			

<p>withholds 58:11 witness 65:14 won 117:14 Woodland 47:18 word 128:21 work 68:15 79:12 82:4,12 83:17 84:6 87:4,4 88:5 101:15 103:12 113:4 working 80:13 127:24 workload 82:2 works 98:3,22 125:1,1 workshop 80:16 84:1,3 90:5 92:21 116:19,23,24 117:6 workshops 85:3 115:5 world 75:17 94:25 worry 92:7 worth 93:3 99:25 101:20 wouldn't 69:23 91:11 116:10 124:22 wrap 61:22 62:3 write 60:25 107:18 written 74:15 91:10 wrong 108:3 www.buellrealti... 47:25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <hr/> <p>X 128:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <hr/> <p>Y 128:15 Yarnall 50:3 52:25 52:25 122:17,18 yeah 62:10 69:19 70:24 80:5 104:19 112:17,17 123:13 year 75:20 76:21</p>	<p>87:13 94:16 107:15 years 85:23 119:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <hr/> <p>Z 128:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <hr/> <p>1 75:20 92:13 10 51:8 10:00 47:16 51:2 1041 50:9 10885 48:23 11:15 102:25 11:18 103:24 11:47 103:24 11th 48:13 74:12 75:7 78:15 12:35 129:14 1300 50:4 1325 47:22 13th 75:7 1411 48:8 15 47:15 51:1 99:14 150 73:9 15th 51:9 17 85:23 119:15 1750 49:22 1800 48:17 1840 47:22 1st 56:16 61:22 72:2 76:15 101:7 101:10,15 107:20 125:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <hr/> <p>2000 49:12 120:7 2005 75:24 2012 64:23 2013 64:23 76:19 2015 76:22 2018 53:19,25 54:5 54:12 55:5,22 57:18 58:4 71:4</p>	<p>71:24 109:7 2019 47:15 51:1,9 2020 56:14 101:7 101:10 206 47:23 49:13,18 20th 116:20,23 2101 50:4 241-7242 49:23 26th 120:7,8 287-9066 47:23 2nd 74:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <hr/> <p>30 75:22 76:2 77:1 101:12 321 49:17 3358 47:20 130:13 34 76:5,10 35 103:3,19 360 47:23 49:6 3727 48:8 383 49:17 3rd 66:5 74:14,23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <hr/> <p>400 48:13 40128 49:5 415 50:5 419 48:13 425 48:24 450 49:22 464-6595 49:13 47-130 47:12 495-4316 48:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <hr/> <p>503 48:14,18 49:23 50:10 509 48:9 534-9066 47:23 58th 50:9 595-3924 48:14 5th 49:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <hr/> <p>600 73:11</p>	<p>621 47:18 635-1419 48:24 664-1192 49:6 669-8197 49:18 6th 75:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <hr/> <p>700 48:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <hr/> <p>800 47:24 49:12 813-5161 48:18 82 94:11 825 48:17 846-6989 47:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <hr/> <p>919-3779 50:10 94612 50:4 97201 49:23 97205 48:14 97215 50:9 97232 48:18 977-5636 50:5 98004 48:23 98101 47:22 98104 49:12 98110 49:18 98503 47:19 98504 49:5 99220 48:9</p>
--	--	--	---