

Docket No. UE-220376 - Vol. III

WUTC v. Pacificorp dba Pacific Power & Light Company

January 26, 2023



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 (DOCKET UE-220376
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)
)
Complainant,)
vs.)
)
PACIFICORP, d/b/a PACIFIC)
POWER & LIGHT COMPANY,)
)
Respondent.)

VIRTUAL SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE, VOLUME III
Pages 44-124
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ANDREW J. O'CONNELL

January 26, 2023
9:30 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 - 4th Avenue, Suite 1840
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 287-9066 | Seattle
(360) 534-9066 | Olympia
(800) 846-6989 | National
www.buellrealtime.com

1 A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont.)
2 FOR SIERRA CLUB:
3 ROSE MONAHAN
4 Sierra Club Environmental Law Program
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, California 94612
5 (415) 977-5704
rose.monahan@sierraclub.org
6
7 FOR AWEC:
8 SOMMER MOSER
Davison Van Cleve
9 1750 SW Harbor Way
Portland, Oregon 97201
10 (971) 710-1154
sjm@dvclaw.com
11
12 WITNESSES:
13 ROHINI Ghosh
ANDREW RECTOR
STEPHANIE CHASE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
3 ANDREW J. O'CONNELL
4
5 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:
6 NASH CALLAGHAN
Office of the Attorney General
7 Utilities and Transportation Division
P.O. Box 40128
8 Olympia, Washington 98504
(360) 915-4521
9 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov
10
11 FOR PACIFICORP:
12 ZACHARY ROGALA
Pacific Power & Light Company
825 Northeast Multnomah Street
13 Suite 1800
Portland, Oregon 97232
14 zachary.rogala@pacificorp.com
15
16 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:
17 ANN PAISNER
Office of the Attorney General
Public Counsel Unit
18 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, Washington 98104
19 (206) 464-6595
ann.paisner@atg.wa.gov
20
21 FOR NWEC:
22 LAUREN MCCLOY
Northwest Energy Coalition
23 811 - 1st Avenue, Suite 305
Seattle, Washington 98104
24 lauren.nwenergy.org
25

1 EXAMINATION INDEX
PAGE
2 EXAMINATION OF ANDREW RECTOR
3 By Judge O'Connell 98
4
5 EXAMINATION OF RHOINI GHOSH
6 By Judge O'Connell 98
7
8 EXAMINATION OF STEPHANIE CHASE
9 By Ms. Paisner 111
10 By Judge O'Connell 112
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 48

1 LACEY, WASHINGTON; JANUARY 26, 2023
 2 9:30 A.M.
 3 --o0o--
 4 P R O C E E D I N G S
 5
 6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be on the record.
 7 Good morning. The time is approximately
 8 9:35 a.m. on January 26, 2023.
 9 My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am an
 10 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities
 11 and Transportation Commission and -- I'm sorry -- I am
 12 presiding in this matter, Docket UE-220376.
 13 And this proceeding concerns a complaint
 14 issued by the Commission through its Staff, alleging
 15 violations by PacifiCorp of statute rule and Commission
 16 order.
 17 On December 1, Commission Staff filed the
 18 motion to withdraw the complaint in this proceeding
 19 along with the settlement agreement to withdraw Staff's
 20 complaint.
 21 On December 23, the Public Counsel unit of
 22 the Washington Attorney General's Office filed its
 23 response in opposition to Staff's motion and the
 24 settlement agreement.
 25 We're here today for a hearing on Staff's

Page 49

1 motion and settlement agreement.
 2 Let's move forward with appearances. Please
 3 tell me how you would like me to address you during this
 4 hearing. For me, you can use he/him pronouns and
 5 address me as Judge or Judge O'Connell.
 6 Okay. Let's start with Commission Staff.
 7 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash
 8 Callaghan, Assistant Attorney General for Commission
 9 Staff. My pronouns are he/him. With me today is Andrew
 10 Rector on behalf of Commission Staff.
 11 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 12 And for PacifiCorp.
 13 MR. ROGALA: Good morning, Your Honor. Zach
 14 Rogala, in-house counsel for PacifiCorp. Pronouns are
 15 he/him, and with me today we have subject matter expert
 16 Rohini Ghosh. Happy to be here and be helpful to the
 17 extent we can.
 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 19 And for Public Counsel.
 20 MS. PAISNER: Good morning, Your Honor.
 21 This is Ann Paisner. I am an assistant attorney general
 22 with the Public Counsel Unit of the Washington State
 23 Attorney General's Office, and here with me today is our
 24 witness, Stephanie K. Chase, who is a regulatory analyst
 25 with Public Counsel. I use she/her pronouns and can be

Page 50

1 addressed as Ms. Paisner. Thank you.
 2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 3 And for the Alliance of Western Energy
 4 Consumers.
 5 MS. MOSER: Good morning, Your Honor.
 6 Sommer Moser on behalf of Alliance of Western Energy
 7 Consumers. Oh, I apologize. My pronouns are she/her,
 8 and you can address me as Ms. Moser.
 9 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 10 For Sierra Club.
 11 MS. MONAHAN: Good morning, Your Honor.
 12 Rose Monahan on behalf of Sierra Club. I use she/her
 13 pronouns, and with me today is Brad Cebulko, who's a
 14 consultant on behalf of the Sierra Club in case Your
 15 Honor should have any questions.
 16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 17 And for Northwest Energy Coalition.
 18 MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor.
 19 Lauren McCloy on behalf of Northwest Energy Coalition.
 20 I'm the policy director. I use she/her pronouns, and I
 21 am appearing with no counsel today.
 22 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you very
 23 much.
 24 You can now all turn off your cameras unless
 25 you are speaking or presenting or would like to be

Page 51

1 heard. Thank you.
 2 Let me begin with how I expect us to proceed
 3 today. I plan to invite the parties to present their
 4 positions on the motion and the settlement agreement. I
 5 will start with inviting Staff and then PacifiCorp,
 6 AWEC, Sierra Club, and NWECC.
 7 Last, I want to hear from Public Counsel and
 8 their position.
 9 So I do expect to hear from Staff and
 10 PacifiCorp on the motion and on the settlement agreement
 11 in the short presentation.
 12 For the other parties, I am leaving it open
 13 optionally, if you had prepared any remarks that you
 14 would like to make before we proceed on with testimony
 15 from witnesses.
 16 So after the presentations, I will have some
 17 questions for counsel or their representatives of Staff,
 18 PacifiCorp, and Public Counsel.
 19 And throughout the hearing, most of my
 20 questions will be directed towards Staff because this is
 21 Staff's motion. But there are certain questions that I
 22 have that might benefit from having input from the other
 23 parties and, in particular, PacifiCorp. And I will
 24 indicate those questions. I think PacifiCorp can help
 25 add some answers, too, when we get to those.

Page 52

1 Let me -- let me return to the schedule. So
 2 after I have questions for counsel and the
 3 representatives, I will then have questions to direct to
 4 witnesses for the settling parties, in particular, the
 5 witnesses from Staff and PacifiCorp. And I will then
 6 also have very few questions for Public Counsel's
 7 witness.

8 Last, I will invite counsel and
 9 representatives for the parties to provide any last
 10 thoughts and closing statements.

11 Are there any questions about the schedule
 12 for the hearing before we get started?

13 Okay. Hearing nothing. Let me ask Staff to
 14 please turn on a camera.

15 Thank you, Mr. Callaghan, and begin with the
 16 short presentation or statement, Staff, on your motion.

17 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. The
 18 issue before the Commission today is whether to grant
 19 Staff's motion to dismiss a formal complaint that Staff
 20 itself brought.

21 The motion is either supported or not
 22 opposed by all parties in this docket, with the
 23 exception of Public Counsel. Public Counsel's rationale
 24 for opposing this motion is twofold.

25 First, Public Counsel argues in its response

Page 53

1 that the motion to dismiss should be denied because the
 2 agreement does not include penalties. Public Counsel
 3 argues that if this proceeding were to continue on to
 4 litigation, the Commission would likely assess penalties
 5 against the Company and, therefore, the motion should be
 6 denied.

7 Second, Public Counsel argues that there is
 8 insufficient evidence in the record to support a finding
 9 that granted the motion is in the public interest.

10 With respect to Public Counsel's first
 11 argument, even if this agreement were to be considered a
 12 settlement agreement on the merits under 480-07-740, the
 13 notion that it should be rejected because things may
 14 turn out differently if this case were to be fully
 15 litigated is questionable.

16 The whole point of settlement is to
 17 efficiently resolve matters and reduce risk and
 18 uncertainty in litigation.

19 Public Counsel is essentially asking the
 20 Commission to conclude that it is so likely that the
 21 Commission would find both violations and assess
 22 penalties if this proceeding were to be fully litigated
 23 that despite the resolution reached by the other parties
 24 and despite the Commission's policy favoring settlement
 25 agreements, this proceeding should continue.

Page 54

1 Second, Public Counsel's response ignores
 2 that the agreement and the motion are not a resolution
 3 of the merits of the formal complaint. Granting a
 4 motion to dismiss is not a ruling on the merits, and the
 5 agreement does not purport to be a resolution of the
 6 merits. In other words, the parties supporting the
 7 motion are not asking the Commission to conclude whether
 8 or not the portfolio included in either the final CEIP
 9 or the portfolio that would be included in the proposed
 10 refile is compliant with statute or Commission rule.

11 Finally, Public Counsel's second argument is
 12 that there is insufficient evidence in the record to
 13 support granting the motion. Staff disagrees. Staff's
 14 testimony in this docket lays out the rationale for
 15 refiling the preferred portfolio using the P02-SCGHG as
 16 the basis, and the motion to dismiss explains why the
 17 agreement does not include penalty.

18 Give the competing concerns related to the
 19 delay in the CEIP itself -- docket itself, there is
 20 ample evidence to support the motion to dismiss. Thank
 21 you.

22 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you very
 23 much.

24 Let me -- before I get to questions, let me
 25 first ask if PacifiCorp has prepared an opening

Page 55

1 statement, and I invite you to turn on your video.

2 MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor. Just a
 3 brief opening statement. Yes, Zach Rogala for the
 4 Company here. Just two quick points.

5 One, just a quick level set for the
 6 proceeding. From the Company's perspective, we're -- we
 7 remain excited to keep working with Staff and the
 8 Commission on meeting our goals of CETA and these
 9 ambitious decarbonization targets. And we just want to
 10 make clear that we're on track to a 69 percent reduction
 11 of emissions from our 2005 levels by 2030. That's a
 12 monumental reduction in emissions, and we look forward
 13 to continuing to work with Washington on this, you know,
 14 significant transition of our generation portfolio.

15 But along that path, we've had disagreements
 16 on how exactly the Commission and the Company agree that
 17 the Company should be incorporating the social cost of
 18 greenhouse gases and its clean energy implementation
 19 plan. And I just want to note that this issue is about
 20 as complex and techocratic as a contested case dispute
 21 could be before the Commission, and we want to thank
 22 Staff and the other parties who joined the settlement
 23 agreement in being able to resolve this issue, I think,
 24 amicably. I think this is a good example of how the
 25 regulatory process works well, and we look forward to

Page 56

1 continuing to work with the Commission and Staff and
 2 stakeholders in the refile CEIP docket, if the
 3 Commission were to approve Staff's motion.
 4 Because this is a complex issue and we look
 5 forward to continuing that discussion, you know, not
 6 just in this next docket, but also over the next two
 7 decades as we try and implement these important but also
 8 complicated issues.
 9 Second point is I just want to reiterate
 10 what Mr. Callaghan noted earlier that this is a pretty
 11 narrow scope hearing. At least from my perspective, you
 12 know, the Commission's decision today is trying to
 13 determine whether it should give its permission to Staff
 14 to withdraw Staff's own complaint. And that permission
 15 is based on a finding that the motion withdraw is in the
 16 public interest.
 17 I think there's ample arguments that we
 18 could provide for why the motion should be granted
 19 because it's in the public interest. And primarily,
 20 rely on the fact that this is an example of how the
 21 regulatory process should work. If you have an issue of
 22 first impression, if you have a complex issue where
 23 there's a zone of compliance, there's not a specific
 24 methodology that is required, the Commission's expert
 25 Staff should be able to work with the parties to resolve

Page 57

1 issues. So that way, they don't have to be resolved
 2 with the contested case decision and potentially create
 3 precedent for some of the other utilities in the state.
 4 So we think there's ample evidence for a
 5 finding of public interest here, and I'm happy to answer
 6 any questions that Your Honor has. And I'll stop there.
 7 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 8 Let me invite the representatives from
 9 either AWEC, Sierra Club, or NWEAC. Would any of these
 10 parties like to make an opening statement or comment?
 11 I see Ms. Monahan. Please go ahead.
 12 MS. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I will
 13 also keep these comments brief, but I wanted to put on
 14 the record that Sierra Club supports approval of a
 15 settlement agreement. We believe that it achieves a
 16 filing that utilizes the social cost of greenhouse gas
 17 in PacifiCorp's preferred CEIP portfolio without
 18 foreclosing other options for incorporating the social
 19 cost of greenhouse gas in future filings.
 20 As was just mentioned, this is a complex
 21 issue that the parties worked, you know, quite -- quite
 22 hard to resolve.
 23 Another aspect of the settlement that I
 24 wanted to raise up is that it requires that PacifiCorp
 25 file further explanation for how the social cost of

Page 58

1 greenhouse gas is incorporated into the P02-SCGHG
 2 portfolio as well as the original preferred portfolio
 3 that PacifiCorp filed. And Sierra Club strongly
 4 believes that having that information on the record will
 5 be extremely useful to both the Commission and
 6 stakeholders in the future CEIP filings. Thank you.
 7 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Is there a
 8 representative from AWEC or NWEAC who would like to make
 9 an opening statement? Again, it's an invitation, not a
 10 requirement, but I wanted to provide that opportunity.
 11 I'm hearing nothing and I'm seeing nothing.
 12 So let me turn to Public Counsel and ask Ms. Paisner,
 13 would you please go ahead and present on Public
 14 Counsel's position in this matter. Go ahead.
 15 MS. PAISNER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.
 16 Thank you for the opportunity for us to clarify our --
 17 our position today. It is slightly different from how
 18 the AGC Staff characterized it just a bit ago.
 19 We are here today to oppose the
 20 December 1, 2022 settlement agreement among the UTC
 21 Staff, PacifiCorp, Sierra Club, and the Northwest Energy
 22 Coalition. Public Counsel is also here to oppose the
 23 associated December 1, 2022 Staff motion to withdraw the
 24 June 6, 2022 complaint against PacifiCorp, in which the
 25 UTC Staff proposed maximum penalties for alleged

Page 59

1 violations of the legal requirements for inclusion of
 2 social cost of greenhouse gas, SCGHG, and PacifiCorp's
 3 Clean Energy Implementation Plan or CEIP.
 4 The alleged violations include failing to
 5 meet requirements stated in the CETA statute, the
 6 Commission rules implementing CETA, and the Commission
 7 Order 01 in Docket UE-210829.
 8 Public Counsel opposes the settlement and
 9 the motion to withdraw the complaint because neither of
 10 these filings is adequately supported in the record, and
 11 both filings are contrary to the public interest.
 12 First, with regard to the settlement
 13 agreement, the UTC regulations at WAC 480-07-740 and
 14 WAC 480-07-750 state Commission rules for all settlement
 15 agreements and set forth a standard that settlement
 16 agreements must comply with the law, must include
 17 sufficient supporting documentation, and must be in the
 18 public interest.
 19 The settlement agreement was filed without
 20 any attached supporting documentation as required under
 21 WAC 480-07-740, sub (3), sub (a).
 22 In addition, the record in both this docket
 23 and the UE-210829 docket is devoid of any evidence
 24 showing any action by PacifiCorp to correct violations
 25 alleged in Staff's June 6, 2022 complaint.

1 The settlement agreement is contrary to the
2 public interest by proposing withdrawal of the complaint
3 for penalties, despite a record that continues to show
4 the legal requirements for SCGHG ands CEIP preferred
5 portfolios are not met, and the maximum penalties are,
6 in fact, justified.

7 Second, with regard to the motion to
8 withdraw the complaint, Commission rules at
9 WAC 480-07-380, sub (3) state the Commission will grant
10 a motion to withdraw a complaint in a proceeding
11 pursuant to Chapter 3405 RCW when the request to
12 withdraw is in the public interest.

13 The complaint in this docket alleges
14 violations of CETA, the Commission's own rules, and
15 Order 01 and Docket UE-210829 regarding the CAP
16 requirements for SCGHG.

17 These requirements, among others in CETA and
18 the associated Commission regulations, are important to
19 meeting Washington's climate goals and doing so with
20 more equitable outcomes. If these CETA requirements are
21 not met, other similar violations could lead to
22 incorrect incremental cost calculations and different
23 resource selections, which contradicts the climate goals
24 in CETA to be set forth in utility CEIPs in the future
25 for this utility and for other utilities.

1 questions for Staff, but before I get to Staff, I want
2 to ask Ms. Monahan to please turn on your camera again.
3 Thank you.

4 You mentioned something that I wanted to
5 follow up on because I am very interested. The
6 determination is whether granting the motion to withdraw
7 is going to be in the public interest, and you mentioned
8 that having information on the record, both about the
9 current CEIP and an updated revised CEIP, will benefit
10 the parties and the public in the future and the
11 Commission in the future for that comparison.

12 Can you maybe explain that a little bit more
13 and tell me if that is one of benefits that you see
14 coming from this if the motion is granted.

15 MS. MONAHAN: Yes, Your Honor. To expand
16 upon that a bit, so part of the settlement agreement
17 requires that PacifiCorp provide a very detailed
18 explanation for how the social cost of greenhouse gas is
19 incorporated into the P02-SCGHG portfolio, which is
20 proposed to be refiled as the preferred portfolio for
21 the CEIP. We think, you know, just on its face, that it
22 would be a very help explanation.

23 The Plexus model that PacifiCorp uses is
24 quite complex. It consists of three separate different
25 models that have to be interpreted all together, and so

1 Lastly, as indicated in our RCW 34.05.461,
2 sub (3) and sub (4), there must be a basis in the record
3 before, not after, the Commission issues a decision
4 granting withdrawal of this complaint.

5 So in sum, PacifiCorp must comply with the
6 law for inclusion of SCGHG in their CEIP before the
7 Commission's -- before the UTC complaint can be
8 withdrawn, not after. It is PacifiCorp's responsibility
9 to show that it has complied with the law.

10 Staff witness Rector's testimony in
11 Exhibit ASR-1T has not been withdrawn, remains in the
12 record for this docket. Nothing in this docket has been
13 filed to contradict any of the statements made in that
14 testimony that support the complaint and not to withdraw
15 it.

16 Therefore, the Commission should reject the
17 settlement agreement, deny the motion to withdraw the
18 complaint, and schedule -- set a schedule in this docket
19 for the remainder of the adjudication. Thank you.

20 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you very much
21 for that.

22 I do have several questions for counsel, and
23 they go along the lines of what the parties presented
24 on.

25 Before we get to -- I do have a number of

1 it's difficult for stakeholders to engage in that level
2 of complexity. So we think that the thorough
3 explanation would be useful.

4 Another aspect of the settlement is that
5 PacifiCorp will also provide an explanation for how they
6 initially submitted their preferred portfolio, which is
7 the P02-MM-CETA portfolio. Through discovery and an
8 extensive settlement discussion, we had extensive
9 discussions with PacifiCorp about how that portfolio
10 considered the social cost of greenhouse gas, even
11 though it was not a direct input into that portfolio.
12 It is very useful, we think, for the public and the
13 Commission to understand what PacifiCorp's initial
14 approach was.

15 As was mentioned, the settlement agreement
16 does not state that -- how -- that the P02-SCGHG
17 portfolio is how the social cost of carbon should be
18 used every time moving forward. And so we think it's
19 useful to have in the record information about what was
20 the initial attempted compliance from PacifiCorp as well
21 as what the settlement agreement requires, that more
22 directly and more clearly incorporated the social cost
23 of greenhouse gas into what would be the preferred
24 portfolio.

25 And so based on all of that and having that

1 information in the record, we think that that makes the
2 settlement agreement in the public interest.

3 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Appreciate
4 that. I have no follow-up questions. Thank you. You
5 can go ahead and turn of your camera.

6 And I'd like to invite Staff's counsel to
7 turn your camera back on.

8 So, Mr. Callaghan, I want to get at what is
9 the primary motivation for the motion. Please tell me
10 what is the primary motivation and is it to get the CEIP
11 proceeding Docket UE-210829 moving? Because this
12 proceeding is preventing that one from moving forward.

13 MR. CALLAGHAN: In short, yes, Your Honor.
14 So I want to be clear that Staff -- and I don't want to
15 speak for the other settling parties -- but Staff was
16 not willing to resolve this matter at any cost, of
17 course. We wanted to make sure that what was included
18 in a refiling was, we believe, consistent with statute
19 and Commission rule and order.

20 However, given that we were able to reach
21 that resolution, Staff was weighing the value of
22 further -- of, you know, potentially, you know, we might
23 get penalties if this were fully litigated versus the
24 further delay that that would cause in this CEIP itself.

25 I think there wouldn't be anyone who would

1 fair under the circumstances. That is not included, but
2 that is part of settlement and compromise and
3 negotiation.

4 So I -- I do -- I don't think that it was a
5 mistake to bring the complaint, but I think that this is
6 a fair and good resolution given the circumstances and
7 that it's in the public interest.

8 Again, this is a complicated issue. But I
9 think that this resolution, given everything that's
10 going on with the Commission, given that the PAC CEIP is
11 a year old at this point and it's still -- you know,
12 there are things that we are working with in the CEIP,
13 but to be honest, it can't be resolved until this
14 complaint is resolved, and this was the best way in
15 Staff's mind to resolve it.

16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.

17 So I want to give you -- to follow up on
18 some things you said, and I -- I want to give you
19 another chance to elaborate more on what convinces Staff
20 that withdrawing the complaint is the right thing to do,
21 that it is in the public interest.

22 MR. CALLAGHAN: So the conditions -- the
23 agreement includes refiling the -- the CEIP with the
24 preferred portfolio that Staff recommended in the
25 testimony. So that is, in our minds, in Staff's

1 disagree with the statement that as long as this
2 complaint is ongoing, it's extremely difficult, if not
3 impossible, to reach a resolution of the CEIP docket.

4 So Staff was weighing the value of, you
5 know, potentially getting a more beneficial outcome by
6 fully litigating versus, you know, being able to
7 continue and make progress in this CEIP, and that's the
8 basis for our motion to dismiss. And we believe it's in
9 the public interest.

10 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So generally, what
11 happened? It's quite significant that a complaint was
12 issued but now Staff is asking to withdraw. So I see in
13 this case a complaint with allegations, testimony from
14 Staff, and now Staff is asking the Commission for
15 permission to withdraw. What changed? Is Staff now
16 thinking that the complaint should not have been issued
17 in the first place?

18 MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. So the --
19 the complaint and Staff's testimony asked for two
20 things. Mr. Rector's testimony is recommending that the
21 Commission order a refiling with the P02-SCGHG as the
22 basis for the preferred portfolio. That is part of this
23 agreement.

24 The second is that Staff was recommending
25 penalties in the amount that the Commission deems is

1 opinion, that brings the CEIP into compliance.

2 It's Commission policy that the goal of
3 enforcement is to assure compliance, and that is
4 achieved here.

5 So in terms of this being in the public
6 interest and, you know, this is, we think, a fair
7 resolution of the case. Is there anything more specific
8 you'd like me to address?

9 JUDGE O'CONNELL: No, not in that regard.

10 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay.

11 JUDGE O'CONNELL: So I want to ask,
12 Mr. Rogala, if you could please turn on your video for
13 PacifiCorp.

14 For both Staff and PacifiCorp, I want to --
15 I want to talk about administrative penalties and how
16 they are addressed in the agreement, paragraphs 9 and
17 10. I want to know how these paragraphs operate in
18 regard to the allegations in the complaint. If you
19 would, please, explain the agreement's terms for
20 administrative penalties.

21 And I'd like to ask Staff first if you would
22 please explain the agreement's terms.

23 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, this is --
24 the settlement agreement includes that -- it doesn't
25 resolve any contested issue of fact or law presented by

1 the complaint. And it doesn't -- as I was referring to
 2 in my opening statement, it's not a determination on the
 3 merits.
 4 And so paragraph 9 is just saying that it
 5 doesn't resolve any of the issues presented in the
 6 complaint and that this matter is simply -- the motion
 7 and the agreement are simply supporting why the motion
 8 to dismiss is in the public interest.
 9 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 10 Mr. Rogala?
 11 MR. ROGALA: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor.
 12 I think it might be helpful to think about this
 13 proceeding differently than from how Public Counsel has
 14 phrased it. I think this difference helps illustrate
 15 why the no-fault and no-penalty settlement term makes
 16 sense.
 17 So as I understand it, under the Washington
 18 APA, when the Commission issues an initial or a final
 19 order in an adjudicative decision, that decision
 20 determines the rights and responsibilities to the
 21 parties in that proceeding.
 22 The Commission's settlement agreement
 23 regulation is framed in being presented in that
 24 adjudicatory forum. So you would require supporting
 25 evidence and documentation to support a settlement

1 unconstitutional. The Commission can take broad actions
 2 under this other agency action vehicle.
 3 So when that distinction is made, I think it
 4 kind of highlights why this settlement paragraph No. 9
 5 makes sense. It's just restating -- sorry. I just had
 6 a restart on my computer. Can you guys see me okay and
 7 hear me?
 8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: We can hear you. You are
 9 rather blurry, but we can see your figure. You're a
 10 hazy image.
 11 MR. ROGALA: All right. Let's -- maybe it
 12 will restart here. I apologize. All right. I will
 13 keep going, and then I will fix it when I stop.
 14 So that decision, you know, underlines why
 15 there's no fault and no penalty. So this settlement
 16 term is just trying to show that what the Commission is
 17 doing here is not, you know, issuing an initial order or
 18 a final order on the merits of anything. What it's
 19 doing is reviewing the agreement attached to the motion
 20 to withdraw that is required by the Commission's
 21 regulations.
 22 And in that determination, it doesn't reach
 23 the merits of whether PacifiCorp is at fault or the
 24 merits of whether the administrative penalties are
 25 warranted after a finding of fact.

1 agreement because the Commission will be issuing a final
 2 order that is going to actually impact the rights and
 3 responsibilities of parties. And in order for an order
 4 to be upheld on judicial review, you need findings of
 5 fact that are based on substantial evidence. You need
 6 evidence to support the record.
 7 I think that's different from the posture of
 8 this proceeding. Here, Staff has moved to withdraw its
 9 own complaint under Commission regulations. And by
 10 withdrawing the complaint, it necessarily would close
 11 the adjudicatory proceeding. It would prevent
 12 jurisdiction over the parties to issue a final order
 13 that impacts the rights and responsibilities of the
 14 parties.
 15 So that places the Commission's decision,
 16 instead of being an adjudicatory decision, it turns it
 17 into an other agency action decision. And the cite for
 18 that under the APA would be RCW 34.05.570, sub (4).
 19 Because what the Commission is doing here is
 20 the Commission is granting its permission for Staff to
 21 withdraw its own complaint. And under that procedural
 22 mechanism, under the APA, the Commission has broad
 23 discretion to make decisions that it feels are not
 24 arbitrary or capricious, and as long as they are within
 25 the agency's, you know, statutory authority, they're not

1 And so it's a -- it's a CYA protection that
 2 we felt was important to kind of frame the procedural
 3 posture here. And we included this argument in our
 4 motion to withdraw as a footnote, where we noted we
 5 didn't think that Commission approval of the settlement
 6 agreement was required under the motion to withdraw
 7 regulations. But we, nonetheless, included, obviously,
 8 because that's what the motion to withdraw regulation
 9 requires.
 10 So happy to answer any other questions, sir.
 11 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. I do
 12 have, in a little bit, a question about the standard of
 13 standard of review that I want to get to, and I'm going
 14 to ask Public Counsel about that as well.
 15 Before I get to that, Staff and PacifiCorp,
 16 I want to know if I grant the motion, is the complaint
 17 withdrawn with prejudice as it regards administrative
 18 penalties? Would the Commission be prevented from
 19 considering it as part of the CEIP docket, the UE-20829,
 20 whether -- whether administrative penalties are
 21 warranted for these allegations?
 22 MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, I think I can go
 23 first unless Nash would like to. I'll defer to your
 24 judgment here.
 25 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, Staff's

Page 72

1 position would be no, that the -- the Commission hasn't
 2 made a determination on the merits. That's part of our
 3 event of why the motion to dismiss should be granted.
 4 And with that being said, though, you know,
 5 the -- the refiling itself, I don't anticipate that
 6 Staff, you know, given the procedure that's in the
 7 agreement to review the -- the -- a draft of the
 8 refiling before it gets filed, to look at the P02-SCGHG
 9 portfolio prior to its actually being refiled, as a
 10 practical matter, I don't see Staff looking at that
 11 prior to it being filed, agreeing to it, and then
 12 raising an objection in the CEIP docket that what we
 13 just agreed to doesn't comply with statute or Commission
 14 rule.
 15 With that being said, from a legal
 16 perspective, our position is that it's not with
 17 prejudice.
 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Rogala, is there
 19 anything else you'd like to add?
 20 MR. ROGALA: Yes, Your Honor. Going back to
 21 that distinction between, you know, whether a decision
 22 from this motion results in an initial order or another
 23 agency action, I think it's another agency action. My
 24 advice from my client is that they could not raise issue
 25 or claim preclusion in a future docket, either in CEIP

Page 73

1 or -- sorry -- the CEIP docket or in future proceedings
 2 because's there no final decision on the merits of the
 3 issue. The issue hasn't been litigated. The claim
 4 hasn't been litigated. So we wouldn't have that
 5 available.
 6 If we view this as an initial or a final
 7 order in the adjudicatory proceeding, though, I'd have
 8 to think about that. There could be some precedential
 9 or with-prejudice issues that are presented. But I --
 10 I'd have to defer to Public Counsel on their
 11 interpretation there.
 12 But if it's a other agency action, the
 13 motion to withdraw would be without prejudice, and we
 14 fully anticipate that the SCGHG issue will get plenty of
 15 discussion in the CEIP docket.
 16 Or, more importantly, Public Counsel, Staff,
 17 Sierra Club, NWECC, they're all participants as well.
 18 And so I don't think this is the end of the
 19 SCGHG discussion. It's going to be a continual process.
 20 And just one more point is that the penalty
 21 exposure, while I think there's a colorable argument
 22 that a refiled CEIP would -- could start -- restart the
 23 clock for the Company's, you know, alleged violation of
 24 Commission authorities, but because this is kind of
 25 clawed back to the initial CEIP, we're doing something

Page 74

1 to effectuate our obligations to file a CEIP in 2021. I
 2 don't think the clock would get restarted as Public
 3 Counsel was arguing in their brief.
 4 So I don't think you're prevented from
 5 addressing the merits of the issue in the future, nor do
 6 I think the Commission's penalty discretion --
 7 discretionary powers would be impacted as well. It
 8 actually could, you know, prejudice the Company because
 9 it extends the potential daily accrual.
 10 So I'll stop there.
 11 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. So my interest
 12 does come from or stem from several other points that
 13 Public Counsel makes in its response. And you're
 14 bringing that up, which is where my concern is coming
 15 from and why I'm asking, which is about, you know, if I
 16 grant this motion, are these -- are the potential for
 17 administrative penalties gone or can the Commission
 18 consider that in the other CEIP docket when PacifiCorp,
 19 according to the settlement agreement, is going to
 20 explain how the social cost of carbon was accounted for
 21 or taken into account or included in the original and is
 22 going to do more in an updated filing? I'm wanting to
 23 know can the Commission look back at -- at this -- these
 24 allegations and whether the original complied.
 25 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, my position

Page 75

1 would be that once the CEIP is refiled, what the
 2 Commission is looking at in this CEIP docket is whether
 3 the refiled CEIP is compliant and meets the Commission's
 4 standard and policies with respect to CEIP.
 5 Now, your question about whether the
 6 Commission could -- is your question whether the
 7 Commission could make a determination and potentially
 8 assess penalties in the CEIP docket against the Company
 9 based on the initial CEIP filing? Is that what you're
 10 asking?
 11 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, consistent with the
 12 allegations that are in this complaint.
 13 So if I grant the motion to withdraw, the
 14 complaint is gone. The complaint would be withdrawn.
 15 But what I'm curious about is what
 16 Mr. Rogala's focusing on. Is this with prejudice as to
 17 those allegations? Could the Commission say, hey, wait
 18 a minute. You didn't do what we had asked and what we
 19 ordered in Order No. 1. Could that be brought up in
 20 that docket?
 21 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, the reason
 22 that Staff brought these allegations as a formal
 23 complaint is, I think, it's procedurally the appropriate
 24 way to deal with alleged violations of Commission rule
 25 and statute and order because it puts the Company on

Page 76

1 notice that we are alleging violations.
 2 So my opinion would be that the -- that it's
 3 not a dismissal with prejudice, but the appropriate way
 4 to bring this back up is to bring another formal
 5 complaint.
 6 I don't think that the Company would
 7 properly be put on notice if this were simply addressed
 8 in the CEIP docket. I think it would have to be brought
 9 through another formal complaint.
 10 But, again, I'm -- I'm saying that because
 11 that is the conclusion that Staff and I reached before
 12 bringing this formal complaint.
 13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And to follow up with
 14 that, Mr. Callaghan, Staff's a party to this settlement
 15 agreement. If I grant the motion, is Staff prevented by
 16 the settlement agreement from filing another complaint?
 17 MR. CALLAGHAN: I don't believe that we
 18 would be because it's -- it's not being dismissed with
 19 prejudice.
 20 But, again, the goal here is to bring the
 21 Company's filing into compliance. We believe that the
 22 motion to dismiss conditioned upon the agreement that
 23 we've reached with the other parties does that. And,
 24 again, I think as a practical matter, if what the
 25 Company shows us in their draft, that the settling

Page 77

1 parties are satisfied with that, as a practical matter,
 2 I find it very unlikely that Staff would see value in
 3 bringing another complaint, given that this formal
 4 complaint is what's delaying the progress in the CEIP
 5 docket as well.
 6 So I think it -- it seems like it would be
 7 extremely counterproductive and illogical for Staff to
 8 bring a complaint, given our interest in resolving the
 9 CEIP docket and the yearlong delay that we've already
 10 had in that docket and the importance of resolving that
 11 matter.
 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I'm ready to move
 13 on to another topic, but, Mr. Rogala, do you have
 14 anything else to add?
 15 MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, if this is a
 16 decision of other agency action, claimed initial
 17 preclusion claims cannot be raised by the Company later
 18 on because there's not a decision on the issue or the
 19 claim on the merits.
 20 So for example, say Staff still believes
 21 after we refile our CEIP that it violates Commission
 22 Order 1, the Commission's rules and statutes, then Staff
 23 would be free to bring forth another complaint on that
 24 issue.
 25 We don't think it's appropriate to raise the

Page 78

1 penalty issue in this CEIP docket because that would be
 2 an acknowledgment docket, not a penalty or complaint
 3 proceeding. But Staff could -- would have the
 4 discretion to bring another complaint.
 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 6 Ms. Paisner, I see your video is on. I am
 7 going to allow you an opportunity to address these
 8 points as well. So rest assured, but I do have a couple
 9 more questions for Staff, one more for Staff and
 10 PacifiCorp.
 11 Mr. Rogala, if you could please turn back on
 12 your video.
 13 Staff's motion states, so paragraph 7, The
 14 settling parties agree that the P02-SCGHG portfolio
 15 complies with the minimum requirements in statute and
 16 rule and the requirements of Order 01.
 17 I see this wording in the motion. I do not
 18 see this term or a term stating this in the settlement
 19 agreement. If this is part of the settlement agreement,
 20 can you please direct me to where it is included?
 21 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I'm not sure
 22 that it is included because I don't believe that it is
 23 necessary because this agreement is just related to the
 24 motion to dismiss and refile the CEIP.
 25 I think it would be hard for any party that

Page 79

1 is signing onto this settlement agreement to then argue
 2 that -- that what they reviewed, prior to the Company
 3 refile with that portfolio, is -- isn't compliant.
 4 So to explain, the settlement agreement has
 5 a process in which the Company provides us a draft of
 6 their updated preferred portfolio using the P02-SCGHG as
 7 the basis. And the parties will review it, and if there
 8 is a party that believes that it's not compliant, it's
 9 not consistent with this agreement, we would attempt to
 10 resolve the matter. And if it can't be resolved, we
 11 would bring the issue back to the Commission.
 12 Given that process, it seems unnecessary to
 13 include a term explicitly that states that the settling
 14 parties agree that it meets the minimum requirements.
 15 I don't want to speak for the other settling
 16 parties, but Staff already put in its testimony that
 17 this was our recommendation, that the Company refile
 18 using the P02-SCGHG as their preferred portfolio.
 19 So I would have to go back and review the
 20 entirety of the settlement to see if it's explicitly
 21 included there, but even if it's not, I don't think it's
 22 necessary.
 23 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Rogala, are you aware
 24 of a term in the settlement that mirrors or includes the
 25 language that is in Staff's motion?

Page 80

1 MR. ROGALA: I do not, Your Honor. And I
 2 agree with everything Mr. Callaghan just noted.
 3 Another thing I'd add is that given its very
 4 complex issue of first impression, I think it makes
 5 sense to keep those specific modeling requirements out
 6 of the settlement agreement and instead use language
 7 that the settlement agreement promotes meeting the
 8 minimum requirements of the authorities. Because we're
 9 talking about a zone of compliance here. We're not
 10 talking about a specific methodology required across all
 11 utilities. Because we want to provide flexibility for
 12 each utility to determine how to implement SCGHG at or
 13 given their respective system constraints.
 14 So I think there's hesitancy there to
 15 provide that much detail, and I'll leave it at that.
 16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Mr. Callaghan, you
 17 brought something up that I want to ask some more
 18 questions about.
 19 I thought, perhaps, I would return to it
 20 later to ask the -- ask counsel during my questioning of
 21 the witnesses, but I think you brought it up. And this
 22 is a good place to ask since I'm interested in hearing
 23 from counsel from Staff and PacifiCorp. It's about the
 24 preclearance requirement.
 25 My question is -- I have a couple -- but

Page 81

1 what will happen if the parties don't all agree that the
 2 revised portfolio is consistent with the agreement?
 3 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. So
 4 that is part of the reason why the agreement -- that in
 5 the motion we are asking that this agreement be included
 6 as a condition of the Commission granting the motion to
 7 dismiss. So that if there is an agreement -- or if
 8 there is -- sorry -- if there is a disagreement during
 9 this preclearance phase, the parties have a mechanism to
 10 come back to that conflict -- come back to the
 11 Commission with that conflict.
 12 In other words, if there's a disagreement,
 13 the parties will try to work it out informally. But if
 14 it can't be worked out, we want this agreement to be a
 15 condition of the motion to dismiss so that the issue can
 16 be brought back to the Commission.
 17 Because if the agreement is a condition of
 18 the motion to dismiss and the -- pieces of the agreement
 19 aren't followed, that would be a violation of Commission
 20 order.
 21 So there's other reasons that we're asking
 22 that this agreement is a condition of granting the
 23 motion to dismiss. We wanted to make sure, given that
 24 there are interested parties in the PAC CEIP docket that
 25 are not parties in this docket, we wanted to make sure

Page 82

1 it was clear that the Commission was giving the Company
 2 permission to refile.
 3 But, again, one of the primary reasons here
 4 is we wanted to make sure that there was a mechanism to
 5 bring a -- any controversy that might come up back to
 6 the Commission.
 7 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Would that happen in this
 8 docket? Would -- and so if they don't agree, would that
 9 issue be brought back to this docket? Would we be,
 10 essentially, in the same place that we are now?
 11 MR. CALLAGHAN: I -- unfortunately, yes. I
 12 mean, I'm -- I'm hoping that it does not come to that,
 13 but part of the reason we're asking that this agreement
 14 is a condition of the motion to dismiss is for that
 15 reason.
 16 But, again, I'm hopeful that we can resolve
 17 this and that it doesn't come to that. But, yes,
 18 that's -- that's essentially -- unfortunately, that
 19 would be the reality of the -- of the situation.
 20 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. In this
 21 hypothetical that could come from the terms of this
 22 agreement, in that case, would -- returning, then, to
 23 this docket, would the element of the agreement
 24 addressing administrative penalties, would that part of
 25 the agreement still be effective? Because it doesn't

Page 83

1 indicate that there's a violation of the agreement. The
 2 agreement would still be in effect.
 3 MR. CALLAGHAN: So the terms of the
 4 agreement are that the Company will refile the portfolio
 5 using the P02-SCGHG as its basis. We would be bringing
 6 this issue back to the Commission as a violation of the
 7 Commission order and seeking to enforce the terms of the
 8 agreement that the Commission included in their order.
 9 So what we would be asking -- coming back to
 10 the Commission and asking for is a determination on
 11 whether the -- the draft that the Company provided us
 12 with really is consistent with the terms of the
 13 agreement that the Commission incorporated into its
 14 order.
 15 So what we would be asking for is a
 16 determination on whether or not that draft portfolio
 17 meets the terms outlined in the agreement, not a
 18 determination on the merits.
 19 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Mr. Rogala, there
 20 are several questions there. Let me ask which one you
 21 would like to address and allow you the floor.
 22 MR. ROGALA: Let's just start about the
 23 preclusive -- or what docket -- what happens.
 24 I have a slightly different take than
 25 Mr. Callaghan on this one. So I think if you look

1 narrowly at the settlement agreement, you could look at
2 this preclearance requirement and say this is clearly
3 what happens if PacifiCorp, you know, just sits on their
4 hands and turns in a revised CEIP that's the exact same
5 thing it did before or is different from the settlement
6 agreement.

7 Is it the case that this complaint
8 proceeding has been closed by an order on Staff's motion
9 to dismiss, and now we're in kind of regulatory no man's
10 land? I think if you look at the settlement agreement
11 narrowly, you could come to that conclusion.

12 But I don't think that's correct. I think
13 the right way to look at this term is that it's a burden
14 for PacifiCorp, and it's a benefit to parties.

15 The burden here is, you know, we're trying
16 to have a good faith settlement term here that when we
17 do something, when we revise the CEIP, parties get to
18 look at it, and they get to give some sort of input and
19 preclearance review before we'd actually start moving
20 forward in the CEIP. That's supposed to be, you know,
21 another checks and balances on us. And that's a good
22 faith effort on us to try to keep this regulatory
23 compact moving forward because we don't want
24 disagreements on this issue going down the road. Of
25 course, we can have ample discussions about what's the

1 appreciate that.

2 One last question and it's about the
3 standard of review. I've heard about it already from
4 the both of you and from Ms. Paisner in assessing
5 Staff's motion.

6 Do -- do I have to stop at the evaluation
7 standard on the motion and only consider whether the
8 motion is in the public interest? Essentially, not
9 going beyond the motion to also evaluate the settlement
10 using the Commission's standards?

11 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. So
12 motions to dismiss do not have to have a settlement
13 agreement associated with it. Again, because they're
14 not decisions on the merits.

15 480-07-380, sub (3), the exact language is
16 that the motion must include any settlement or other
17 agreement to -- pursuant to which the party is seeking
18 withdrawal.

19 So my argument would be, first, that under
20 either standard, I think our motion and agreement meets
21 either standard.

22 But second, I think that the motion to
23 dismiss should be based on the public interest standard.

24 Now, of course, for a motion to dismiss a
25 formal complaint, whether the motion to dismiss is

1 correct methodology, but we want to make sure that what
2 we file aligns with the settlement agreement.

3 And here's the point. If we don't, we
4 violated the settlement agreement. And if we do that,
5 Staff or Public Counsel can file a complaint on this
6 issue.

7 And because of that, you know, the penalties
8 would still be live and, like we discussed earlier,
9 while I think there's colorable claim about the clock
10 could get restarted from when a refiled CEIP was filed,
11 I think the more plausible argument is that the refiled
12 CEIP would claw back to the initial statutory
13 requirements of when we're supposed to file a CEIP,
14 which is in 2021.

15 So it harms us to break this provision
16 because we have daily occurring penalty exposure if
17 Staff or Public Counsel wants to file a new complaint.

18 So if -- if you approve this motion to
19 dismiss, this proceeding closes. This paragraph 8
20 preclearance requirement is a tail requirement that
21 happens after this proceeding is closed. But if we
22 break that provision, then that's on us, and we get --
23 start a new complaint and be exposed to larger
24 penalties.

25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you both. I

1 consistent with the public interest, is going to be
2 decided in part based on some determination in some
3 sense of whether the agreement is -- the merits of the
4 complaint only in the sense of, you know, whether the
5 resolution of the issue is so out of bounds with the
6 Commission's assessment of how the matter should be
7 resolved that the proceeding actually needs to continue.

8 But, again, given the Commission's policy
9 favoring settlements, given the record that is in this
10 case related to what Staff was asking for in the
11 complaint and what this resolution of the issue
12 includes, again, I think under either standard, the
13 motion and the related agreement meets that standard.

14 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.

15 Mr. Rogala?

16 MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor. Just a
17 quick statement of the law and then two hypotheticals
18 that I think might be helpful.

19 The statement of law is we're here today for
20 the Commission to give permission for Staff to withdraw
21 its complaint. Review this as an other agency action
22 under the APA. That decision is reviewed for either an
23 arbitrary or capricious abuse of discretion in granting
24 permission or to determine whether it was constitutional
25 or exceeded the bounds of your statutory powers.

1 So I think that's kind of the bread and
2 butter standard of review process, and, you know, that
3 decision to permit approval of this motion is based on
4 public interest.

5 But that's, I don't think, is too helpful.
6 I think what's more helpful is to give some examples
7 about how that discretion should be used.

8 So on one side is where we are now, and
9 that's where a party has agreed with several other
10 parties in the docket to withdraw its own proceeding.
11 And by doing so, it could allow for more open
12 discussions on a complex issue.

13 If the Commission were to deny this motion,
14 it puts us in a weird position where the party who
15 initiated the complaint doesn't want to move forward
16 with the complaint, given the settlement agreement, but
17 then it is, nonetheless, forced to prosecute the
18 complaint after this motion to deny.

19 Of course, the Commission can order Staff to
20 do anything, but it's kind of a weird precedent for it,
21 and I think that -- I don't think that is, per se,
22 reversible. I just think it creates an interesting
23 dynamic and an interesting precedent for future cases.

24 On the other side is another example, where,
25 I think, the Commission should use or could use its

1 you both, but please stay here, not with your video on.
2 You can go ahead and turn it off. But if you would,
3 please, be prepared to come back on if necessary.

4 Let me ask Public Counsel, Ms. Paisner, if
5 you could please turn on your camera. There's a lot
6 that came up in that discussion that I'm going to let
7 you address. I have a couple legal questions for you,
8 and I'll also let you follow up on some of the things
9 that were brought up by Staff and PacifiCorp.

10 I think if we could, we'll start kind of at
11 the end. And I want to ask you about the standard of
12 review, and my question for Public Counsel is, in
13 assessing Staff's motion, do I have to go beyond the
14 motion and also evaluate the settlement using the
15 Commission's standards for assessing a settlement
16 agreement?

17 MS. PAISNER: My answer to that question is
18 yes. And I believe we're talking about WAC 480-07-380,
19 and I have that in front of me.

20 The Commission will grant such a motion when
21 the request to withdraw is in the public interest. And
22 also, I think it's sub (3), sub (a), the motion must
23 include any settlement or other agreement pursuant to
24 which the party is seeking withdrawal.

25 If that settlement does not comply with the

1 powers to dismiss -- sorry -- to deny a motion to
2 withdraw brought by a party. Say, for example,
3 PacifiCorp files a rate case, and there's a real bad
4 fact, a real bad issue in there, that parties have
5 discovered. And instead of the Company litigating that
6 decision to a final decision on the merits in the rate
7 case, we just move to withdraw our application. Say,
8 sorry, you know, not going to touch this issue, right?

9 In that circumstance, the public interest
10 would seem to be served by denying the Company's motion
11 to withdraw because public interest wants to have a
12 resolution of that disputed fact, right?

13 But it gives kind of a question of, you
14 know, like, culpability or mens rea here. Here, we're
15 not in a position where the Company is trying to
16 withdraw its own rate case. We're in a position where
17 Staff has, you know, diligently worked to resolve this
18 complaint and wants to withdraw its own complaint.

19 I think that kind of brackets, you know,
20 what the public interest discretion is here. And I'll
21 stop talking.

22 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you both. I
23 appreciate your thoughtful responses.

24 Those are all the questions I have for
25 counsel from Staff and PacifiCorp at this point. Thank

1 Commission's rules for settlement, it would seem that
2 the basis underpinning the decision to approve a
3 withdrawal would -- would be fraud. And in that sense,
4 that goes back to your question about the judicial
5 review.

6 Under Chapter 34.05 RCW, Commission
7 decisions must be supported by an adequate record. And
8 in particular, I believe, as Mr. Rogala referenced, I
9 believe the standard is evidence that is substantial.
10 If evidence in the record does not support a settlement
11 agreement and it was filed as a settlement agreement, I
12 cannot understand what basis there would be to say the
13 Commission's own rules for settlement agreements would
14 not apply in that instance.

15 And so I -- I do not think -- I mean, first
16 of all, I don't think it's in the public interest at all
17 to grant this withdrawal. And I don't see how it would
18 be even -- even if you were to ignore the settlement
19 agreement requirements in WAC 480-74-740 and 750.

20 But I -- to answer your question in short,
21 yes, you must go beyond just the public interest and go
22 to those other WACs on settlement agreements if
23 it's supposed to support the motion to withdraw.

24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: So while you're -- Staff
25 is saying the motion and settlement, it meets both

1 standards. Doesn't matter which one you look at. And
2 you're saying it fails both standards no matter which
3 one you look at.

4 MS. PAISNER: Yes.

5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me -- let me offer you
6 the floor to explain why, at bare minimum, this is not
7 in the public interest from Public Counsel's
8 perspective.

9 MS. PAISNER: Thank you, Judge O'Connell. I
10 first would like to dial it back to comments provided by
11 the Sierra Club referencing settlement discussions.
12 These discussions are not in the record.

13 What the record shows is PacifiCorp filed
14 its final CEIP on December 30, 2021, and it is now the
15 end of January 2023. There was discussion earlier about
16 the P02-SCGHG portfolio. That portfolio has existed
17 since before the final CEIP was filed in
18 December 30, 2021.

19 I just want to emphasize here, you know,
20 there's discussion about delay. And the delay here is
21 PacifiCorp's own delay. It's not the Staff's delay.
22 It's not any other party. CETA is the law, and the
23 Commission's rules implementing CETA, these are legal
24 requirements that is on PacifiCorp to comply with these
25 requirements. There should not need to be a settlement

1 can -- complaint proceedings like this one could go on
2 for over a year before utilities have to comply with the
3 CETA requirements and with the Commission's regulations
4 implementing it.

5 So I think that just ignoring, for the sake
6 of argument, the settlement agreement requirements in
7 WAC 480-07-740 and 750, I think the public interest is
8 harmed greatly by withdrawing this complaint.

9 But I think those requirements on settlement
10 agreements apply. I think the record, as indicated by
11 Staff's witness Rector's testimony and the 20 exhibits
12 referenced in that testimony, establishes that there
13 were violations here. There were violations of CETA,
14 the Commission's regulations, the Commission order in
15 the CEIP docket. I think there's an evidentiary basis
16 here that I think the Commission should pay close
17 attention to and be very concerned with the lack of
18 action by this utility. Thank you.

19 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. I have
20 a couple follow-up questions.

21 First, for clarity, in response to Staff's
22 motion, you're not asking that I assess penalties
23 against PacifiCorp at this point, correct? You're only
24 arguing that I should deny the motion to withdraw; is
25 that right?

1 agreement in which PacifiCorp complies only after the
2 Commission throws out this complaint alleging violations
3 of what it was supposed to do, that it was supposed to
4 meet these legal requirements in CETA, the Commission
5 rules and then also in the Commission order and this
6 other CEIP docket.

7 PacifiCorp also has indicated that they --
8 they know how to make this filing. They don't need the
9 Commission to withdraw the complaint. They can file it.
10 They filed an errata on April 27, 2022. They know full
11 well how to make this revision. They have made it seem
12 as though it's not something they're waiting to do,
13 other than just the Commission to not assess penalties
14 anymore.

15 And I think that the public interest is for
16 utilities to comply with CETA, to comply with the law
17 and the social cost of greenhouse gas in their CEIP
18 planning process. I think that PacifiCorp here is
19 attempting to be above that law. They're attempting to
20 go above not having to comply with CETA. And I think
21 they should have to do that. I think that if this
22 complaint were to be withdrawn, the public interest
23 would be harmed. I think it would send a clear message
24 to utilities that their compliance with the CETA
25 requirements does not have to be clear, that proceedings

1 MS. PAISNER: That's correct. Yes.

2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Let me -- let me
3 return to a point that came up in my discussion with
4 Staff and PacifiCorp about the administrative penalties.
5 What are your thoughts about there being no preclusion
6 about the Commission being able to pursue the
7 administrative penalties regardless of whether I grant
8 the motion or not?

9 So in the event I do grant the motion, Staff
10 and public -- and Staff and PacifiCorp have said that
11 there would be no preclusion. What are your thoughts?

12 MS. PAISNER: Well, in the -- in the other
13 docket, it's not -- there's no litigation schedule. At
14 the moment, it's -- the parties have engaged in
15 discussions, but there's been no request for
16 adjudication.

17 Therefore, while it's possible that these
18 issues would not be precluded, it's unclear that they
19 would be pursued.

20 And furthermore, since there is no basis
21 to -- there's not a sufficient basis to withdraw it
22 here, and there's nothing holding PacifiCorp back from
23 complying with the law, I believe that this complaint
24 should not be withdrawn. The settlement agreement
25 should not be approved.

1 I think that it's unclear that these
2 penalties would be pursued in the other docket, and that
3 is concerning for the public interest.

4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I want to ask you about
5 something that Mr. Rogala brought up, the perspective
6 that this could be viewed -- that granting the motion to
7 withdraw could be viewed as an other agency action
8 instead of an order resolving the adjudication.

9 Have you considered that and what are your
10 thoughts?

11 MS. PAISNER: I am unfamiliar with how this
12 would be considered an other agency action if -- if this
13 were to be pursued. I think that the Staff stated very
14 clearly in the complaint its authority to issue -- to
15 issue the complaint against PacifiCorp, and I think it's
16 perfectly justified for them to pursue it.

17 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Okay. Thank you.
18 Those were the questions I had for counsel.

19 I want to move on to witnesses, but I see
20 the time, that it's 10:55 a.m. We've been here for
21 nearly an hour and a half. I am slightly surprised at
22 how long the hearing has been thus far. I do not expect
23 it to last much longer as I only have a few questions
24 for witnesses.

25 But before we hear from witnesses, I would

1 MS. GHOSH: Your Honor, my pronouns are
2 she/her, and you can address me as Ms. Ghosh.

3 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you,
4 Ms. Ghosh.

5 Okay. I will swear you in as a group and
6 then we will move forward.

7 (Andrew Rector and Rohini Ghosh sworn.)

8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Let me turn to
9 counsel, Mr. Callaghan and Mr. Rogala, to introduce your
10 witnesses.

11 Mr. Callaghan, go first, please.

12 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
13 Commission Staff offers Andrew Rector for questioning.
14 Thank you.

15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And, Mr. Rogala, go
16 ahead.

17 MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor.
18 PacifiCorp tenders Rohini Ghosh for any questions you
19 have.

20 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. For the
21 record, both witnesses, before we begin, starting with
22 Mr. Rector, will you please say and spell your name for
23 the record.

24 MR. RECTOR: Sure, my name is Andrew Rector,
25 first name A-n-d-r-e-w, last name R-e-c-t-o-r.

1 like to take a short mid-morning break. So let's take a
2 ten-minute break. We'll come back at 11:05 a.m., and we
3 will begin with witnesses from the settling parties, in
4 particular, Staff witness Rector and PacifiCorp's
5 witness, I believe, it's Ghosh.

6 So does anyone else -- would anyone else
7 like to be heard before we take a break?

8 Okay. I'm hearing nothing. We will be off
9 the record until 11:05. Thank you.

10 (A break was taken from
11 10:56 a.m. to 11:06 a.m.)

12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Let's
13 be back on the record.

14 Thank you. We're back after a short break.

15 The time is now shortly after 11:05 a.m., and I have,
16 appearing on video, witnesses from Staff and PacifiCorp
17 as well as counsel. I'm going to ask that the witnesses
18 stay on video and testify as a group.

19 First -- first ask the witnesses, how would
20 you like me to address you during this hearing?

21 MR. RECTOR: Thank you, Your Honor. My
22 pronouns are he/him. You can address me as Mr. Rector.

23 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.

24 And for PacifiCorp, how would you like me to
25 address you in this hearing?

1 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And,
2 Ms. Ghosh, would you please say and spell your name for
3 the record.

4 MS. GHOSH: Yes. My name is Rohini Ghosh,
5 first name Rohini, R-o-h-i-n-i, last name Ghosh,
6 G-h-o-s-h.

7 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you both.

8 Now, Mr. Callaghan and Mr. Rogala, you can
9 turn off your video unless you need to be heard. Thank
10 you.

11 So, Mr. Rector, Ms. Ghosh, I want to ask a
12 little bit about the preclearance requirement in
13 paragraph 8 of the settlement agreement.

14 Please tell me about the preclearance
15 requirement process and how that is going to be in the
16 public interest.

17 And first, let's -- if I could hear from
18 Mr. Rector and then Ms. Ghosh.

19 MR. RECTOR: Sure. The preclearance
20 requirement requires the Company to file -- refile their
21 CEIP using the P02-SCGHG portfolio within seven business
22 days before the -- the end of the period as stated in
23 the order. And then Staff and all of the other parties
24 will have five business days to review that filing.

25 Yes. So that will sort of be the process of

Page 100

1 the review, and Staff will certainly look through the
 2 road map, the explanation, the work papers as well as
 3 the refiled CEIP itself -- excuse me -- in that -- in
 4 that time period to -- yeah.
 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 6 Let me turn to Ms. Ghosh.
 7 MS. GHOSH: Thank you, Your Honor. I agree
 8 with everything Mr. Rector just said. I think from our
 9 side, the Company plans to prepare a revised CEIP in
 10 line with all of the settlement agreements we've talked
 11 about. So including the P02-SCGHG portfolio as well as
 12 the additional detail and road maps. And all of that
 13 material in its entirety would be supplied to Staff and
 14 parties those seven business days before the official
 15 filing period.
 16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. I do want to
 17 ask about that time period.
 18 The agreement says the parties will have
 19 five business days to determine whether the draft
 20 revised CEIP is consistent with this agreement, with the
 21 settlement agreement.
 22 Will you please identify for me the elements
 23 of the settlement that the draft revised CEIP must
 24 include in order to be consistent with the agreement?
 25 MS. GHOSH: Sure. To my understanding, the

Page 101

1 revised CEIP must include, first and foremost, the
 2 P02-SCGHG portfolio as the basis for all analysis and
 3 compliance assessment within the CEIP. So that means
 4 that we will only present results from the P02-SCGHG
 5 portfolio, and any additional resources that need to be
 6 added to this portfolio for compliance against our 2030
 7 or 2045 requirements to supply Washington retail sales
 8 with a -- either carbon neutral or completely
 9 nonemitting source of energy generation, any resources
 10 that need to be added for that purpose would be added to
 11 the P02-SCGHG Washington allocated portfolio.
 12 And so that additional portfolio, which then
 13 we might call P02-SCGHG CETA, would be still based on
 14 P02-SCGHG, and so both portfolios would be filed, one as
 15 the alternative, lowest reasonable cost portfolio, and
 16 one as the CEIP preferred portfolio.
 17 Additional to just the -- the revised
 18 portfolio analysis based on those stated portfolios, we
 19 would also include additional detail of just how the
 20 P02-SCGHG portfolio was created. That includes more
 21 detail around the Plexus modeling software, how the
 22 social cost of greenhouse gas is added as a dispatch
 23 cost adder to all emitting resources as also reflected
 24 in market prices, and then also additional detail to
 25 how -- once that optimal portfolio is formed, how we

Page 102

1 then get a Washington allocated view and more discussion
 2 around Washington allocated resources only, less so on
 3 the system as a whole.
 4 And additionally, similar detailed
 5 explanation and road map to how we got to P02-MM-CETA,
 6 which was the originally filed 21-IRP preferred
 7 portfolio and CEIP portfolio.
 8 I believe that that captures all of the main
 9 ingredients that would be in the refile. Of course,
 10 that also flows into a redone incremental cost section
 11 based on those portfolios I mentioned. And Mr. Rector
 12 can point out anything if I've missed something.
 13 MR. RECTOR: No, I don't believe that I have
 14 anything to add there.
 15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So thank you both.
 16 And thank you, Ms. Ghosh.
 17 So I'm looking at the -- the settlement
 18 agreement. And what I believe I heard from you is that
 19 the elements that have to be included, those are the
 20 things that are spelled out in paragraph 5. It says
 21 PacifiCorp will use the P02-SCGHG portfolio as the
 22 basis.
 23 It goes on to explain, then, that you
 24 will -- the preferred portfolio, that will include all
 25 Washington allocated resources.

Page 103

1 So that paragraph, that's the one that
 2 identifies the elements that will determine whether it's
 3 consistent with the agreement; is that correct?
 4 MS. GHOSH: Yes, Your Honor. That's
 5 consistent with my understanding.
 6 MR. RECTOR: Yeah.
 7 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Rector, sorry?
 8 MR. RECTOR: Yes, I agree.
 9 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 10 So my next question is to follow up.
 11 Mr. Rector, could -- and also Ms. Ghosh,
 12 could PacifiCorp submit the same CEIP and be consistent
 13 with the agreement? Does something have to be
 14 different?
 15 MR. RECTOR: The portion that would have to
 16 be different would be the filing using the P02-SCGHG
 17 portfolio. That would -- that would be the significant
 18 difference there.
 19 MS. GHOSH: Yes, Your Honor. Exactly what
 20 Mr. Rector just said. From our point of view, filing
 21 with the P02-SCGHG portfolio as the base portfolio is
 22 different than what we did in the original filing,
 23 though the modeling outcomes for the Washington
 24 allocated portfolio will look the same for the capacity
 25 decisions.

Page 104

1 However, because we will be running the
2 systems operation piece under the social cost of
3 greenhouse gases rather than expected price conditions,
4 this will result in different calculations of our
5 renewable and nonemitting energy targets.
6 And so all of these are elements in
7 Chapter 1 of the CEIP, which will be updated to reflect
8 the new portfolio for the basis of the CEIP as well as
9 the incremental cost section.
10 So in short, yes, we will file something
11 different. We would not be able to file the exact same
12 CEIP in -- pursuant to the settlement agreement.
13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
14 So Mr. Rogala accurately stated that these
15 issues are quite complex. And I want to make sure I
16 understand a little bit more about what model is already
17 included, just so I understand the mechanics. I want to
18 ask about the model used versus what will be refiled as
19 the draft revised CEIP.
20 Is the current version of the P02-SCGHG
21 portfolio already included in the P02-MM-CETA portfolio
22 or is that something new that has to be created?
23 MS. GHOSH: Thank you for that question,
24 Your Honor. I will preempt this with it's -- I will try
25 to answer this fully and succinctly so that it's not

Page 105

1 confusing because this is a lot of material.
2 So the short answer is the P02-SCGHG
3 portfolio is already created. It was run as a set of --
4 within the set of portfolios we developed during the
5 process of the 2021 integrated resource plan at
6 PacifiCorp. The social cost of greenhouse gas dispatch
7 cost adder was added in several different portfolios in
8 different ways, but I will just focus on P02-SCGHG as
9 the topic.
10 And so that portfolio was run and it exists
11 and so that is not new. Those work papers were also
12 filed as part of the CEIP filing.
13 The way in which it informs P02-MM-CETA is
14 that there were essentially two portfolios that were
15 feeding into the final resource selection for
16 P02-MM-CETA.
17 So P02-MM was identified as a top performing
18 portfolio amongst the range of portfolios we ran for
19 system performance. But P02-SCGHG was specifically
20 analyzed for Washington allocated resources.
21 And so both portfolios were actually
22 assessed against CETA clean energy targets, specifically
23 the 2026 requirement that coal fuelled resources are out
24 of Washington customer rates, the '23 requirement that
25 Washington retail sales are supplied by carbon neutral

Page 106

1 generation, and the 2045 target that Washington retail
2 sales are 100 percent supplied by nonemitting
3 generation.
4 And it was found that neither portfolio was
5 actually fully compliant in 2030. There was a bit of a
6 shortfall where we were not meeting 80 to 100 percent of
7 Washington retail sales with nonemitting resources.
8 But what we did was we looked at those
9 outcomes that were optimally generated under the social
10 cost of greenhouse gases and immediately found that in
11 the action plan window and in the first ten years that
12 higher energy efficiency selections were a result
13 because those energy efficiency bundles were relatively
14 cost effective and offset highly impactful emitting
15 generation. And so that was brought into the final
16 portfolio.
17 There were no other resources over the
18 20-year horizon of that social cost of greenhouse gas
19 portfolio allocated to Washington that we had that had a
20 meaningful impact in terms of allocating more renewable
21 or nonemitting generation to Washington. So whatever we
22 found that was optimal was brought into the final
23 portfolio.
24 And it was called P02-MM-CETA for that
25 reason because it was assessed to be compliant against

Page 107

1 targets, and the Washington allocated resources were
2 optimized under social cost of greenhouse gases.
3 And so that final resulting portfolio was
4 the result of analysis in both prior price policies.
5 And the final portfolio was run under expected price
6 conditions, which is MM, which is medium -- gas medium
7 carbon price.
8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
9 So I have a few final questions just for
10 Staff. So, Mr. Rector, the settling parties agree that
11 the P02-SCGHG portfolio complies with the minimum
12 requirements and statute and rule. This is the part
13 that's in Staff's motion and the requirements of
14 Order 01.
15 What is -- what is Staff getting out of this
16 settlement agreement? Is it only the explanation of how
17 the P02-SCGHG portfolio is included in the P02-MM-CETA
18 portfolio?
19 MR. RECTOR: Excuse me. That is a big part
20 of what Staff is getting, but also, the use of the -- of
21 the -- excuse me -- P02-SCGHG, as Ms. Ghosh, I think,
22 just sort of mentioned as being the -- the portfolio
23 upon which the CEIP is based.
24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I see
25 Mr. Callaghan's video is on.

1 Mr. Callaghan, do you need to be recognized?
2 MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor. Sorry. I
3 was just turning on my video in case things steered in a
4 more legal direction. But I -- Mr. Rector answered the
5 question. So I'm fine.

6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Mr. Rector, I do
7 have another question for you that is very similar to
8 what I asked of Mr. Callaghan, and it's about Staff's
9 primary motivation.

10 Is Staff's primary motivation to get the
11 CEIP docket moving forward?

12 MR. RECTOR: Yes. As I believe
13 Mr. Callaghan and also Mr. Rogala have noted, it has
14 been a little over a year now since the CEIP has or was
15 filed with the Commission. So we look -- we would like
16 to move on to that docket. It's -- yes. That's -- that
17 is something that's important to the -- to Staff. So...

18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. In your testimony,
19 Mr. Rector, you doubted whether the social cost of
20 greenhouse gases was included in PacifiCorp's CEIP. I'm
21 curious if you are now -- are you now convinced that it
22 is included?

23 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, could I jump
24 in for a second?

25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead, Mr. Callaghan.

1 For one, it -- it does get us to a place of
2 compliance with the rule and law and order. And it does
3 so in a way that is voluntary and, again, doesn't
4 require penalties or anything.

5 And, again, also, it does help mitigate the
6 risk of litigation and continuing into, you know,
7 continuing to litigate in this particular docket.

8 But, again, it also -- it also is in the
9 public interest because, as mentioned, the CEIP docket
10 is a year old now, and the Staff is -- is definitely
11 interested in moving on to that docket and the
12 discussions involved in it as well.

13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Let
14 me -- let me ask counsel.

15 Mr. Callaghan, Mr. Rogala, and other
16 counsel, let me turn to you. Is there -- let me offer
17 an opportunity for you to ask questions of the
18 witnesses, if you have any.

19 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I
20 have no further questions for the witnesses.

21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And, Mr. Rogala?

22 MR. ROGALA: No further questions, Your
23 Honor.

24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I do not have any
25 more questions. So, Mr. Rector and Ms. Ghosh, thank you

1 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. So
2 my concern here is that what's being presented in front
3 of the Commission today is, in part, an agreement. And
4 there are -- during settlement negotiations, there are
5 things that are discussed and are brought up that are
6 confidential. And Staff's motivation for reaching this
7 compromised position has to do with things ranging from
8 the content of the agreement to an assessment of
9 litigation risk and all kinds of considerations related
10 to the evidence that might have been presented at an
11 evidentiary hearing.

12 And so I'm just concerned that this is
13 straying into an area that might inadvertently lead to
14 confidential information being discussed.

15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. I understand.

16 Let me -- let me ask you, Mr. Rector, in a
17 little bit different way.

18 Please explain from your perspective and
19 not -- be aware. I have read the testimony that's been
20 filed in this docket -- why you think that the granting
21 the motion to withdraw, accepting the settlement
22 agreement is in the public interest, why that's the
23 right thing to be doing at this point.

24 MR. RECTOR: It is in the public interest
25 for a few reasons.

1 very much for your testimony. You are ex -- excuse me.
2 You are excused. Appreciate your testimony.

3 Let me now ask for Public Counsel witness
4 Chase to please appear on video to testify.

5 And, Ms. Paisner, if you could also please
6 turn on your video.

7 So first, for Public Counsel's witness, how
8 would you like me to address you during this hearing?

9 MS. CHASE: Good morning. Thank you, Judge
10 O'Connell. My name is Stephanie Chase. I use she/her
11 pronouns, and you may address me as Ms. Chase.

12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Okay. I will
13 swear you in and then we will move forward.

14 (Stephanie Chase sworn.)

15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.

16 Ms. Paisner, want to recognize you to please
17 introduce your witness.

18 MS. PAISNER: Thank you.

19
20 EXAMINATION

21 BY MS. PAISNER:

22 Q. Good morning, Ms. Chase.

23 A. Good morning.

24 Q. Please state and spell your name.

25 A. My name is Stephanie Chase. Stephanie is

Page 112

1 spelled S-t-e-p-h-a-n-i-e. Chase is spelled C-h-a-s-e.
 2 **Q. What is your place of employment?**
 3 A. I'm a regulatory analyst for the Public Counsel
 4 Unit of the Washington State Attorney General's Office.
 5 **Q. Did you file testimony and any exhibits in this**
 6 **docket on behalf of Public Counsel?**
 7 A. Yes, I filed testimony in this docket.
 8 **Q. Was your testimony prepared by you or under your**
 9 **instruction and supervision?**
 10 A. It was.
 11 **Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony?**
 12 A. I have one update to make. On page 14, we -- I
 13 addressed the number of violations, and that was based
 14 on a hearing date of January 19, which would result in
 15 1,930 violations. I would update that today, as our
 16 hearing is seven days later, to a total of 1,965
 17 violations.
 18 **Q. Thank you.**
 19 MS. PAISNER: Your Honor, Ms. Chase is ready
 20 for questioning.
 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 22 Well, I want to hear more from you about the
 23 harm to this CEIP process if the Commission were to
 24 grant Staff's motion to withdraw.
 25 In your testimony, page 13, line 18 through

Page 113

1 14, line 6, you describe how serious or harmful the
 2 alleged allegation is to the public, and you speak to
 3 the potential that an incorrect accounting of the social
 4 cost of greenhouse gases could lead to selecting
 5 different resources and an incorrect incremental cost
 6 calculation.
 7 Will you please elaborate?
 8 MS. CHASE: Sure. The -- as -- as you heard
 9 from the witnesses from PacifiCorp, the difference is
 10 in -- the resource selections in this particular CEIP
 11 were not great.
 12 But our concern is for compliance going
 13 forward. We would like all the utilities to follow the
 14 rules as they are written and comply with the
 15 requirements.
 16 In other years, there may be larger
 17 differences if they don't account for the social cost of
 18 greenhouse gas in the way that they are supposed to or
 19 sort of in the band of ways that they are supposed to
 20 and clearly explain that.
 21 Then -- then we believe that that can result
 22 in different resource selections and impact Washington's
 23 climate goals in a negative way.
 24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: So is your point that this
 25 would send a bad signal? If not be a bad precedent, but

Page 114

1 a bad signal?
 2 MS. CHASE: Yes. It would send a signal to
 3 utilities that they don't have to be particularly
 4 cleaner in writing their documents and providing their
 5 explanations to Staff and other parties. And we would
 6 like to see -- you know, see this succeed, and we
 7 believe that it's important to enforce -- to require
 8 compliance with the law.
 9 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I'm being conscious
 10 of the fact that I am not try -- I'm not asking for
 11 confidential information or negotiation discussions to
 12 be disclosed here.
 13 But thinking about whether -- whether there
 14 is an incorrect accounting of the social cost of
 15 greenhouse gases, do you see an incorrect accounting
 16 here?
 17 MS. CHASE: What we have in the record is
 18 unclear. And certainly, the explanation that was
 19 provided by Ms. Ghosh a few minutes ago is helpful
 20 information to have on the record.
 21 But, again, Public Counsel's concern is that
 22 we don't have a filing, either in this docket or in this
 23 CEIP docket, that clearly explains how the Company
 24 accounts for the social cost of greenhouse gas.
 25 Although, they know how they have done it, it has not

Page 115

1 been clearly explained on the record or in conjunction
 2 with the filing of the settlement agreement and motion
 3 to withdraw.
 4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I want to follow up on
 5 that because I did hear Ms. Ghosh give quite a bit of
 6 explanation. And you, having heard that testimony
 7 today, do you have any more or new thoughts stemming
 8 from what you've heard today?
 9 MS. CHASE: I guess primarily a question as
 10 to why that explanation has not been provided on the
 11 record.
 12 I do not, you know, doubt Ms. Ghosh's
 13 capacity and -- and excellence at providing this
 14 information. I am just curious as to why the Company
 15 has not provided it on the record thus far.
 16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, I asked both Staff
 17 witness and PacifiCorp's witness, and so I will ask you
 18 and offer you that same opportunity to explain why you
 19 think granting the motion is not the right thing to do,
 20 not in the public interest.
 21 MS. CHASE: In this case, we believe --
 22 Public Counsel believes that the Company has not
 23 demonstrated compliance with the requirements of CETA
 24 and the Commission's prior order. We believe that it's
 25 not in the public interest to allow the motion to

Page 116

1 withdraw to go forward and the settlement agreement to
 2 go into effect without evidence on the record in support
 3 of what the Company is actually doing.
 4 As we -- as I stated in my testimony, they
 5 have in the settlement agreement a plan to comply, but
 6 that's not actually compliance. Public Counsel believes
 7 that it would be in the public interest to provide that
 8 evidence, that demonstration of compliance, in order to
 9 assure the public and stakeholders that the Company is
 10 following the rules and -- and statutory requirements of
 11 CETA.
 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Those
 13 are all of my questions.
 14 Turning now to counsel to offer an
 15 opportunity to ask any questions.
 16 MS. PAISNER: I have one question.
 17 Ms. Chase, are you aware of any reason or
 18 anything in the record that explains why PacifiCorp has
 19 waited this long to revise its CEIP that it filed on
 20 December 30, 2021?
 21 MS. CHASE: I'm not aware of anything, any
 22 explanation.
 23 MS. PAISNER: Thank you.
 24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 25 Ms. Chase, thank you for your testimony

Page 117

1 today. I don't have any more questions. You are
 2 excused.
 3 MS. CHASE: Thank you.
 4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you very much.
 5 Okay. I want to take a breath and then hear
 6 from counsel for the parties with any closing statements
 7 or closing arguments that they want to present.
 8 I'll turn to Public Counsel last.
 9 First, let me recognize Staff and then
 10 PacifiCorp and any other of the settling parties who
 11 would like to be heard, and then we'll turn to Public
 12 Counsel.
 13 So first, let me recognize Staff.
 14 Mr. Callaghan?
 15 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I
 16 don't have any additional comments or thoughts to
 17 provide, other than what I've stated in my opening
 18 statement.
 19 We've had a robust discussion today. I
 20 think we've covered all of the issues, and I urge the
 21 Commission to approve the motion.
 22 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. We have heard a lot
 23 from witnesses. So I -- that is why I am affording this
 24 opportunity. So that if counsel has any additional
 25 thoughts, that you could provide it. So thank you,

Page 118

1 Mr. Callaghan.
 2 Mr. Rogala, from PacifiCorp, any closing
 3 thoughts?
 4 MR. ROGALA: Yeah. Three quick points, Your
 5 Honor.
 6 First, it's a lot of legal argument here
 7 today. I think the authorities were cited. So we can
 8 use the hearing transcript to the extent there's
 9 questions on, you know, clarifying positions here.
 10 But, of course, if you want legal briefing
 11 on any of these issues, we're happy to provide further
 12 argument, if you'd like. We stand ready to provide
 13 briefs if you order any.
 14 Second, you know, just want to zoom out.
 15 Why are we here today? You know, we're here today to
 16 get the thumbs up or a thumbs down on whether the
 17 Commission should permit Staff to withdraw its
 18 complaint. And in that scope, I think, it's a simple
 19 decision. Because when Staff has asked to withdraw its
 20 complaint, withdraw its adjudicatory proceeding, then by
 21 definition, you know, there can't be a decision on the
 22 merits.
 23 And if that's the scope, then, you know, in
 24 broad discretion to decide whether to do that or not,
 25 and given those range of examples that we talked about

Page 119

1 earlier, we think the discretion falls on the side of
 2 approving the Staff's motion because they're taking the
 3 proceeding out and not allowing for a decision on the
 4 merits.
 5 But this isn't, you know, hiding the ball.
 6 This goes to my third point. This allows us to do the
 7 hard work, which is continue the CEIP docket with a
 8 refile and revised CEIP, where we can, you know, keep
 9 working through where I'm sure there'll be disputed
 10 issues and get an acknowledged CEIP. So that can then
 11 inform future RFPs for nonemitting and renewable
 12 resources, which can then help further reduce our
 13 emissions across our six-state service territory.
 14 That's the important stuff. We don't want
 15 to minimize at all that this is a complex and nuance
 16 issue. But we think the appropriate place to resolve
 17 that is in the CEIP docket and with continuing
 18 discussions with Staff and the Commission.
 19 So we just want to thank everyone.
 20 Available for any questions or comments, and yeah.
 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 22 Let me turn to representatives from AWEC,
 23 Sierra Club, NWECC. If there is anything that you would
 24 like to add after hearing everything this morning, I
 25 would invite you, optionally, to make any final

Page 120

1 comments.
 2 Okay. Hearing nothing, I am going to turn
 3 now to Public Counsel.
 4 Ms. Paisner, if there's anything else that
 5 you would like to add, concluding thoughts, please, go
 6 ahead.
 7 MS. PAISNER: Thank you, Your Honor.
 8 Earlier today PacifiCorp used the expression sitting on
 9 their hands, and that is the reason we are here today.
 10 We are here today because of PacifiCorp's delay and
 11 PacifiCorp's failure to cooperate with UTC Staff and
 12 comply with the law on SCGHG and PacifiCorp's failure to
 13 file a timely revision to that CEIP.
 14 The Commission's enforcement policy
 15 considers whether the Company promptly corrects
 16 violations and remedies impacts, and it has been over a
 17 year during which PacifiCorp, to use its own words, has
 18 sat on its hands and failed to correct and clarify the
 19 record on inclusion of SCGHG and its CEIP.
 20 PacifiCorp must provide a CEIP that complies
 21 with CETA, the Commission's implementing regulations,
 22 and the Commission's Order O1 in Docket UE-210829.
 23 Without evidence in the record, provided
 24 with the settlement agreement to withdraw the complaint,
 25 and to the contrary, with ample evidence supporting

Page 121

1 penalties for violations, the public interest requires
 2 the Commission to reject the settlement and deny the
 3 motion.
 4 The Commission must hold PacifiCorp to the
 5 law. Completing this adjudication could happen quickly,
 6 and the Commission should require PacifiCorp to follow
 7 through with this because this proceeding still exists
 8 entirely due to PacifiCorp's own delay.
 9 Public Counsel asks that the Commission
 10 require PacifiCorp's compliance with the SCGHG
 11 requirements on the record before allowing withdrawal of
 12 the UTC Staff complaint. Thank you.
 13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Okay. Thank you
 14 all for your efforts today, counsel and witnesses, and
 15 in preparation of today. I want to address expectations
 16 for when I will issue an order.
 17 We typically receive our transcripts from
 18 the hearing in about a week. I intend to issue an order
 19 soon after receiving that transcript for reference
 20 purposes.
 21 Is there -- let me request that counsel turn
 22 on their videos here at the end. I'd like to ask
 23 counsel, is there anything else we should address before
 24 we adjourn today?
 25 MR. CALLAGHAN: I don't believe so, Your

Page 122

1 Honor.
 2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Hearing nothing,
 3 again, I want to thank you.
 4 Oh, Mr. Rogala?
 5 MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, it's just a small
 6 thing. It struck me when I was listening to Public
 7 Counsel.
 8 In the hypothetical that Staff's motion is
 9 denied, you know, it's our position that the proceeding
 10 would continue along the normal contested case schedule.
 11 We would have, you know, the rights for response
 12 testimony to Staff's testimony. Interveners could file
 13 response testimony, and then there would be the
 14 potentially cross-intervener response testimony and
 15 Staff reply testimony as well. And then an evidentiary
 16 hearing after, you know, all that procedural schedule.
 17 I think that's assumed and given, but I just
 18 want to make sure that that's -- would be our
 19 understanding of the case. But nothing beyond that.
 20 JUDGE O'CONNELL: That is also my
 21 understanding.
 22 Is there -- I don't know if there could be a
 23 different understanding, but if there is, I can assure
 24 the parties that, in the event the motion is denied, we
 25 will have to reestablish a new schedule. And at that

Page 123

1 point, we will be discussing what that new schedule will
 2 look like and what procedural needs there are.
 3 So, Mr. Rogala, what I guess I'm trying to
 4 say is that I don't think we need to discuss that in
 5 detail now because in the event it is denied, then we
 6 would have to set a new schedule. And we would address
 7 those issues then. Okay.
 8 MS. PAISNER: Your Honor, may I just -- I
 9 apologize. May I just add one more thing?
 10 PacifiCorp -- our understanding is that
 11 PacifiCorp may file a revision to its CEIP at any time.
 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. That
 13 was my understanding from your presentation today. And
 14 so yep, I got that.
 15 Okay. Before we sign off, before we
 16 adjourn, anything else we should address?
 17 Okay. I'm hearing nothing, but it is a
 18 video hearing, a virtual hearing. I just want to take a
 19 breath to allow that opportunity to hit the unmute
 20 button.
 21 Okay. Hearing nothing, we are adjourned.
 22 Thank you all. We are off the record.
 23 (Adjourned at 11:47 a.m.)
 24
 25

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF WASHINGTON
COUNTY OF THURSTON

I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
certify that the foregoing transcript is true and
accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.



Tayler Garlinghouse
Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358

A				
A-n-d-r-e-w 98:25	90:7 97:20,22,25	62:16 63:15,21	107:1	appropriate 75:23
a.m 44:16 48:2,8	98:2 111:8,11	64:2 65:23 66:23	allocating 106:20	76:3 77:25 119:16
96:20 97:2,11,11	121:15,23 123:6	67:16,24 68:7,22	allow 78:7 83:21	approval 57:14
97:15 123:23	123:16	69:1 70:19 71:6	88:11 115:25	71:5 88:3
ability 124:9	addressed 50:1	72:7 74:19 76:15	123:19	approve 56:3 85:18
able 55:23 56:25	67:16 76:7 112:13	76:16,22 78:19,19	allowing 119:3	91:2 117:21
64:20 65:6 95:6	addressing 74:5	78:23 79:1,4,9	121:11	approved 95:25
104:11	82:24	80:6,7 81:2,4,5,7	allows 119:6	approving 119:2
abuse 87:23	adequate 91:7	81:14,17,18,22	alternative 101:15	approximately
accepting 109:21	adequately 59:10	82:13,22,23,25	ambitious 55:9	48:7
account 74:21	adjourn 121:24	83:1,2,4,8,13,17	amicably 55:24	April 93:10
113:17	123:16	84:1,6,10 85:2,4	amount 65:25	arbitrary 69:24
accounted 74:20	adjourned 123:21	86:13,17,20 87:3	ample 54:20 56:17	87:23
accounting 113:3	123:23	87:13 88:16 90:16	57:4 84:25 120:25	area 109:13
114:14,15	adjudication 61:19	90:23 91:11,11,19	analysis 101:2,18	argue 79:1
accounts 114:24	95:16 96:8 121:5	93:1 94:6 95:24	107:4	argues 52:25 53:3,7
accrual 74:9	adjudicative 68:19	99:13 100:18,20	analyst 49:24 112:3	arguing 74:3 94:24
accurate 124:9	adjudicatory 68:24	100:21,24 102:18	analyzed 105:20	argument 53:11
accurately 104:14	69:11,16 73:7	103:3,13 104:12	Andrew 44:13 45:3	54:11 71:3 73:21
achieved 67:4	118:20	107:16 109:3,8,22	46:13 47:2 48:9	85:11 86:19 94:6
achieves 57:15	administrative	115:2 116:1,5	49:9 98:7,13,24	118:6,12
acknowledged	44:13 45:2 48:10	120:24	ands 60:4	arguments 56:17
119:10	67:15,20 70:24	agreement's 67:19	Ann 45:16 49:21	117:7
acknowledgment	71:17,20 74:17	67:22	ann.paisner@atg...	asked 65:19 75:18
78:2	82:24 95:4,7	agreements 53:25	45:19	108:8 115:16
action 59:24 69:17	advice 72:24	59:15,16 91:13,22	answer 57:5 71:10	118:19
70:2 72:23,23	affording 117:23	94:10 100:10	90:17 91:20	asking 53:19 54:7
73:12 77:16 87:21	AGC 58:18	ahead 57:11 58:13	104:25 105:2	65:12,14 74:15
94:18 96:7,12	agency 69:17 70:2	58:14 64:5 90:2	answered 108:4	75:10 81:5,21
106:11	72:23,23 73:12	98:16 108:25	answers 51:25	82:13 83:9,10,15
actions 70:1	77:16 87:21 96:7	120:6	anticipate 72:5	87:10 94:22
add 51:25 72:19	96:12	aligns 85:2	73:14	114:10
77:14 80:3 102:14	agency's 69:25	allegation 113:2	anymore 93:14	asks 121:9
119:24 120:5	ago 58:18 114:19	allegations 65:13	APA 68:18 69:18	aspect 57:23 63:4
123:9	agree 55:16 78:14	67:18 71:21 74:24	69:22 87:22	ASR-1T 61:11
added 101:6,10,10	79:14 80:2 81:1	75:12,17,22	apologize 50:7	assess 53:4,21 75:8
101:22 105:7	82:8 100:7 103:8	alleged 58:25 59:4	70:12 123:9	93:13 94:22
adder 101:23 105:7	107:10	59:25 73:23 75:24	appear 111:4	assessed 105:22
addition 59:22	agreed 72:13 88:9	113:2	appearances 49:2	106:25
additional 100:12	agreeing 72:11	alleges 60:13	appearing 50:21	assessing 86:4
101:5,12,17,19,24	agreement 48:19	alleging 48:14 76:1	97:16	90:13,15
117:16,24	48:24 49:1 51:4	93:2	application 89:7	assessment 87:6
additionally 102:4	51:10 53:2,11,12	Alliance 50:3,6	apply 91:14 94:10	101:3 109:8
address 49:3,5 50:8	54:2,5,17 55:23	allocated 101:11	appreciate 64:3	assistant 49:8,21
67:8 78:7 83:21	57:15 58:20 59:13	102:1,2,25 103:24	86:1 89:23 111:2	associated 58:23
	59:19 60:1 61:17	105:20 106:19	approach 63:14	60:18 86:13

<p>assumed 122:17 assure 67:3 116:9 122:23 assured 78:8 attached 59:20 70:19 attempt 79:9 attempted 63:20 attempting 93:19 93:19 attention 94:17 attorney 45:6,17 48:22 49:8,21,23 112:4 authorities 73:24 80:8 118:7 authority 69:25 96:14 available 73:5 119:20 Avenue 44:22 45:18,23 aware 79:23 109:19 116:17,21 AWEC 46:7 51:6 57:9 58:8 119:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>back 64:7 72:20 73:25 74:23 76:4 78:11 79:11,19 81:10,10,16 82:5 82:9 83:6,9 85:12 90:3 91:4 92:10 95:22 97:2,13,14 bad 89:3,4 113:25 113:25 114:1 balances 84:21 ball 119:5 band 113:19 bare 92:6 base 103:21 based 56:15 63:25 69:5 75:9 86:23 87:2 88:3 101:13 101:18 102:11</p>	<p>107:23 112:13 basis 54:16 61:2 65:8,22 79:7 83:5 91:2,12 94:15 95:20,21 101:2 102:22 104:8 because's 73:2 behalf 49:10 50:6 50:12,14,19 112:6 believe 57:15 64:18 65:8 76:17,21 78:22 90:18 91:8 91:9 95:23 97:5 102:8,13,18 108:12 113:21 114:7 115:21,24 121:25 believes 58:4 77:20 79:8 115:22 116:6 beneficial 65:5 benefit 51:22 62:9 84:14</p> <hr/> <p>benefits 62:13 best 66:14 124:9 beyond 86:9 90:13 91:21 122:19 big 107:19 bit 58:18 62:12,16 71:12 99:12 104:16 106:5 109:17 115:5 blurry 70:9 bounds 87:5,25 Box 45:7 brackets 89:19 Brad 50:13 bread 88:1 break 85:15,22 97:1,2,7,10,14 breath 117:5 123:19 brief 55:3 57:13 74:3 briefing 118:10 briefs 118:13 bring 66:5 76:4,4</p>	<p>76:20 77:8,23 78:4 79:11 82:5 bringing 74:14 76:12 77:3 83:5 brings 67:1 broad 69:22 70:1 118:24 brought 52:20 75:19,22 76:8 80:17,21 81:16 82:9 89:2 90:9 96:5 106:15,22 109:5 Buell 44:21 bundles 106:13 burden 84:13,15 business 99:21,24 100:14,19 butter 88:2 button 123:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>C 45:1 46:1 48:4 124:1,1 C-h-a-s-e 112:1 calculation 113:6 calculations 60:22 104:4 California 46:4 call 101:13 Callaghan 45:6 49:7,8 52:15,17 56:10 64:8,13 65:18 66:22 67:10 67:23 71:25 74:25 75:21 76:14,17 78:21 80:2,16 81:3 82:11 83:3 83:25 86:11 98:9 98:11,12 99:8 108:1,2,8,13,23 108:25 109:1 110:15,19 117:14 117:15 118:1 121:25 Callaghan's 107:25</p>	<p>called 106:24 camera 52:14 62:2 64:5,7 90:5 cameras 50:24 CAP 60:15 capacity 103:24 115:13 capricious 69:24 87:23 captures 102:8 carbon 63:17 74:20 101:8 105:25 107:7 case 50:14 53:14 55:20 57:2 65:13 67:7 82:22 84:7 87:10 89:3,7,16 108:3 115:21 122:10,19 cases 88:23 cause 64:24 CCR 44:20 124:15 Cebulko 50:13 CEIP 54:8,19 56:2 57:17 58:6 59:3 60:4 61:6 62:9,9 62:21 64:10,24 65:3,7 66:10,12 66:23 67:1 71:19 72:12,25 73:1,15 73:22,25 74:1,18 75:1,2,3,4,8,9 76:8 77:4,9,21 78:1,24 81:24 84:4,17,20 85:10 85:12,13 92:14,17 93:6,17 94:15 99:21 100:3,9,20 100:23 101:1,3,16 102:7 103:12 104:7,8,12,19 105:12 107:23 108:11,14,20 110:9 112:23 113:10 114:23 116:19 119:7,8,10</p>	<p>119:17 120:13,19 120:20 123:11 CEIPs 60:24 certain 51:21 certainly 100:1 114:18 Certified 124:6 certify 124:8 CETA 55:8 59:5,6 60:14,17,20,24 92:22,23 93:4,16 93:20,24 94:3,13 101:13 105:22 115:23 116:11 120:21 chance 66:19 changed 65:15 changes 112:11 Chapter 60:11 91:6 104:7 characterized 58:18 Chase 46:14 47:8 49:24 111:4,9,10 111:11,14,22,25 112:1,19 113:8 114:2,17 115:9,21 116:17,21,25 117:3 checks 84:21 circumstance 89:9 circumstances 66:1 66:6 cite 69:17 cited 118:7 claim 72:25 73:3 77:19 85:9 claimed 77:16 claims 77:17 clarify 58:16 120:18 clarifying 118:9 clarity 94:21 claw 85:12 clawed 73:25 clean 55:18 59:3</p>
--	--	--	--	---

105:22 cleaner 114:4 clear 55:10 64:14 82:1 93:23,25 clearly 63:22 84:2 96:14 113:20 114:23 115:1 Cleve 46:8 client 72:24 climate 60:19,23 113:23 clock 73:23 74:2 85:9 close 69:10 94:16 closed 84:8 85:21 closes 85:19 closing 52:10 117:6 117:7 118:2 Club 46:2,3 50:10 50:12,14 51:6 57:9,14 58:3,21 73:17 92:11 119:23 coal 105:23 Coalition 45:22 50:17,19 58:22 colorable 73:21 85:9 come 74:12 81:10 81:10 82:5,12,17 82:21 84:11 90:3 97:2 coming 62:14 74:14 83:9 comment 57:10 comments 57:13 92:10 117:16 119:20 120:1 Commission 44:2,4 44:18 45:5 48:11 48:14,15,17 49:6 49:8,10 52:18 53:4,20,21 54:7 54:10 55:8,16,21 56:1,3 58:5 59:6,6 59:14 60:8,9,18	61:3,16 62:11 63:13 64:19 65:14 65:21,25 66:10 67:2 68:18 69:1,9 69:19,20,22 70:1 70:16 71:5,18 72:1,13 73:24 74:17,23 75:2,6,7 75:17,24 77:21 79:11 81:6,11,16 81:19 82:1,6 83:6 83:7,8,10,13 87:20 88:13,19,25 90:20 91:6 93:2,4 93:5,9,13 94:14 94:16 95:6 98:13 108:15 109:3 112:23 117:21 118:17 119:18 121:2,4,6,9 Commission's 53:24 56:12,24 60:14 61:7 68:22 69:15 70:20 74:6 75:3 77:22 86:10 87:6,8 90:15 91:1 91:13 92:23 94:3 94:14 115:24 120:14,21,22 compact 84:23 Company 44:8 45:12 53:5 55:4 55:16,17 74:8 75:8,25 76:6,25 77:17 79:2,5,17 82:1 83:4,11 89:5 89:15 99:20 100:9 114:23 115:14,22 116:3,9 120:15 Company's 55:6 73:23 76:21 89:10 comparison 62:11 competing 54:18 Complainant 44:5 complaint 48:13,18 48:20 52:19 54:3	56:14 58:24 59:9 59:25 60:2,8,10 60:13 61:4,7,14 61:18 65:2,11,13 65:16,19 66:5,14 66:20 67:18 68:1 68:6 69:9,10,21 71:16 75:12,14,14 75:23 76:5,9,12 76:16 77:3,4,8,23 78:2,4 84:7 85:5 85:17,23 86:25 87:4,11,21 88:15 88:16,18 89:18,18 93:2,9,22 94:1,8 95:23 96:14,15 118:18,20 120:24 121:12 completely 101:8 Completing 121:5 complex 55:20 56:4 56:22 57:20 62:24 80:4 88:12 104:15 119:15 complexity 63:2 compliance 56:23 63:20 67:1,3 76:21 80:9 93:24 101:3,6 110:2 113:12 114:8 115:23 116:6,8 121:10 compliant 54:10 75:3 79:3,8 106:5 106:25 complicated 56:8 66:8 complied 61:9 74:24 complies 78:15 93:1 107:11 120:20 comply 59:16 61:5 72:13 90:25 92:24 93:16,16,20 94:2 113:14 116:5	120:12 complying 95:23 compromise 66:2 compromised 109:7 computer 70:6 concern 74:14 109:2 113:12 114:21 concerned 94:17 109:12 concerning 96:3 concerns 48:13 54:18 conclude 53:20 54:7 concluding 120:5 conclusion 76:11 84:11 condition 81:6,15 81:17,22 82:14 conditioned 76:22 conditions 66:22 104:3 107:6 CONFERENCE 44:11 confidential 109:6 109:14 114:11 conflict 81:10,11 confusing 105:1 conjunction 115:1 conscious 114:9 consider 74:18 86:7 considerations 109:9 considered 53:11 63:10 96:9,12 considering 71:19 considers 120:15 consistent 64:18 75:11 79:9 81:2 83:12 87:1 100:20 100:24 103:3,5,12 consists 62:24 constitutional	87:24 constraints 80:13 consultant 50:14 Consumers 50:4,7 Cont 46:1 content 109:8 contested 55:20 57:2 67:25 122:10 continual 73:19 continue 53:3,25 65:7 87:7 119:7 122:10 continues 60:3 continuing 55:13 56:1,5 110:6,7 119:17 contradict 61:13 contradicts 60:23 contrary 59:11 60:1 120:25 controversy 82:5 convinced 108:21 convince 66:19 cooperate 120:11 correct 59:24 84:12 85:1 94:23 95:1 103:3 120:18 corrects 120:15 cost 55:17 57:16,19 57:25 59:2 60:22 62:18 63:10,17,22 64:16 74:20 93:17 101:15,22,23 102:10 104:2,9 105:6,7 106:10,14 106:18 107:2 108:19 113:4,5,17 114:14,24 counsel 45:15,17 48:21 49:14,19,22 49:25 50:21 51:7 51:17,18 52:2,8 52:23,25 53:2,7 53:19 58:12,22 59:8 61:22 64:6 68:13 71:14 73:10
---	---	--	---	---

73:16 74:3,13 80:20,23 85:5,17 89:25 90:4,12 96:18 97:17 98:9 110:14,16 111:3 112:3,6 115:22 116:6,14 117:6,8 117:12,24 120:3 121:9,14,21,23 122:7 Counsel's 52:6,23 53:10 54:1,11 58:14 92:7 111:7 114:21 counterproductive 77:7 COUNTY 124:4 couple 78:8 80:25 90:7 94:20 course 64:17 84:25 86:24 88:19 102:9 118:10 covered 117:20 create 57:2 created 101:20 104:22 105:3 creates 88:22 cross-intervener 122:14 culpability 89:14 curious 75:15 108:21 115:14 current 62:9 104:20 customer 105:24 CYA 71:1	decades 56:7 decarbonization 55:9 December 48:17,21 58:20,23 92:14,18 116:20 decide 118:24 decided 87:2 decision 56:12 57:2 61:3 68:19,19 69:15,16,17 70:14 72:21 73:2 77:16 77:18 87:22 88:3 89:6,6 91:2 118:19,21 119:3 decisions 69:23 86:14 91:7 103:25 deems 65:25 defer 71:23 73:10 definitely 110:10 definition 118:21 delay 54:19 64:24 77:9 92:20,20,21 92:21 120:10 121:8 delaying 77:4 demonstrated 115:23 demonstration 116:8 denied 53:1,6 122:9 122:24 123:5 deny 61:17 88:13 88:18 89:1 94:24 121:2 denying 89:10 describe 113:1 despite 53:23,24 60:3 detail 80:15 100:12 101:19,21,24 123:5 detailed 62:17 102:4 determination 62:6 68:2 70:22 72:2	75:7 83:10,16,18 87:2 determine 56:13 80:12 87:24 100:19 103:2 determines 68:20 developed 105:4 devoid 59:23 dial 92:10 difference 68:14 103:18 113:9 differences 113:17 different 58:17 60:22 62:24 69:7 83:24 84:5 103:14 103:16,22 104:4 104:11 105:7,8 109:17 113:5,22 122:23 differently 53:14 68:13 difficult 63:1 65:2 diligently 89:17 direct 52:3 63:11 78:20 directed 51:20 direction 108:4 directly 63:22 director 50:20 disagree 65:1 disagreement 81:8 81:12 disagreements 55:15 84:24 disagrees 54:13 disclosed 114:12 discovered 89:5 discovery 63:7 discretion 69:23 74:6 78:4 87:23 88:7 89:20 118:24 119:1 discretionary 74:7 discuss 123:4 discussed 85:8 109:5,14	discussing 123:1 discussion 56:5 63:8 73:15,19 90:6 92:15,20 95:3 102:1 117:19 discussions 63:9 84:25 88:12 92:11 92:12 95:15 110:12 114:11 119:18 dismiss 52:19 53:1 54:4,16,20 65:8 68:8 72:3 76:22 78:24 81:7,15,18 81:23 82:14 84:9 85:19 86:12,23,24 86:25 89:1 dismissal 76:3 dismissed 76:18 dispatch 101:22 105:6 dispute 55:20 disputed 89:12 119:9 distinction 70:3 72:21 Division 45:7 docket 44:4 48:12 52:22 54:14,19 56:2,6 59:7,22,23 60:13,15 61:12,12 61:18 64:11 65:3 71:19 72:12,25 73:1,15 74:18 75:2,8,20 76:8 77:5,9,10 78:1,2 81:24,25 82:8,9 82:23 83:23 88:10 93:6 94:15 95:13 96:2 108:11,16 109:20 110:7,9,11 112:6,7 114:22,23 119:7,17 120:22 documentation 59:17,20 68:25 documents 114:4	doing 60:19 69:19 70:17,19 73:25 88:11 109:23 116:3 doubt 115:12 doubted 108:19 draft 72:7 76:25 79:5 83:11,16 100:19,23 104:19 due 121:8 dynamic 88:23
E				
E 45:1,1 46:1,1 48:4,4 111:20 124:1,1 earlier 56:10 85:8 92:15 119:1 120:8 effect 83:2 116:2 effective 82:25 106:14 effectuate 74:1 efficiency 106:12 106:13 efficiently 53:17 effort 84:22 efforts 121:14 either 52:21 54:8 57:9 72:25 86:20 86:21 87:12,22 101:8 114:22 elaborate 66:19 113:7 element 82:23 elements 100:22 102:19 103:2 104:6 emissions 55:11,12 119:13 emitting 101:23 106:14 emphasize 92:19 employment 112:2 energy 45:22 50:3 50:6,17,19 55:18 58:21 59:3 101:9				

<p>104:5 105:22 106:12,13 enforce 83:7 114:7 enforcement 67:3 120:14 engage 63:1 engaged 95:14 entirely 121:8 entirety 79:20 100:13 Environmental 46:3 equitable 60:20 errata 93:10 essentially 53:19 82:10,18 86:8 105:14 establishes 94:12 evaluate 86:9 90:14 evaluation 86:6 event 72:3 95:9 122:24 123:5 evidence 53:8 54:12,20 57:4 59:23 68:25 69:5 69:6 91:9,10 109:10 116:2,8 120:23,25 evidentiary 94:15 109:11 122:15 ex 111:1 exact 84:4 86:15 104:11 exactly 55:16 103:19 EXAMINATION 47:1,2,5,8 example 55:24 56:20 77:20 88:24 89:2 examples 88:6 118:25 exceeded 87:25 excellence 115:13 exception 52:23 excited 55:7</p>	<p>excuse 100:3 107:19,21 111:1 excused 111:2 117:2 Exhibit 61:11 exhibits 94:11 112:5 existed 92:16 exists 105:10 121:7 expand 62:15 expect 51:2,9 96:22 expectations 121:15 expected 104:3 107:5 expert 49:15 56:24 explain 62:12 67:19,22 74:20 79:4 92:6 102:23 109:18 113:20 115:18 explained 115:1 explains 54:16 114:23 116:18 explanation 57:25 62:18,22 63:3,5 100:2 102:5 107:16 114:18 115:6,10 116:22 explanations 114:5 explicitly 79:13,20 exposed 85:23 exposure 73:21 85:16 expression 120:8 extends 74:9 extensive 63:8,8 extent 49:17 118:8 extremely 58:5 65:2 77:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <hr/> <p>F 124:1 face 62:21 fact 56:20 60:6 67:25 69:5 70:25</p>	<p>89:4,12 114:10 failed 120:18 failing 59:4 fails 92:2 failure 120:11,12 fair 66:1,6 67:6 faith 84:16,22 falls 119:1 far 96:22 115:15 fault 70:15,23 favoring 53:24 87:9 feeding 105:15 feels 69:23 felt 71:2 figure 70:9 file 57:25 74:1 85:2 85:5,13,17 93:9 99:20 104:10,11 112:5 120:13 122:12 123:11 filed 48:17,22 58:3 59:19 61:13 72:8 72:11 85:10 91:11 92:13,17 93:10 101:14 102:6 105:12 108:15 109:20 112:7 116:19 files 89:3 filing 57:16 74:22 75:9 76:16,21 93:8 99:24 100:15 103:16,20,22 105:12 114:22 115:2 filings 57:19 58:6 59:10,11 final 54:8 68:18 69:1,12 70:18 73:2,6 89:6 92:14 92:17 105:15 106:15,22 107:3,5 107:9 119:25 Finally 54:11 find 53:21 77:2</p>	<p>finding 53:8 56:15 57:5 70:25 findings 69:4 fine 108:5 first 52:25 53:10 54:25 56:22 59:12 65:17 67:21 71:23 80:4 86:19 91:15 92:10 94:21 97:19 97:19 98:11,25 99:5,17 101:1 106:11 111:7 117:9,13 118:6 five 99:24 100:19 fix 70:13 flexibility 80:11 floor 83:21 92:6 flows 102:10 focus 105:8 focusing 75:16 follow 62:5 66:17 76:13 90:8 103:10 113:13 115:4 121:6 follow-up 64:4 94:20 followed 81:19 following 116:10 footnote 71:4 forced 88:17 foreclosing 57:18 foregoing 124:8 foremost 101:1 formal 52:19 54:3 75:22 76:4,9,12 77:3 86:25 formed 101:25 forth 59:15 60:24 77:23 forum 68:24 forward 49:2 55:12 55:25 56:5 63:18 64:12 84:20,23 88:15 98:6 108:11 111:13 113:13 116:1</p>	<p>found 106:4,10,22 frame 71:2 framed 68:23 fraud 91:3 free 77:23 front 90:19 109:2 fuelled 105:23 full 93:10 fully 53:14,22 64:23 65:6 73:14 104:25 106:5 further 57:25 64:22,24 110:20 110:22 118:11 119:12 furthermore 95:20 future 57:19 58:6 60:24 62:10,11 72:25 73:1 74:5 88:23 119:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>G 48:4 G-h-o-s-h 99:6 Garlinghouse 44:20 124:6,15 gas 57:16,19 58:1 59:2 62:18 63:10 63:23 93:17 101:22 105:6 106:18 107:6 113:18 114:24 gases 55:18 104:3 106:10 107:2 108:20 113:4 114:15 general 45:6,17 49:8,21 General's 48:22 49:23 112:4 generally 65:10 generated 106:9 generation 55:14 101:9 106:1,3,15 106:21 getting 65:5 107:15</p>
---	--	---	---	---

<p>107:20 Ghosh 46:13 47:5 49:16 97:5 98:1,2 98:4,7,18 99:2,4,4 99:5,11,18 100:6 100:7,25 102:16 103:4,11,19 104:23 107:21 110:25 114:19 115:5 Ghosh's 115:12 give 54:18 56:13 66:17,18 84:18 87:20 88:6 115:5 given 64:20 66:6,9 66:10 72:6 77:3,8 79:12 80:3,13 81:23 87:8,9 88:16 118:25 122:17 gives 89:13 giving 82:1 go 57:11 58:13,14 61:23 64:5 71:22 79:19 90:2,13 91:21,21 93:20 94:1 98:11,15 108:25 116:1,2 120:5 goal 67:2 76:20 goals 55:8 60:19,23 113:23 goes 91:4 102:23 119:6 going 62:7 66:10 69:2 70:13 71:13 72:20 73:19 74:19 74:22 78:7 84:24 86:9 87:1 89:8 90:6 97:17 99:15 113:12 120:2 good 48:7 49:13,20 50:5,11,18 55:24 66:6 80:22 84:16 84:21 111:9,22,23 grant 52:18 60:9</p>	<p>71:16 74:16 75:13 76:15 90:20 91:17 95:7,9 112:24 granted 53:9 56:18 62:14 72:3 granting 54:3,13 61:4 62:6 69:20 81:6,22 87:23 96:6 109:20 115:19 great 113:11 greatly 94:8 greenhouse 55:18 57:16,19 58:1 59:2 62:18 63:10 63:23 93:17 101:22 104:3 105:6 106:10,18 107:2 108:20 113:4,18 114:15 114:24 group 97:18 98:5 guess 115:9 123:3 guys 70:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>half 96:21 hands 84:4 120:9 120:18 happen 81:1 82:7 121:5 happened 65:11 happens 83:23 84:3 85:21 happy 49:16 57:5 71:10 118:11 Harbor 46:9 hard 57:22 78:25 119:7 harm 112:23 harmed 93:23 94:8 harmful 113:1 harms 85:15 hazy 70:10 he/him 49:4,9,15 97:22</p>	<p>hear 51:7,9 70:7,8 96:25 99:17 112:22 115:5 117:5 heard 51:1 86:3 97:7 99:9 102:18 113:8 115:6,8 117:11,22 hearing 48:25 49:4 51:19 52:12,13 56:11 58:11 80:22 96:22 97:8,20,25 109:11 111:8 112:14,16 118:8 119:24 120:2 121:18 122:2,16 123:17,18,18,21 help 51:24 62:22 110:5 119:12 helpful 49:16 68:12 87:18 88:5,6 114:19 helps 68:14 hesitancy 80:14 hey 75:17 hiding 119:5 higher 106:12 highlights 70:4 highly 106:14 hit 123:19 hold 121:4 holding 95:22 honest 66:13 Honor 49:7,13,20 50:5,11,15,18 52:17 55:2 57:6 57:12 58:15 62:15 64:13 65:18 67:23 68:11 71:22,25 72:20 74:25 75:21 77:15 78:21 80:1 81:3 86:11 87:16 97:21 98:1,12,17 100:7 103:4,19 104:24 108:2,23 109:1 110:19,23</p>	<p>112:19 117:15 118:5 120:7 122:1 122:5 123:8 hopeful 82:16 hoping 82:12 horizon 106:18 hour 96:21 hypothetical 82:21 122:8 hypotheticals 87:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>identified 105:17 identifies 103:2 identify 100:22 ignore 91:18 ignores 54:1 ignoring 94:5 III 44:11 illogical 77:7 illustrate 68:14 image 70:10 immediately 106:10 impact 69:2 106:20 113:22 impacted 74:7 impactful 106:14 impacts 69:13 120:16 implement 56:7 80:12 implementation 55:18 59:3 implementing 59:6 92:23 94:4 120:21 importance 77:10 important 56:7 60:18 71:2 108:17 114:7 119:14 importantly 73:16 impossible 65:3 impression 56:22 80:4 in-house 49:14</p>	<p>inadvertently 109:13 include 53:2 54:17 59:4,16 79:13 86:16 90:23 100:24 101:1,19 102:24 included 54:8,9 64:17 66:1 71:3,7 74:21 78:20,22 79:21 81:5 83:8 102:19 104:17,21 107:17 108:20,22 includes 66:23 67:24 79:24 87:12 101:20 including 100:11 inclusion 59:1 61:6 120:19 incorporated 58:1 62:19 63:22 83:13 incorporating 55:17 57:18 incorrect 60:22 113:3,5 114:14,15 incremental 60:22 102:10 104:9 113:5 INDEX 47:1 indicate 51:24 83:1 indicated 61:1 93:7 94:10 inform 119:11 informally 81:13 information 58:4 62:8 63:19 64:1 109:14 114:11,20 115:14 informs 105:13 ingredients 102:9 initial 63:13,20 68:18 70:17 72:22 73:6,25 75:9 77:16 85:12 initially 63:6 initiated 88:15</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>input 51:22 63:11 84:18 instance 91:14 instruction 112:9 insufficient 53:8 54:12 integrated 105:5 intend 121:18 interest 53:9 56:16 56:19 57:5 59:11 59:18 60:2,12 62:7 64:2 65:9 66:7,21 67:6 68:8 74:11 77:8 86:8 86:23 87:1 88:4 89:9,11,20 90:21 91:16,21 92:7 93:15,22 94:7 96:3 99:16 109:22 109:24 110:9 115:20,25 116:7 121:1 interested 62:5 80:22 81:24 110:11 interesting 88:22 88:23 interpretation 73:11 interpreted 62:25 Intervenors 122:12 introduce 98:9 111:17 invitation 58:9 invite 51:3 52:8 55:1 57:8 64:6 119:25 inviting 51:5 involved 110:12 issue 52:18 55:19 55:23 56:4,21,22 57:21 66:8 67:25 69:12 72:24 73:3 73:3,14 74:5 77:18,24 78:1 79:11 80:4 81:15</p>	<p>82:9 83:6 84:24 85:6 87:5,11 88:12 89:4,8 96:14,15 119:16 121:16,18 issued 48:14 65:12 65:16 issues 56:8 57:1 61:3 68:5,18 73:9 95:18 104:15 117:20 118:11 119:10 123:7 issuing 69:1 70:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <hr/> <p>J 44:13 45:3 January 44:15 48:1 48:8 92:15 112:14 joined 55:22 judge 44:13 45:2 47:3,6,10 48:6,10 49:5,5,11,18 50:2 50:9,16,22 54:22 57:7 58:7 61:20 64:3 65:10 66:16 67:9,11 68:9 70:8 71:11 72:18 74:11 75:11 76:13 77:12 78:5 79:23 80:16 82:7,20 83:19 85:25 87:14 89:22 91:24 92:5,9 94:19 95:2 96:4 96:17 97:12,23 98:3,8,15,20 99:1 99:7 100:5,16 102:15 103:7,9 104:13 107:8,24 108:6,18,25 109:15 110:13,21 110:24 111:9,12 111:15 112:21 113:24 114:9 115:4,16 116:12 116:24 117:4,22 119:21 121:13</p>	<p>122:2,20 123:12 judgment 71:24 judicial 69:4 91:4 jump 108:23 June 58:24 59:25 jurisdiction 69:12 justified 60:6 96:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <hr/> <p>K 49:24 keep 55:7 57:13 70:13 80:5 84:22 119:8 kind 70:4 71:2 73:24 84:9 88:1 88:20 89:13,19 90:10 kinds 109:9 know 55:13 56:5,12 57:21 62:21 64:22 64:22 65:5,6 66:11 67:6,17 69:25 70:14,17 71:16 72:4,6,21 73:23 74:8,15,23 84:3,15,20 85:7 87:4 88:2 89:8,14 89:17,19 92:19 93:8,10 110:6 114:6,25 115:12 118:9,14,15,21,23 119:5,8 122:9,11 122:16,22 knowledge 124:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <hr/> <p>Lacey 44:19 48:1 lack 94:17 land 84:10 language 79:25 80:6 86:15 larger 85:23 113:16 Lastly 61:1 Lauren 45:22 50:19</p>	<p>lauren.nwenergy... 45:24 law 44:13 45:2 46:3 48:10 59:16 61:6 61:9 67:25 87:17 87:19 92:22 93:16 93:19 95:23 110:2 114:8 120:12 121:5 lays 54:14 lead 60:21 109:13 113:4 leave 80:15 leaving 51:12 legal 59:1 60:4 72:15 90:7 92:23 93:4 108:4 118:6 118:10 let's 48:6 49:2,6 70:11 83:22 97:1 97:12 99:17 level 55:5 63:1 levels 55:11 Light 44:8 45:12 line 100:10 112:25 113:1 lines 61:23 listening 122:6 litigate 110:7 litigated 53:15,22 64:23 73:3,4 litigating 65:6 89:5 litigation 53:4,18 95:13 109:9 110:6 little 62:12 71:12 99:12 104:16 108:14 109:17 live 85:8 LLC 44:21 long 65:1 69:24 96:22 116:19 longer 96:23 look 55:12,25 56:4 72:8 74:23 83:25 84:1,10,13,18 92:1,3 100:1</p>	<p>103:24 108:15 123:2 looked 106:8 looking 72:10 75:2 102:17 Loop 44:18 lot 90:5 105:1 117:22 118:6 lowest 101:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <hr/> <p>M 111:20 main 102:8 man's 84:9 map 100:2 102:5 maps 100:12 market 101:24 material 100:13 105:1 matter 48:12 49:15 58:14 64:16 68:6 72:10 76:24 77:1 77:11 79:10 87:6 92:1,2 matters 53:17 maximum 58:25 60:5 McCloy 45:22 50:18,19 mean 82:12 91:15 meaningful 106:20 means 101:3 mechanics 104:17 mechanism 69:22 81:9 82:4 medium 107:6,6 meet 59:5 93:4 meeting 55:8 60:19 80:7 106:6 meets 75:3 79:14 83:17 86:20 87:13 91:25 mens 89:14 mentioned 57:20 62:4,7 63:15 102:11 107:22</p>
---	---	---	--	--

<p>110:9 merits 53:12 54:3,4 54:6 68:3 70:18 70:23,24 72:2 73:2 74:5 77:19 83:18 86:14 87:3 89:6 118:22 119:4 message 93:23 met 60:5,21 methodology 56:24 80:10 85:1 mid-morning 97:1 mind 66:15 minds 66:25 minimize 119:15 minimum 78:15 79:14 80:8 92:6 107:11 minute 75:18 minutes 114:19 mirrors 79:24 missed 102:12 mistake 66:5 mitigate 110:5 MM 107:6 model 62:23 104:16,18 modeling 80:5 101:21 103:23 models 62:25 moment 95:14 Monahan 46:3 50:11,12 57:11,12 62:2,15 monumental 55:12 morning 48:7 49:13,20 50:5,11 50:18 111:9,22,23 119:24 Moser 46:8 50:5,6 50:8 motion 48:18,23 49:1 51:4,10,21 52:16,19,21,24 53:1,5,9 54:2,4,7 54:13,16,20 56:3</p>	<p>56:15,18 58:23 59:9 60:7,10 61:17 62:6,14 64:9 65:8 68:6,7 70:19 71:4,6,8,16 72:3,22 73:13 74:16 75:13 76:15 76:22 78:13,17,24 79:25 81:5,6,15 81:18,23 82:14 84:8 85:18 86:5,7 86:8,9,16,20,22 86:24,25 87:13 88:3,13,18 89:1 89:10 90:13,14,20 90:22 91:23,25 94:22,24 95:8,9 96:6 107:13 109:21 112:24 115:2,19,25 117:21 119:2 121:3 122:8,24 motions 86:12 motivation 64:9,10 108:9,10 109:6 move 49:2 77:12 88:15 89:7 96:19 98:6 108:16 111:13 moved 69:8 moving 63:18 64:11,12 84:19,23 108:11 110:11 Multnomah 45:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <p>N 45:1 46:1 48:4 111:20,20 name 48:9 98:22,24 98:25,25 99:2,4,5 99:5 111:10,24,25 narrow 56:11 narrowly 84:1,11 Nash 45:6 49:7 71:23 nash.callaghan@...</p>	<p>45:9 National 44:24 nearly 96:21 necessarily 69:10 necessary 78:23 79:22 90:3 need 69:4,5 92:25 93:8 99:9 101:5 101:10 108:1 123:4 needs 87:7 123:2 negative 113:23 negotiation 66:3 114:11 negotiations 109:4 neither 59:9 106:4 neutral 101:8 105:25 new 85:17,23 104:8 104:22 105:11 115:7 122:25 123:1,6 no-fault 68:15 no-penalty 68:15 nonemitting 101:9 104:5 106:2,7,21 119:11 normal 122:10 Northeast 45:12 Northwest 45:22 50:17,19 58:21 note 55:19 noted 56:10 71:4 80:2 108:13 notice 76:1,7 notion 53:13 nuance 119:15 number 61:25 112:13 NWEC 45:21 51:6 57:9 58:8 73:17 119:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <p>O 48:4 111:20 O'Connell 44:13</p>	<p>45:3 47:3,6,10 48:6,9 49:5,11,18 50:2,9,16,22 54:22 57:7 58:7 61:20 64:3 65:10 66:16 67:9,11 68:9 70:8 71:11 72:18 74:11 75:11 76:13 77:12 78:5 79:23 80:16 82:7 82:20 83:19 85:25 87:14 89:22 91:24 92:5,9 94:19 95:2 96:4,17 97:12,23 98:3,8,15,20 99:1 99:7 100:5,16 102:15 103:7,9 104:13 107:8,24 108:6,18,25 109:15 110:13,21 110:24 111:10,12 111:15 112:21 113:24 114:9 115:4,16 116:12 116:24 117:4,22 119:21 121:13 122:2,20 123:12 o0o-- 48:3 O1 120:22 Oakland 46:4 objection 72:12 obligations 74:1 obviously 71:7 occurring 85:16 offer 92:5 110:16 115:18 116:14 offers 98:13 Office 45:6,17 48:22 49:23 112:4 official 100:14 offset 106:14 Oh 50:7 122:4 okay 49:6,18 50:22 52:13 54:22 57:7 58:7 61:20 65:10 66:16 67:10 68:9</p>	<p>70:6 71:11 77:12 78:5 80:16 82:20 83:19 87:14 89:22 94:19 95:2 96:17 96:17 97:8,12,23 98:3,5,15 99:1,7 100:5 102:15 103:9 104:13 107:8,24 108:6,18 110:13,24 111:12 114:9 116:12,24 117:5,22 119:21 120:2 121:13,13 122:2 123:7,12,15 123:17,21 old 66:11 110:10 Olympia 44:23 45:8 once 75:1 101:25 ongoing 65:2 open 51:12 88:11 opening 54:25 55:3 57:10 58:9 68:2 117:17 operate 67:17 operation 104:2 opinion 67:1 76:2 opportunity 58:10 58:16 78:7 110:17 115:18 116:15 117:24 123:19 oppose 58:19,22 opposed 52:22 opposes 59:8 opposing 52:24 opposition 48:23 optimal 101:25 106:22 optimally 106:9 optimized 107:2 optionally 51:13 119:25 options 57:18 order 48:16 59:7 60:15 64:19 65:21 68:19 69:2,3,3,12</p>
--	---	--	---	---

70:17,18 72:22 73:7 75:19,25 77:22 78:16 81:20 83:7,8,14 84:8 88:19 93:5 94:14 96:8 99:23 100:24 107:14 110:2 115:24 116:8 118:13 120:22 121:16,18 ordered 75:19 Oregon 45:13 46:9 original 58:2 74:21 74:24 103:22 originally 102:6 outcome 65:5 outcomes 60:20 103:23 106:9 outlined 83:17	58:21,24 59:24 61:5 62:17,23 63:5,9,20 67:13 67:14 70:23 71:15 74:18 78:10 80:23 84:3,14 89:3,25 90:9 92:13,24 93:1,7,18 94:23 95:4,10,22 96:15 97:16,24 98:18 102:21 103:12 105:6 113:9 116:18 117:10 118:2 120:8,17,20 121:4,6 123:10,11 PacifiCorp's 57:17 59:2 61:8 63:13 92:21 97:4 108:20 115:17 120:10,11 120:12 121:8,10 page 47:1 112:12 112:25 Pages 44:12 Paisner 45:16 47:9 49:20,21 50:1 58:12,15 78:6 86:4 90:4,17 92:4 92:9 95:1,12 96:11 111:5,16,18 111:21 112:19 116:16,23 120:4,7 123:8 papers 100:2 105:11 paragraph 68:4 70:4 78:13 85:19 99:13 102:20 103:1 paragraphs 67:16 67:17 part 62:16 65:22 66:2 71:19 72:2 78:19 81:4 82:13 82:24 87:2 105:12 107:12,19 109:3 participants 73:17	particular 51:23 52:4 91:8 97:4 110:7 113:10 particularly 114:3 parties 51:3,12,23 52:4,9,22 53:23 54:6 55:22 56:25 57:10,21 61:23 62:10 64:15 68:21 69:3,12,14 76:23 77:1 78:14 79:7 79:14,16 81:1,9 81:13,24,25 84:14 84:17 88:10 89:4 95:14 97:3 99:23 100:14,18 107:10 114:5 117:6,10 122:24 party 76:14 78:25 79:8 86:17 88:9 88:14 89:2 90:24 92:22 path 55:15 pay 94:16 penalties 53:2,4,22 58:25 60:3,5 64:23 65:25 67:15 67:20 70:24 71:18 71:20 74:17 75:8 82:24 85:7,24 93:13 94:22 95:4 95:7 96:2 110:4 121:1 penalty 54:17 70:15 73:20 74:6 78:1,2 85:16 percent 55:10 106:2,6 perfectly 96:16 performance 105:19 performing 105:17 period 99:22 100:4 100:15,17 permission 56:13 56:14 65:15 69:20	82:2 87:20,24 permit 88:3 118:17 perspective 55:6 56:11 72:16 92:8 96:5 109:18 phase 81:9 phrased 68:14 piece 104:2 pieces 81:18 place 65:17 80:22 82:10 110:1 112:2 119:16 places 69:15 plan 51:3 55:19 59:3 105:5 106:11 116:5 planning 93:18 plans 100:9 plausible 85:11 please 49:2 52:14 57:11 58:13 62:2 64:9 67:12,19,22 78:11,20 90:1,3,5 98:11,22 99:2,14 100:22 109:18 111:4,5,16,24 113:7 120:5 plenty 73:14 Plexus 62:23 101:21 point 53:16 56:9 66:11 73:20 85:3 89:25 94:23 95:3 102:12 103:20 109:23 113:24 119:6 123:1 points 55:4 74:12 78:8 118:4 policies 75:4 107:4 policy 50:20 53:24 67:2 87:8 120:14 portfolio 54:8,9,15 55:14 57:17 58:2 58:2 62:19,20 63:6,7,9,11,17,24 65:22 66:24 72:9	78:14 79:3,6,18 81:2 83:4,16 92:16,16 99:21 100:11 101:2,5,6 101:11,12,15,16 101:18,20,25 102:7,7,21,24 103:17,21,21,24 104:8,21,21 105:3 105:10,18 106:4 106:16,19,23 107:3,5,11,17,18 107:22 portfolios 60:5 101:14,18 102:11 105:4,7,14,18,21 portion 103:15 Portland 45:13 46:9 position 51:8 58:14 58:17 72:1,16 74:25 88:14 89:15 89:16 109:7 122:9 positions 51:4 118:9 possible 95:17 posture 69:7 71:3 potential 74:9,16 113:3 potentially 57:2 64:22 65:5 75:7 122:14 Power 44:8 45:12 powers 74:7 87:25 89:1 practical 72:10 76:24 77:1 precedent 57:3 88:20,23 113:25 precedential 73:8 preclearance 80:24 81:9 84:2,19 85:20 99:12,14,19 precluded 95:18 preclusion 72:25 77:17 95:5,11
P				
P 45:1,1 46:1,1 48:4 P.O 45:7 P02-MM 105:17 P02-MM-CETA 63:7 102:5 104:21 105:13,16 106:24 107:17 P02-SCGHG 54:15 58:1 62:19 63:16 65:21 72:8 78:14 79:6,18 83:5 92:16 99:21 100:11 101:2,4,11 101:13,14,20 102:21 103:16,21 104:20 105:2,8,19 107:11,17,21 PAC 66:10 81:24 Pacific 44:7 45:12 PacifiCorp 44:7 45:10 48:15 49:12 49:14 51:5,10,18 51:23,24 52:5 54:25 57:24 58:3				

preclusive 83:23	48:18 53:3,22,25	59:11,18 60:2,12	80:18 83:20 89:24	82:13,15 106:25
preempt 104:24	55:6 60:10 64:11	62:7,10 63:12	90:7 94:20 96:18	116:17 120:9
preferred 54:15	64:12 68:13,21	64:2 65:9 66:7,21	96:23 98:18 107:9	reasonable 101:15
57:17 58:2 60:4	69:8,11 73:7 78:3	67:5 68:8,13	110:17,20,22,25	reasons 81:21 82:3
62:20 63:6,23	84:8 85:19,21	71:14 73:10,16	116:13,15 117:1	109:25
65:22 66:24 79:6	87:7 88:10 118:20	74:2,13 85:5,17	118:9 119:20	receive 121:17
79:18 101:16	119:3 121:7 122:9	86:8,23 87:1 88:4	quick 55:4,5 87:17	receiving 121:19
102:6,24	proceedings 73:1	89:9,11,20 90:4	118:4	recognize 111:16
prejudice 71:17	93:25 94:1	90:12,21 91:16,21	quickly 121:5	117:9,13
72:17 73:13 74:8	process 55:25	92:7,7 93:15,22	quite 57:21,21	recognized 108:1
75:16 76:3,19	56:21 73:19 79:5	94:7 95:10 96:3	62:24 65:11	recommendation
preparation 121:15	79:12 88:2 93:18	99:16 109:22,24	104:15 115:5	79:17
prepare 100:9	99:15,25 105:5	110:9 111:3,7		recommended
prepared 51:13	112:23	112:3,6 113:2	R	66:24
54:25 90:3 112:8	Program 46:3	114:21 115:20,22	R 45:1 46:1 48:4	recommending
present 51:3 58:13	progress 65:7 77:4	115:25 116:6,7,9	124:1	65:20,24
101:4 117:7	promotes 80:7	117:8,11 120:3	R-e-c-t-o-r 98:25	record 48:6 53:8
presentation 51:11	promptly 120:15	121:1,9 122:6	R-o-h-i-n-i 99:5	54:12 57:14 58:4
52:16 123:13	pronouns 49:4,9,14	purport 54:5	raise 57:24 72:24	59:10,22 60:3
presentations	49:25 50:7,13,20	purpose 101:10	77:25	61:2,12 62:8
51:16	97:22 98:1 111:11	purposes 121:20	raised 77:17	63:19 64:1 69:6
presented 61:23	properly 76:7	pursuant 60:11	raising 72:12	79:9 91:7,10
67:25 68:5,23	proposed 54:9	86:17 90:23	ran 105:18	92:12,13 94:10
73:9 109:2,10	58:25 62:20	104:12	range 105:18	97:9,13 98:21,23
presenting 50:25	proposing 60:2	pursue 95:6 96:16	118:25	99:3 114:17,20
presiding 48:12	prosecute 88:17	pursued 95:19 96:2	ranging 109:7	115:1,11,15 116:2
pretty 56:10	protection 71:1	96:13	rate 89:3,6,16	116:18 120:19,23
prevent 69:11	provide 52:9 56:18	put 57:13 76:7	rates 105:24	121:11 123:22
prevented 71:18	58:10 62:17 63:5	79:16	rationale 52:23	Rector 46:13 47:2
74:4 76:15	80:11,15 116:7	puts 75:25 88:14	54:14	49:10 97:4,21,22
preventing 64:12	117:17,25 118:11		RCW 60:11 61:1	98:7,13,22,24,24
price 104:3 107:4,5	118:12 120:20	Q	69:18 91:6	99:11,18,19 100:8
107:7	provided 83:11	question 71:12	rea 89:14	102:11,13 103:6,7
prices 101:24	92:10 114:19	75:5,6 80:25 86:2	reach 64:20 65:3	103:8,11,15,20
primarily 56:19	115:10,15 120:23	89:13 90:12,17	70:22	107:10,19 108:4,6
115:9	provides 79:5	91:4,20 103:10	reached 53:23	108:12,19 109:16
primary 64:9,10	providing 114:4	104:23 108:5,7	76:11,23	109:24 110:25
82:3 108:9,10	115:13	115:9 116:16	reaching 109:6	Rector's 61:10
prior 72:9,11 79:2	provision 85:15,22	questionable 53:15	read 109:19	65:20 94:11
107:4 115:24	public 45:15,17	questioning 80:20	ready 77:12 112:19	redone 102:10
procedural 69:21	48:21 49:19,22,25	98:13 112:20	118:12	reduce 53:17
71:2 122:16 123:2	51:7,18 52:6,23	questions 50:15	real 89:3,4	119:12
procedurally 75:23	52:23,25 53:2,7,9	51:17,20,21,24	reality 82:19	reduction 55:10,12
procedure 72:6	53:10,19 54:1,11	52:2,3,6,11 54:24	really 83:12	reestablish 122:25
proceed 51:2,14	56:16,19 57:5	57:6 61:22 62:1	Realtime 44:21	reference 121:19
proceeding 48:13	58:12,13,22 59:8	64:4 71:10 78:9	reason 75:21 81:4	referenced 91:8

<p>94:12 referencing 92:11 referring 68:1 refile 54:10 56:2 77:21 79:17 82:2 83:4 99:20 102:9 119:8 refiled 62:20 72:9 73:22 75:1,3 85:10,11 100:3 104:18 refiling 54:15 64:18 65:21 66:23 72:5,8 78:24 79:3 reflect 104:7 reflected 101:23 regard 59:12 60:7 67:9,18 regarding 60:15 regardless 95:7 regards 71:17 regulation 68:23 71:8 regulations 59:13 60:18 69:9 70:21 71:7 94:3,14 120:21 regulatory 49:24 55:25 56:21 84:9 84:22 112:3 reiterate 56:9 reject 61:16 121:2 rejected 53:13 related 54:18 78:23 87:10,13 109:9 relatively 106:13 rely 56:20 remain 55:7 remainder 61:19 remains 61:11 remarks 51:13 remedies 120:16 renewable 104:5 106:20 119:11 reply 122:15 REPORTED 44:20</p>	<p>Reporter 124:7 Reporting 44:21 representative 58:8 representatives 51:17 52:3,9 57:8 119:22 request 60:11 90:21 95:15 121:21 require 68:24 110:4 114:7 121:6 121:10 required 56:24 59:20 70:20 71:6 80:10 requirement 58:10 80:24 84:2 85:20 85:20 99:12,15,20 105:23,24 requirements 59:1 59:5 60:4,16,17 60:20 78:15,16 79:14 80:5,8 85:13 91:19 92:24 92:25 93:4,25 94:3,6,9 101:7 107:12,13 113:15 115:23 116:10 121:11 requires 57:24 62:17 63:21 71:9 99:20 121:1 resolution 53:23 54:2,5 64:21 65:3 66:6,9 67:7 87:5 87:11 89:12 resolve 53:17 55:23 56:25 57:22 64:16 66:15 67:25 68:5 79:10 82:16 89:17 119:16 resolved 57:1 66:13 66:14 79:10 87:7 resolving 77:8,10 96:8 resource 60:23</p>	<p>105:5,15 113:10 113:22 resources 101:5,9 101:23 102:2,25 105:20,23 106:7 106:17 107:1 113:5 119:12 respect 53:10 75:4 respective 80:13 Respondent 44:9 response 48:23 52:25 54:1 74:13 94:21 122:11,13 122:14 responses 89:23 responsibilities 68:20 69:3,13 responsibility 61:8 rest 78:8 restart 70:6,12 73:22 restarted 74:2 85:10 restating 70:5 result 104:4 106:12 107:4 112:14 113:21 resulting 107:3 results 72:22 101:4 retail 101:7 105:25 106:1,7 return 52:1 80:19 95:3 returning 82:22 reversible 88:22 review 69:4 71:13 72:7 79:7,19 84:19 86:3 87:21 88:2 90:12 91:5 99:24 100:1 reviewed 79:2 87:22 reviewing 70:19 revise 84:17 116:19 revised 62:9 81:2 84:4 100:9,20,23</p>	<p>101:1,17 104:19 119:8 revision 93:11 120:13 123:11 RFPs 119:11 RHOINI 47:5 right 66:20 70:11 70:12 84:13 89:8 89:12 94:25 109:23 115:19 rights 68:20 69:2 69:13 122:11 risk 53:17 109:9 110:6 road 84:24 100:2 100:12 102:5 robust 117:19 Rogala 45:11 49:13 49:14 55:2,3 67:12 68:10,11 70:11 71:22 72:18 72:20 77:13,15 78:11 79:23 80:1 83:19,22 87:15,16 91:8 96:5 98:9,15 98:17 99:8 104:14 108:13 110:15,21 110:22 118:2,4 122:4,5 123:3 Rogala's 75:16 Rohini 46:13 49:16 98:7,18 99:4,5 Rose 46:3 50:12 rose.monahan@s... 46:5 rule 48:15 54:10 64:19 72:14 75:24 78:16 107:12 110:2 rules 59:6,14 60:8 60:14 77:22 91:1 91:13 92:23 93:5 113:14 116:10 ruling 54:4 run 105:3,10 107:5 running 104:1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>S 45:1 46:1 48:4 S-t-e-p-h-a-n-i-e 112:1 sake 94:5 sales 101:7 105:25 106:2,7 sat 120:18 satisfied 77:1 saying 68:4 76:10 91:25 92:2 says 100:18 102:20 SCGHG 59:2 60:4 60:16 61:6 73:14 73:19 80:12 120:12,19 121:10 schedule 52:1,11 61:18,18 95:13 122:10,16,25 123:1,6 scope 56:11 118:18 118:23 se 88:21 Seattle 44:22,23 45:18,23 second 53:7 54:1 54:11 56:9 60:7 65:24 86:22 108:24 118:14 section 102:10 104:9 see 57:11 62:13 65:12 70:6,9 72:10 77:2 78:6 78:17,18 79:20 91:17 96:19 107:24 114:6,6,15 seeing 58:11 seeking 83:7 86:17 90:24 selecting 113:4 selection 105:15 selections 60:23 106:12 113:10,22 send 93:23 113:25 114:2</p>
--	---	---	--	---

sense 68:16 70:5 80:5 87:3,4 91:3	97:14 104:10 105:2	software 101:21	115:16 117:9,13	statute 48:15 54:10
separate 62:24	shortfall 106:6	Sommer 46:8 50:6	118:17,19 119:18	59:5 64:18 72:13
serious 113:1	Shorthand 124:6	soon 121:19	120:11 121:12	75:25 78:15
served 89:10	shortly 97:15	sorry 48:11 70:5	122:15	107:12
service 119:13	show 60:3 61:9	73:1 81:8 89:1,8	Staff's 48:19,23,25	statutes 77:22
set 55:5 59:15	70:16	103:7 108:2	51:21 52:19 54:13	statutory 69:25
60:24 61:18 105:3	showing 59:24	sort 84:18 99:25	56:3,14 59:25	85:12 87:25
105:4 123:6	shows 76:25 92:13	107:22 113:19	64:6 65:19 66:15	116:10
settlement 44:11	side 88:8,24 100:9	source 101:9	66:25 71:25 76:14	stay 90:1 97:18
48:19,24 49:1	119:1	Southeast 44:18	78:13 79:25 84:8	steered 108:3
51:4,10 53:12,16	Sierra 46:2,3 50:10	speak 64:15 79:15	86:5 90:13 92:21	stem 74:12
53:24 55:22 57:15	50:12,14 51:6	113:2	94:11,21 107:13	stemming 115:7
57:23 58:20 59:8	57:9,14 58:3,21	speaking 50:25	108:8,10 109:6	Stephanie 46:14
59:12,14,15,19	73:17 92:11	specific 56:23 67:7	112:24 119:2	47:8 49:24 111:10
60:1 61:17 62:16	119:23	80:5,10	122:8,12	111:14,25,25
63:4,8,15,21 64:2	sign 123:15	specifically 105:19	stakeholders 56:2	stop 57:6 70:13
66:2 67:24 68:15	signal 113:25 114:1	105:22	58:6 63:1 116:9	74:10 86:6 89:21
68:22,25 70:4,15	114:2	spell 98:22 99:2	stand 118:12	straying 109:13
71:5 74:19 76:14	significant 55:14	111:24	standard 59:15	Street 45:12 46:4
76:16 78:18,19	65:11 103:17	spelled 102:20	71:12,13 75:4	strongly 58:3
79:1,4,20,24 80:6	signing 79:1	112:1,1	86:3,7,20,21,23	struck 122:6
80:7 84:1,5,10,16	similar 60:21 102:4	Square 44:18	87:12,13 88:2	stuff 119:14
85:2,4 86:9,12,16	108:7	Staff 45:5 48:14,17	90:11 91:9	sub 59:21,21 60:9
88:16 90:14,15,23	simple 118:18	49:6,9,10 51:5,9	standards 86:10	61:2,2 69:18
90:25 91:1,10,11	simply 68:6,7 76:7	51:17,20 52:5,13	90:15 92:1,2	86:15 90:22,22
91:13,18,22,25	sir 71:10	52:16,19 54:13	start 49:6 51:5	subject 49:15
92:11,25 94:6,9	sits 84:3	55:7,22 56:1,13	73:22 83:22 84:19	submit 103:12
95:24 99:13	sitting 120:8	56:25 58:18,21,23	85:23 90:10	submitted 63:6
100:10,21,23	situation 82:19	58:25 61:10 62:1	started 52:12	substantial 69:5
102:17 104:12	six-state 119:13	62:1 64:14,15,21	starting 98:21	91:9
107:16 109:4,21	sjm@dvclaw.com	65:4,12,14,14,15	state 49:22 57:3	succeed 114:6
115:2 116:1,5	46:10	65:24 66:19,24	59:14 60:9 63:16	succinctly 104:25
120:24 121:2	skill 124:9	67:14,21 69:8,20	111:24 112:4	sufficient 59:17
settlements 87:9	slightly 58:17	71:15 72:6,10	124:3,7	95:21
settling 52:4 64:15	83:24 96:21	73:16 75:22 76:11	stated 59:5 96:13	Suite 44:22 45:13
76:25 78:14 79:13	small 122:5	76:15 77:2,7,20	99:22 101:18	45:18,23 46:4
79:15 97:3 107:10	social 55:17 57:16	77:22 78:3,9,9	104:14 116:4	sum 61:5
117:10	57:18,25 59:2	79:16 80:23 85:5	117:17	supervision 112:9
seven 99:21 100:14	62:18 63:10,17,22	85:17 87:10,20	statement 52:16	supplied 100:13
112:16	74:20 93:17	88:19 89:17,25	55:1,3 57:10 58:9	105:25 106:2
she/her 49:25 50:7	101:22 104:2	90:9 91:24 95:4,9	65:1 68:2 87:17	supply 101:7
50:12,20 98:2	105:6 106:9,18	95:10 96:13 97:4	87:19 117:18	support 53:8 54:13
111:10	107:2 108:19	97:16 98:13 99:23	statements 52:10	54:20 61:14 68:25
short 51:11 52:16	113:3,17 114:14	100:1,13 107:10	61:13 117:6	69:6 91:10,23
64:13 91:20 97:1	114:24	107:15,20 108:17	states 78:13 79:13	116:2
		110:10 114:5	stating 78:18	supported 52:21

<p>59:10 91:7 supporting 54:6 59:17,20 68:7,24 120:25 supports 57:14 supposed 84:20 85:13 91:23 93:3 93:3 113:18,19 sure 64:17 78:21 81:23,25 82:4 85:1 98:24 99:19 100:25 104:15 113:8 119:9 122:18 surprised 96:21 SW 46:9 swear 98:5 111:13 sworn 98:7 111:14 system 80:13 102:3 105:19 systems 104:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <p>T 111:20 124:1,1 tail 85:20 take 70:1 83:24 97:1,1,7 117:5 123:18 taken 74:21 97:10 talk 67:15 talked 100:10 118:25 talking 80:9,10 89:21 90:18 target 106:1 targets 55:9 104:5 105:22 107:1 Taylor 44:20 124:6 124:15 techocratic 55:20 tell 49:3 62:13 64:9 99:14 ten 106:11 ten-minute 97:2 tenders 98:18 term 68:15 70:16</p>	<p>78:18,18 79:13,24 84:13,16 terms 67:5,19,22 82:21 83:3,7,12 83:17 106:20 territory 119:13 testify 97:18 111:4 testimony 51:14 54:14 61:10,14 65:13,19,20 66:25 79:16 94:11,12 108:18 109:19 111:1,2 112:5,7,8 112:11,25 115:6 116:4,25 122:12 122:12,13,14,15 thank 49:7,11,18 50:1,2,9,16,22 51:1 52:15,17 54:20,22 55:2,21 57:7,12 58:6,15 58:16 61:19,20 62:3 64:3,4 66:16 68:9,11 71:11 74:11 78:5 81:3 85:25 86:11 87:14 87:16 89:22,25 92:9 94:18,19 96:17 97:9,12,14 97:21,23 98:3,8 98:12,14,17,20 99:1,7,9 100:5,7 100:16 102:15,16 103:9 104:13,23 107:8 109:1,15 110:13,19,25 111:9,12,15,18 112:18,21 116:12 116:23,24,25 117:3,4,15,25 119:19,21 120:7 121:12,13 122:3 123:12,22 thing 66:20 80:3 84:5 109:23 115:19 122:6</p>	<p>123:9 things 53:13 65:20 66:12,18 90:8 102:20 108:3 109:5,7 think 51:24 55:23 55:24 56:17 57:4 62:21 63:2,12,18 64:1,25 66:4,5,9 67:6 68:12,12,14 69:7 70:3 71:5,22 72:23 73:8,18,21 74:2,4,6 75:23 76:6,8,24 77:6,25 78:25 79:21 80:4 80:14,21 83:25 84:10,12,12 85:9 85:11 86:20,22 87:12,18 88:1,5,6 88:21,21,22,25 89:19 90:10,22 91:15,16 93:15,18 93:20,21,23 94:5 94:7,9,10,15,16 96:1,13,15 100:8 107:21 109:20 115:19 117:20 118:7,18 119:1,16 122:17 123:4 thinking 65:16 114:13 third 119:6 thorough 63:2 thought 80:19 thoughtful 89:23 thoughts 52:10 95:5,11 96:10 115:7 117:16,25 118:3 120:5 three 62:24 118:4 throws 93:2 thumbs 118:16,16 THURSTON 124:4 time 48:7 63:18 96:20 97:15 100:4 100:17 123:11</p>	<p>timely 120:13 today 48:25 49:9 49:15,23 50:13,21 51:3 52:18 56:12 58:17,19 87:19 109:3 112:15 115:7,8 117:1,19 118:7,15,15 120:8 120:9,10 121:14 121:15,24 123:13 top 105:17 topic 77:13 105:9 total 112:16 touch 89:8 track 55:10 transcript 118:8 121:19 124:8 transcripts 121:17 transition 55:14 Transportation 44:2,4,18 45:7 48:11 true 124:8 try 56:7 81:13 84:22 104:24 114:10 trying 56:12 70:16 84:15 89:15 123:3 turn 50:24 52:14 53:14 55:1 58:12 62:2 64:5,7 67:12 78:11 90:2,5 98:8 99:9 100:6 110:16 111:6 117:8,11 119:22 120:2 121:21 turning 108:3 116:14 turns 69:16 84:4 two 55:4 56:6 65:19 87:17 105:14 twofold 52:24 typically 121:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p>UE-20829 71:19</p>	<p>UE-210829 59:7,23 60:15 64:11 120:22 UE-220376 44:4 48:12 uncertainty 53:18 unclear 95:18 96:1 114:18 unconstitutional 70:1 underlines 70:14 underpinning 91:2 understand 63:13 68:17 91:12 104:16,17 109:15 understanding 100:25 103:5 122:19,21,23 123:10,13 unfamiliar 96:11 unfortunately 82:11,18 unit 45:17 48:21 49:22 112:4 unmute 123:19 unnecessary 79:12 update 112:12,15 updated 62:9 74:22 79:6 104:7 upheld 69:4 urge 117:20 use 49:4,25 50:12 50:20 80:6 88:25 88:25 102:21 107:20 111:10 118:8 120:17 useful 58:5 63:3,12 63:19 uses 62:23 UTC 58:20,25 59:13 61:7 120:11 121:12 utilities 44:2,4,18 45:7 48:10 57:3 60:25 80:11 93:16 93:24 94:2 113:13</p>
---	---	---	--	---

114:3 utility 60:24,25 80:12 94:18 utilizes 57:16	waiting 93:12 want 51:7 55:9,19 55:21 56:9 62:1 64:8,14,14 66:17 66:18 67:11,14,15 67:17 71:13,16 79:15 80:11,17 81:14 84:23 85:1 88:15 90:11 92:19 96:4,19 99:11 100:16 104:15,17 111:16 112:22 115:4 117:5,7 118:10,14 119:14 119:19 121:15 122:3,18 123:18 wanted 57:13,24 58:10 62:4 64:17 81:23,25 82:4 wanting 74:22 wants 85:17 89:11 89:18 warranted 70:25 71:21 Washington 44:1,4 44:18,19,22 45:8 45:18,23 48:1,10 48:22 49:22 55:13 68:17 101:7,11 102:1,2,25 103:23 105:20,24,25 106:1,7,19,21 107:1 112:4 124:3 124:7 Washington's 60:19 113:22 way 46:9 57:1 66:14 75:24 76:3 84:13 105:13 109:17 110:3 113:18,23 ways 105:8 113:19 we'll 90:10 97:2 117:11 we're 48:25 55:6,10 73:25 80:8,9	81:21 82:13 84:9 84:15 85:13 87:19 89:14,16 90:18 97:14 118:11,15 we've 55:15 76:23 77:9 96:20 100:10 117:19,20 Webster 46:4 week 121:18 weighing 64:21 65:4 weird 88:14,20 Western 50:3,6 willing 64:16 window 106:11 with-prejudice 73:9 withdraw 48:18,19 56:14,15 58:23 59:9 60:8,10,12 61:14,17 62:6 65:12,15 69:8,21 70:20 71:4,6,8 73:13 75:13 87:20 88:10 89:2,7,11 89:16,18 90:21 91:23 93:9 94:24 95:21 96:7 109:21 112:24 115:3 116:1 118:17,19 118:20 120:24 withdrawal 60:2 61:4 86:18 90:24 91:3,17 121:11 withdrawing 66:20 69:10 94:8 withdrawn 61:8,11 71:17 75:14 93:22 95:24 witness 49:24 52:7 61:10 94:11 97:4 97:5 111:3,7,17 115:17,17 witnesses 46:12 51:15 52:4,5 80:21 96:19,24,25	97:3,16,17,19 98:10,21 110:18 110:20 113:9 117:23 121:14 Woodland 44:18 wording 78:17 words 54:6 81:12 120:17 work 55:13 56:1,21 56:25 81:13 100:2 105:11 119:7 worked 57:21 81:14 89:17 working 55:7 66:12 119:9 works 55:25 wouldn't 64:25 73:4 writing 114:4 written 113:14 www.buellrealti... 44:25	01 59:7 60:15 78:16 107:14 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 48:17 58:20,23 75:19 77:22 104:7 1,930 112:15 1,965 112:16 10 67:17 10:55 96:20 10:56 97:11 100 106:2,6 11:05 97:2,9,15 11:06 97:11 11:47 123:23 111 47:9 112 47:10 13 112:25 1300 46:4 1325 44:22 14 112:12 113:1 1750 46:9 18 112:25 1800 45:13 1840 44:22 19 112:14 1st 45:23 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 20 94:11 20-year 106:18 2000 45:18 2005 55:11 2021 74:1 85:14 92:14,18 105:5 116:20 2022 58:20,23,24 59:25 93:10 2023 44:15 48:1,8 92:15 2026 105:23 2030 55:11 101:6 106:5 2045 101:7 106:1 206 44:23 45:19 21-IRP 102:6
<hr/> V <hr/> value 64:21 65:4 77:2 Van 46:8 vehicle 70:2 version 104:20 versus 64:23 65:6 104:18 video 55:1 67:12 78:6,12 90:1 97:16,18 99:9 107:25 108:3 111:4,6 123:18 videos 121:22 view 73:6 102:1 103:20 viewed 96:6,7 violated 85:4 violates 77:21 violation 73:23 81:19 83:1,6 violations 48:15 53:21 59:1,4,24 60:14,21 75:24 76:1 93:2 94:13 94:13 112:13,15 112:17 120:16 121:1 virtual 44:11 123:18 VOLUME 44:11 voluntary 110:3 vs 44:6				
<hr/> W <hr/> WAC 59:13,14,21 60:9 90:18 91:19 94:7 WACs 91:22 wait 75:17 waited 116:19				
			<hr/> X <hr/> X 111:20 <hr/> Y <hr/> yeah 68:11 100:4 103:6 118:4 119:20 year 66:11 94:2 108:14 110:10 120:17 yearlong 77:9 years 106:11 113:16 yep 123:14 <hr/> Z <hr/> Zach 49:13 55:3 ZACHARY 45:11 zachary.rogala@... 45:14 zone 56:23 80:9 zoom 118:14 <hr/> 0 <hr/>	

<p>2101 46:4 23 48:21 105:24 26 44:15 48:1,8 27 93:10 287-9066 44:23</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <p>8 85:19 99:13 80 106:6 800 44:24 45:18 811 45:23 825 45:12 846-6989 44:24</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>3 59:21 60:9 61:2 86:15 90:22 30 92:14,18 116:20 305 45:23 3358 44:20 124:15 34.05 91:6 34.05.461 61:1 34.05.570 69:18 3405 60:11 360 44:23 45:8</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <p>9 67:16 68:4 70:4 9:30 44:16 48:2 9:35 48:8 915-4521 45:8 94612 46:4 971 46:10 97201 46:9 97232 45:13 977-5704 46:5 98 47:3,6 98101 44:22 98104 45:18,23 98503 44:19 98504 45:8</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>4 61:2 69:18 40128 45:7 415 46:5 44-124 44:12 464-6595 45:19 480-07-380 60:9 86:15 90:18 480-07-740 53:12 59:13,21 94:7 480-07-750 59:14 480-74-740 91:19 4th 44:22</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>5 102:20 534-9066 44:23 5th 45:18</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p>6 58:24 59:25 113:1 621 44:18 69 55:10</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>7 78:13 710-1154 46:10 750 91:19 94:7</p>				