Docket Nos. UE-220066, UG-22067 and UG-210918 (Consolidated) - Vol. II

WUTC v. Puget Sound Energy / In the Matter of the Petition of Puget Sound Energy

August 18, 2022



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

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

email: info@buellrealtime.com



Page 102	Page 104
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	1 APPEARANCES (Cont.)
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	FOR ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS:
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND) DOCKETS UE-220066, TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,) UG-220067, and) UG-210918 Complainant,) (Consolidated)) vs.)	SOMMER MOSER 4 Davison Van Cleve 1750 Southwest Harbor Way 5 Suite 450 Portland, Oregon 97201 6 971-710-1154 sjm@dvclaw.com
PUGET SOUND ENERGY, Respondent.) VIRTUAL STATUS CONFERENCE VOLUME II Pages 102-138 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MICHAEL HOWARD Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast Lacey, Washington 98503 (All participants appeared via videoconference.)	FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT: 9
DATE TAKEN: AUGUST 18, 2022 REPORTED BY: ROSE DETLOFF, RMR, CRR, CCR #21036100	dex@smxblaw.com
Page 103	Page 105
A P P E A R A N C E S ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: MICHAEL HOWARD FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JEFF ROBERSON Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 360-664-1186 jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: SHEREE STROM CARSON Perkins Coie 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 425-635-1400 scarson@perkinscoie.com FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA W. GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 206-464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov	TOR WALMART: FOR WALMART:

1 (Pages 102 to 105)

	Page 106		Page 108
1	APPEARANCES (Cont.)	1	General representing Staff.
2	. ,	2	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
3	FOR PUYALLUP TRIBE:	3	And could we hear from Public Counsel.
3	NICHOLAS THOMAS	4	MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon, Judge Howard.
4	Ogden Murphy Wallace	5	
_	901 Fifth Avenue		This is Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General,
5	Suite 3500 Seattle, Washington 98164	6	appearing on behalf of Public Counsel.
6	206-447-7000	7	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
	nthomas@omwlaw.com	8	Do we have AWEC?
7 8	FOR MICROSOFT:	9	MS. MOSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
9	TYLER PEPPLE	10	Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC.
	Davison Van Cleve	11	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
10	1750 Southwest Harbor Way	12	Do we have The Energy Project?
11	Suite 450 Portland, Oregon 97201	13	MR. ZAKAI: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
	971-710-1150	14	Yochi Zakai, Shute Mihaly & Weinberger, on behalf of The
12	tcp@dvclaw.com	15	Energy Project today.
13 14		16	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
	* * * *	17	Could we have an appearance for the Federal
15		18	Executive Agencies.
16 17		19	MS. LIOTTA: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
18		20	This is Rita Liotta with FEA.
19		21	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
20 21		22	Could we have an appearance for Nucor Steel.
22		23	MS. BAKER: This is Laura Baker with the
23		24	firm Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew on behalf of Nucor
24 25		25	Steel.
	Page 107		Page 109
1	LACEY, WASHINGTON; AUGUST 18, 2022	,	
		1	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2	1:00 p.m.	2	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And could we hear from counsel for Walmart.
2			
	1:00 p.m.	2	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart.
3	1:00 p.m. -o0o-	2	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki
3 4	1:00 p.m. -o0o-	2 3 4	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf
3 4 5	1:00 p.m. -o0o- P R O C E E D I N G S	2 3 4 5	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart.
3 4 5 6	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone.	2 3 4 5 6	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets	2 3 4 5 6 7	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint
3 4 5 6 7 8	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front
3 4 5 6 7 8	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on behalf of King County.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. Let's start our status conference today by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on behalf of King County. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. Let's start our status conference today by taking appearances, beginning with PSE.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on behalf of King County. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And do we have the representative for CENSE,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. Let's start our status conference today by taking appearances, beginning with PSE. MS. CARSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on behalf of King County. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And do we have the representative for CENSE, Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. Let's start our status conference today by taking appearances, beginning with PSE. MS. CARSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on behalf of King County. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And do we have the representative for CENSE, Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy? Mr. Hansen, it looks like you are on the call.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. Let's start our status conference today by taking appearances, beginning with PSE. MS. CARSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie representing PSE.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on behalf of King County. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And do we have the representative for CENSE, Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy? Mr. Hansen, it looks like you are on the call. You may need to unmute yourself.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. Let's start our status conference today by taking appearances, beginning with PSE. MS. CARSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie representing PSE. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on behalf of King County. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And do we have the representative for CENSE, Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy? Mr. Hansen, it looks like you are on the call. You may need to unmute yourself. MR. HANSEN: Yes. This is Norman Hansen on
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. Let's start our status conference today by taking appearances, beginning with PSE. MS. CARSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie representing PSE. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance for Staff.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on behalf of King County. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And do we have the representative for CENSE, Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy? Mr. Hansen, it looks like you are on the call. You may need to unmute yourself. MR. HANSEN: Yes. This is Norman Hansen on behalf of CENSE. We're on the call.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	1:00 p.mo0o- PROCEEDINGS JUDGE HOWARD: Good afternoon, everyone. We're here today for a status conference in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067. It's consolidated dockets. This case is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy. This is a general rate case filed by PSE. And we are here today for a status conference following the filed settlement and two other settlements in principle indicated by the parties. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. Let's start our status conference today by taking appearances, beginning with PSE. MS. CARSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie representing PSE. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And could we hear from counsel for Walmart. MS. BALDWIN: Good afternoon. This is Vicki Baldwin with the firm Parsons Behle & Latimer on behalf of Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance from the joint environmental advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered. MS. PAREKH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jaimini Parekh with the joint environmental advocates. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Do we have counsel for King County? MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Raul Martinez with King County Prosecutor's Office on behalf of King County. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And do we have the representative for CENSE, Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy? Mr. Hansen, it looks like you are on the call. You may need to unmute yourself. MR. HANSEN: Yes. This is Norman Hansen on

Page 110

JUDGE HOWARD: And could we hear from counsel for the Puyallup Tribe.

MR. THOMAS: Yes. Good afternoon, Your Honor. Nicholas Thomas here on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians.

I apologize. I'm having some issues with my laptop camera, but I'm attending telephonically. And that 917 number you see on the call is me.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And that is perfectly fine. It is just a status conference. Thank you.

So as the parties may be aware, I called this status conference today primarily to discuss the modifications to the procedural schedule in this case going forward.

On August 5th -- I believe it was -- we had the Green Direct settlement, a partial settlement, filed in these consolidated dockets. And on August 12th, PSE notified the Commission that it reached a settlement in principle with other parties of the case.

Specifically, there is a full multiparty settlement in principle. That includes Staff and three intervenors. There's also a partial multiparty settlement in principle between the Company, Federal Executive Agencies, and Microsoft.

Page 112

been proposed. But I do ask that the parties recognize the realities of the Commission evaluating and reviewing a very complex matter in such a narrow time window before the hearing with the benefit of all of the prefiled testimony.

So with that explanation, Ms. Carson, have the parties been able to confer any further about the schedule given some of the concerns that I've expressed?

MS. CARSON: The parties have not conferred more about the schedule. We do have some developments. We have some additional settling parties.

At least one -- Nucor Steel -- is now a party to the full multiparty settlement, as I understand it.

And they can address that as well. And I believe we have The Energy Project and the joint environmental advocates on board to the partial settlement, although I'll let them address that. I don't want to overstep.

So although we haven't spoken, I have a few thoughts. I think it will be very difficult to get the settlement agreement and the supporting testimony done before a week from Friday. And part of the reason is there has been a lot of time spent trying to bring these additional parties on board. A lot of back-and-forth.

And, of course, as you say, it's a wide-ranging settlement covering -- with several parties covering all

Page 111

PSE proposed a modified schedule, which maintained the evidentiary hearing date of October 3rd and October 4th, 2022, as I recall. And it indicated that no party opposed this proposed schedule. Following this e-mail from the parties, I suspended the procedural schedule with the exception of the hearing date and called this status conference to discuss the new modified schedule for the case going forward.

By e-mail to the parties, I indicated some concerns that the proposed schedule from the parties did not allow sufficient time for the Commission to prepare for the October hearing following the receipt of any opposition testimony to the settlement. PSE proposed that response testimony in opposition to the settlement would be due September 16th.

Along the lines of my earlier e-mail to the parties, it would be very helpful to the Commission if this date could be moved earlier, perhaps to September 7th or September 9th, and possibly we could move the preceding dates leading up to that -- so just a submission of the settlement and joint testimony itself -- up a couple days, perhaps to August 24th.

And I recognize that these are very limited timeframes we're talking about. This may be difficult for the parties to limit the time further from what has

Page 113

issues. So I think it will be difficult to file the settlement agreement and supporting testimony before August 26th.

I would say, though, that it's really narrowed in terms of what's being opposed. And what is being opposed, as I understand it, is the LNG facility by two parties who have already filed testimony opposing it. Energize Eastside by CENSE, who has already filed testimony opposing it, and Public Counsel may have one or two other areas, again, which they have filed testimony about.

So I do think the time for opposition to the settlement could probably be narrowed from the 21 days given that it seems like it will be somewhat repetitive of what's already been filed in the case.

And then I guess my last thought is I don't know if it's possible to slightly move the hearing dates if more time is needed, perhaps a week out. What is very important to PSE and was part of the agreement is that the statutory suspension date would not be waived or moved. And so that's of critical importance for PSE. PSE is willing to do -- you know, to work with all the parties, but that's one thing that is very important to PSE.

JUDGE HOWARD: I can understand that latter

Page 114

point, and that's within the Company's discretion on that issue.

I did consider attempting to move the hearing date perhaps a week or two later. Even if it were possible, that could be difficult given just the number of issues and the Commission's review of the case and preparing a suitable final order.

And in this particular instance, the Commissioners are -- I believe they are traveling the following week, and they have a number of commitments already in their schedule that would seem to make it frankly impossible to set aside enough time to have a hearing in this case where I would be comfortable that we would not be quickly running out of time.

As far as preparing the settlement, I mean, I do recognize that it cannot simply be filed by -- in a few days -- in a matter of a few days. It does take effort and time. I would ask the parties to consider whether that date could be moved up perhaps a couple of days, perhaps to August 24th. But that's a point we can return to.

And, Ms. Carson, I agree with your observations. Of course, I'm not the Commissioner. I'm not the final decision-maker in this case. But it does seem that hopefully the scope of the opposition to the

all I have to say.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Well, I think that this does put us in a bit of a difficult situation if the parties are bound to support the proposed schedule. I'm not certain how much -- how much it would be helpful to break and go off the record for the parties to discuss this issue.

Would any of the other parties like to raise a concern or proposal or something along those lines?

MS. GAFKEN: I came off of camera, Judge -- or I'm sorry. Tyler Pepple raised his hand. So I will let him go first and I will go second.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{JUDGE}}$ HOWARD: Oh, thank you. I did not see that.

Mr. Pepple, why don't you proceed, and then we'll hear from Ms. Gafken.

MR. PEPPLE: This is actually just -- sorry
to derail. I just wanted to enter my appearance for the
record on behalf of Microsoft. I think I just got
overlooked there. So that was all.

JUDGE HOWARD: I apologize. I apologize. I did not have Microsoft on my list.

MR. PEPPLE: That's okay.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Pepple. Ms. Gafken, what were you going to raise?

Page 115

settlement would be relatively narrow and the parties would be referring in large part to earlier filed responsive testimony.

Mr. Roberson, what is Staff's position on that?

MR. ROBERSON: Thank you, Judge Howard. I guess I would make three points.

One, the settlement agreement contains a term that obligates Staff to support the schedule that we've presented to the Commission. So I have to advocate for it.

Second, this is probably the most challenging rate case I've ever worked on. The parties have worked incredibly diligently. I mean, settlement negotiations have gone on for days. They are still ongoing as of, like, 40 minutes ago or something like that. The parties aren't dragging their feet. They're moving as fast as they can.

And the third point I would make is I feel like there is no way Staff can have testimony ready before the date, which is, I believe, next Friday. It just can't be done.

But it puts the Commission in a hard place. You obviously have the discretion to reject the settlement scheduled that's been proposed. But I feel like it's the only workable schedule. And, yeah, that's Page 117

Page 116

MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. I just wanted to reiterate the point that was -- well, reiterate and then expand on the point that was raised earlier about this being a very complicated case.

At some point during this case -- I don't remember who, but somebody represented that this was the most complicated PSE case or the most substantial PSE case in a decade, and I can say that that is absolutely a fair representation.

I think a comparable case might have been one Puget case that had -- I don't know -- seven different settlements. This case is of a similar stature, which, I think, gives some credence to the Commission's concerns about being able to process it in the time that we have.

Having said that, the parties have really been diligent in working through the issues and have worked very well together to come to some resolution.

You know, from Public Counsel's perspective, shortening the time really would be difficult. The parties are all pretty familiar, and I think the Commission is fairly familiar with our internal process of obtaining the appropriate authorizations.

And so I would defer a bit to the other settling parties since we're not a settling party at

Page 118

this point. But I certainly would not be able to get authority by the 24th. It's going to be hard to do that by the 26th, as it is.

1 2

And then in terms of -- there are pieces of the settlement that Public Counsel will be opposing, and we have filed our primary cases. But we don't know what supporting evidence the settling parties will be presenting. And so that's the one area that I think -- it's a bit of an unknown.

And I'm sorry. I was told that I was breaking up. Am I coming through okay?

JUDGE HOWARD: Much better now. Thank you.
MS. GAFKEN: Okay. My apologies. The
Internet has been not my friend today. All day.

So I was just saying that it's a little bit of an unknown exactly what the settling parties will file in support of the settlements. And so I'm a little bit hesitant to say with any absolution that we could shorten the time significantly. You know, there is 21 days built into it. We probably could shave a few days off of it. But I'm a bit hesitant to strongly advocate for that.

And as has been noted, the proposed schedule was something that the parties did consider. We did consider the timeline, the Commission's needs, the

And we are concerned about having less time than what the parties agreed to.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I can appreciate that this is not -- this is not an easy situation. It's a very complicated case. And now, we're dealing with a fairly defined short timeframe to fit all of these steps in.

Since I am speaking to you, I was curious, has Puyallup Tribe joined the partial multiparty settlement?

MR. THOMAS: This is still a point of internal discussion, Your Honor. As you may recall from order number three, once upon a time, our participation in this matter is fairly limited. So our involvement may well be outside the terms of that particular agreement. Our involvement was limited to Tacoma LNG.

But it does raise a good point. Whether or not we're a party to that settlement, it's likely that one or two of the settlements is going to resolve a lot of this case, and the contested issues moving forward will be limited.

So maybe that will help the Commission in terms of the amount of time that it needs to review the response testimony filed in this matter. Basically, it won't have as much to review and consider between the 16th and October 3rd.

Page 119

parties' needs. And so we tried to balance that the best that we could. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Gafken. I see Mr. Thomas has his hand raised.

MR. THOMAS: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

I just wanted to let you know that the Tribe is similarly situated to Public Counsel in that we will likely be one of the parties submitting the testimony in response to the settlement agreement and the testimony that will be filed sometime next week. And so we wanted for you to hear our perspective very briefly. I think Public Counsel summed it up fairly well.

We are similarly concerned just that we do not know what is going to be filed in support of the settlement and are a little bit worried that 21 days to go through everything, work with witnesses in the event that we are going to be submitting additional testimony in response, and pulling that all together -- 21 days is itself going to be pretty tight.

And so I just wanted to make sure I made a record on the fact that we are concerned about the runway getting any shorter in terms of response testimony being prepared and filed.

So frankly, we'd like more time than September 16th, but September 16th does represent a compromise.

Page 121

Page 120

JUDGE HOWARD: I imagine. And in terms of the Puyallup Tribe itself -- and I'm not trying to debate you on this point necessarily -- but we do already have the Tribe's prefiled response testimony from -- I believe it was Dr. Sahu.

And so if the Tribe is continuing to oppose the settlement on the LNG issue, it does seem to me that a lot of that work has already been done with the prefiled response testimony. And we also have the opportunity for cross at the settlement hearing on October 3rd and 4th

So I do hope that -- I do hope that those considerations sort of mollify the concerns somewhat around having a short turnaround for response testimony.

Would any other party -- oh, Mr. Thomas, would you like to respond?

MR. THOMAS: Well, I wasn't sure if you were inviting me to.

But, no, I appreciate that point. I understand where Your Honor is coming from on that. The concern remains. We don't know what will be filed on August 26th and whether or not there's going to be more response testimony that we feel we need to provide, which we have a right to do.

So that would be all I'd say. Thank you.

5 (Pages 118 to 121)

point.

Page 122

JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, you have your hand raised.

MS. CARSON: Yes. I just wanted to add one point that may be obvious, but I don't know if it is or not.

All the parties, including the parties who have opposed this settlement or are currently opposing this settlement, have been involved in the back-and-forth, the settlement negotiations. And so in terms of what is in the settlement agreement, it should not be a surprise at all to parties who oppose the settlement. They are being included and involved up to this point in time.

JUDGE HOWARD: Well, I can tell you all that my normal step here would be to ask the parties to confer off the record and cajole and hope that we get some new agreements, but I'm not sure that that's going to happen at this point.

Would any of the other parties like to respond on the issue of the schedule? And then I would like to ask some specific questions about where some of the intervenors are on joining settlements.

But were there any -- Mr. Thomas, you still have your hand raised.

MR. THOMAS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Between the phone and the Zoom call, I failed to take it down.

I think, in light of that request, I would plan to take a brief -- we could have a brief discussion off the record, hopefully just a relatively brief period of time. I'm going to leave that to either Public Counsel or Staff's counsel to send me a message to let me know when I should rejoin the Zoom call.

Before we do that, would any other party like to raise any concerns before we go off the record?

All right. I'm not hearing any. We'll go off the record. I would anticipate a relatively short ten-to-15-minute discussion. If the parties are having a worthwhile discussion that takes a little bit longer than that, that's perfectly fine. Just let me know when to rejoin the Zoom call.

And when we come back onto the record, we'll discuss a couple of other issues about where intervenors are at in terms of joining settlements, and I also wanted to touch on CENSE's participation in the case.

All right. So we are off the record. (Discussion off the record.)

JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the record.

Ms. Gafken, I am informed that the parties do have a proposal to present. So would you mind relaying that.

MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Thank you.

Page 123

I'll do that now.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. No problem.

Would any of the other parties like to raise any concerns at this point given some of the comments by the parties at our status conference today?

I am thinking it may not be helpful to go off the record and attempt to have further discussion among the parties. I believe that I may simply have to enter an order setting forth the modified schedule.

Ms. Gafken, you have your hand raised. Ms. GAFKEN: Yeah. Thank you.

I guess I would make a suggestion that we do take just a very brief time to consult with the parties. I understand it's kind of a futile feeling that that might have, but I do have a suggestion that I'd like to run by the parties, and I haven't had a chance to do that. And I don't necessarily want to do that here on the record before talking with the parties unless I have to.

So I would like a few minutes, once we get through with this part of the status conference, to have a brief conversation with folks to see if maybe we can come up with something that might be a little more --well, workable is relative, I guess.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.

Page 125

Page 124

The parties do have a proposal to share. We certainly hear the Commission's concerns about the schedule. Total settlements have the right to present their case under WAC 480.07.740, Subsection C.

The proposal that the parties initially came up with had the opposition filings on Friday, September 16th. We are proposing that we move that date to Monday, September 12th.

And while there are still some concerns about the timing of that and having enough time to make the presentations that we want to and need to, the September 12th would provide more time for the Commission while still providing some time. I hesitate to say adequate time, but it would give the parties time to make their presentations as well.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Ms. Gafken.

Would any of the other -MS. GAFKEN: I guess -JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.
MS. GAFKEN: I'm sorry. Just one more

You had mentioned either September 7th or September 9th earlier in the status conference, and there was quite a bit of concern about that, even from

6 (Pages 122 to 125)

Page 126 Public Counsel's standpoint. It's very difficult to pull together a presentation by the 7th or the 9th, but I think we could by the 12th. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Would any of the other parties like to add anything to that? MR. THOMAS: Judge Howard, Nick Thomas for the Tribe. If I may, very briefly. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. THOMAS: Thank you. I just want to make sure I'm making a record on this. We would prefer the 16th. This new deadline does exacerbate the concerns that I articulated earlier in today's conference. But if the response testimony deadline is going to be moved up, we would prefer

September 12th to an earlier deadline.

And that's all I have to say.

2.0

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you,
Mr. Thomas. And I will -- from my memory, the Tribe's
participation in this case is limited in focus to the
Tacoma LNG issue and some low-income customer issues; is
that right?

MR. THOMAS: Correct, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think I stated

and we've already touched on this some, would be clarifying some of the parties' positions and where they're at right now with respect to some of the settlements.

Page 128

Ms. Gafken, do I remember right that Public Counsel is still considering whether to join the partial multiparty settlement?

MS. GAFKEN: That is correct. I actually don't have authority to say one way or another on any of the pieces, but I do anticipate that we will be opposing the LNG settlement. And then we are considering joining the multiparty settlement. There is one component of the multiparty settlement that I also believe we will be opposing. So there's one other issue contained within that settlement.

But I do think that -- I mean, there are many terms that we view as favorable as well. So I think we will be in something of a supporting stance with that settlement.

JUDGE HOWARD: And, again, I recognize that it's difficult to predict exactly how this all may play out

But if Public Counsel ends up taking this generally supportive position of the settlement or generally neutral position on many aspects of the

Page 127

my observations earlier that it does seem that whatever response testimony would be filed in opposition to the settlement would -- that much of the work has already been done given the fact that we have response testimony filed in this case. I believe it was in July. And that's still in the record.

And especially on the issue of LNG, while that is a complex issue, the Tribe has offered extensive testimony about it. So I just want to note the observation.

And with regards to the parties' proposal for September 12th, I do appreciate the movement on this. I recognize that any movement earlier is difficult. It is difficult for experts and regulatory analysts to make this work.

But also, I would like the parties to bear in mind that the Commission is -- the Commissioners do need to be properly advised and informed walking into the settlement hearing, and it is going to be a heroic effort at this point for our policy team to pull that off in time for the hearing.

So I'm going to take this all under consideration and think about it very carefully. I'm not going to give a verbal ruling today on the schedule.

So the next main issue I want to discuss today,

Page 129

settlement, would Public Counsel still be referring the Commission to its testimony filed earlier on issues like cost of capital and depreciation and other issues?

MS. GAFKEN: So on the issues that we are opposing, I think there's kind of two parts. And just talking generally, right -- so as you noted, we have filed our responsive testimony addressing all of the issues that we're addressing in the case.

I think the pieces that remain contested would be pulled forward, and there may be additional discussion and testimony provided as well in response to the settlement in particular because the settlement is going to be a different position than the initial filing. It will be a different position than the parties filed because of the compromise, right? It's a different thing.

As Ms. Carson noted, we do know what the terms are. We don't know what the supporting evidence is going to be. So that's the piece that I don't want to pretend like I know. But I do know what the terms are, and I do know where the sticking points are. So we're not sitting on our laurels waiting for the deadline to be set. We know that we need to start working now.

In terms of the pieces that I anticipate supporting or the pieces that I think are favorable and

Page 130 Page 132 1 in the public interest, I would want to point those 1 MS. LIOTTA: Your Honor, this is Rita --2 things out, too. So that would be new testimony. That 2 MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor -would be new testimony that likely points back to the 3 3 MS. LIOTTA: Oh, I'm sorry. testimony that we have already filed. MR. XENOPOULOS: No problem. 4 4 So it's pretty similar, I think, to what we 5 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's hear from Ms. Liotta 5 6 filed in the Avista case where we supported some pieces 6 first, and then we'll turn to the second. 7 of that settlement and opposed other pieces. So it's 7 MS. LIOTTA: Your Honor, Rita Liotta with 8 not going to be exactly -- it won't be exactly the same, 8 FEA, and we anticipate joining the partial multiparty 9 9 but the framework will be similar. settlement as well. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 10 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Ms. Liotta, you cut out a little bit towards the end. But am I correct And I wanted to check in with The Energy 11 11 Project. We heard earlier from PSE's counsel, but PSE 12 in hearing that FEA anticipates joining the partial 12 did not necessarily want to speak for The Energy multiparty settlements? 13 13 Project. MS. LIOTTA: Yes, Your Honor. That's 14 14 15 Mr. Zakai, would you mind updating us? 15 correct. MR. ZAKAI: Yes, Judge Howard. Thank you 16 16 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 17 17 Was there another representative who was about 18 The Energy Project is generally supportive of 18 to speak there? the term sheet that has been circulated. I, of course, MR. XENOPOULOS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank 19 19 you. This is Damon Xenopoulos from Nucor Steel Seattle. 20 would like to reserve my right to look at that final 20 settlement document, which has not yet been drafted, 21 and we anticipate joining the full settlement. 21 22 before obligating my client to a certain position. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 22 MR. XENOPOULOS: Thank you. 23 But the term sheet that has been drafted has 23 24 incorporated our input, and we are hopeful that we will 24 MR. HANSEN: This is Norm Hansen for CENSE. 25 be able to sign on to the final settlement agreement. 25 Can you hear me? Page 131 Page 133 1 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 1 JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Could I hear from the joint environmental 2 MR. HANSEN: Yes. Of course, our issue is 2 3 advocates and where these organizations are at with 3 limited in scope, as you know, to the Energize Eastside, 4 4 which is a \$300 million project. So, of course, we respect to the settlement. 5 5 would be objecting to the prudency of Energize Eastside, MS. PAREKH: Yes. Thank you, Judge Howard. 6 Our position is essentially the same as The 6 which is included at the current time in the current 7 Energy Project. There's still some pieces that need to 7 proposal for settlement. 8 be put together. So we haven't seen a final complete 8 And it's interesting to me that this Energize version of the term sheet, but we anticipate joining the 9 9 Eastside is \$300 million, and I noted that they were 10 partial agreement. We will not be joining the LNG --10 talking about electric rates of 223 million. So it's I'm sorry. We will not be joining the full agreement. 11 just a point of information. 11 12 JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. And in this particular 12 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for the 13 instance, the full agreement also contains the terms 13 update, Mr. Hansen. about the Tacoma LNG. 14 MR. HANSEN: You're welcome. 14 Mr. Zakai, you have your hand raised. JUDGE HOWARD: And the last issue I wanted 15 15 MR. ZAKAI: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. 16 to just briefly touch on at our status conference today 16 17 I wanted to make a clarification that that is 17 is CENSE's response testimony filed by Mr. Lockhart. And as the parties are aware, I e-mailed the 18 also The Energy Project's position. We would not be 18 joining the LNG settlement, but we would be signing on 19 19 parties to simply raise some concern to ensure that 20 to the other terms. 20 Mr. Lockhart's testimony was in fact filed on behalf of 21 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 21 CENSE. 22 And we did hear from the Puyallup Tribe. Would 22 And I will turn to Mr. Hansen as the 23 any of the other parties like to give the Commission any 23 representative of record for that organization to 24 updates on where they're at with respect to the 24 address that point. Mr. Hansen, would you mind settlement that I perhaps overlooked?

25

addressing that.

25

Page 134 Page 136 MR. HANSEN: Yes. I can confirm that it was 1 1 that suspended. 2 filed on behalf of CENSE. 2 JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to make a note 3 We had an unusual situation here because we 3 here. have limited funds. As you know, we requested a grant 4 4 So I think that there are -- Ms. Carson, as you 5 5 of \$80,000, and we received 50-. And within the last know, there's at least one or two deadlines that we may 6 few months, we ran out of funds, so therefore we lost 6 need to include in the schedule going forward for the 7 our legal representation. 7 case that we haven't yet talked about yet or the parties 8 8 haven't included yet in their proposal from their So this was a little bit of a different 9 9 process, as you are aware, of filing it. That may have e-mail. One of those would be the joint issues matrix. 10 caused some confusion. But I think we're working to do 10 If I recall right, there was one filed already, the best we can. 11 and I think we just referred to that. I anticipate, 11 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Hansen. I regardless of where I fall on the deadline for response 12 12 testimony in the settlement, that I will carry over the 13 13 just want to reiterate that I wasn't intending to express any criticism about necessarily how it was deadlines that we had in the prehearing conference order 14 14 15 filed. I was simply trying to confirm that the 15 for the joint issues matrix. 16 testimony was on behalf of your organization, and I felt 16 So we have the joint issues matrix due 17 it was better to clarify this at this juncture rather 17 September 26th. If that's already been filed, then it's 18 18 already been filed. It may need to be updated in light than closer to the hearing. 19 MR. HANSEN: Yes. I can confirm that. 19 of a new settlement. 20 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 20 And I believe there was an updated joint issues Is there anything else that we should address 21 matrix deadline in connection with the posthearing 21 today before we adjourn this status conference? briefing on October 31st. And I would anticipate 22 22 23 MS. CARSON: Actually, I do have one issue, 23 carrying over the deadline for the posthearing briefing, 24 Your Honor. 24 expecting the parties may want that opportunity. 25 I wanted to clarify -- and you can address this 25 Are there any objections or concerns to my Page 135 Page 137 when you revise the schedule. But I wanted to 1 1 carrying over those two points from the prehearing 2 2 understand if a joint issues matrix will be needed and conference order? 3 MS. CARSON: I have no objections or for you to include that one way or the other in the 3 concerns about that. I do think it would be good to 4 order. Obviously, we've circulated one. But it's very 4 5 different now with the settlement, and it's not clear if 5 preserve the briefing dates. 6 it's still needed. So I guess that's one question I 6 And just one point of clarification. We have 7 would have. 7 not filed. We were required to circulate the joint 8 And one other issue is, I think there still 8 issues matrix. I don't think the filing date was until September 26th. So it has not yet been filed, and it 9 needs to be a public comment hearing scheduled. Has 9 10 that been scheduled? 10 would probably look a little different now that there's JUDGE HOWARD: I'm not aware of it being 11 11 a settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. That certainly 12 scheduled. 12 Ms. Gafken, would Public Counsel speak to that? 13 13 makes sense. MS. GAFKEN: Yes. So it has been scheduled. 14 14 Any other statements or concerns from any of 15 If you bear with me just a second, I'll pull up my 15 the parties? calendar and find the date. It's in September. 16 16 All right. Hearing none, is there anything 17 Oh, it's currently scheduled for September 28th 17 else we should address today before we adjourn? 18 in the evening. 6:00 or 6:30. I can't remember what 18 All right. I will plan on issuing either a 19 time the start time is, but it's that evening time that 19 notice or an order soon setting forth the modified 20 we usually see. But September 28th is when it's 20 schedule for this case going forward. 21 scheduled for. 21 We are adjourned. Thank you. 22 MS. CARSON: Thank you. (Proceedings adjourned at 1:53 p.m.) 22 23 JUDGE HOWARD: Great. 23

24

25

MS. GAFKEN: And, of course, we would want

to keep that on the procedural schedule and not have

24

25

*	Page 138	
1	CERTIFICATE	
2		
3	STATE OF WASHINGTON	
4	COUNTY OF KING	
5 6	I, Rose Detloff, a Certified Court Reporter in	
7	and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that	
8	the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the	
9	best of my knowledge, skill and ability.	
10		
11		
12 13	willy rane Datleff	
14	ROSE DETLOFF, RMR, CRR, CCR #21036100	
15	,,	
16	My commission expires:	
17	DECEMBER 6, 2022	
18		
19 20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	ahead 125:20	104:15 105:10,15	breaking 118:10	126:21 127:5
A	ALLIANCE 104:2	105:21 106:4	Brew 104:20	129:8 130:6 136:7
ability 138:9	allow 111:11	Avista 130:6	108:24	137:20
able 112:7 117:14 118:1 130:25	amount 120:22	aware 110:12	Bridle 105:21	cases 118:6
	analysts 127:14	133:18 134:9	brief 123:13,22	caused 134:10
absolutely 117:8 absolution 118:18	anticipate 124:10	135:11	124:2,2,3	CCR 102:25
accurate 138:8	128:10 129:24	AWEC 108:8,10	briefing 136:22,23	138:14
add 122:3 126:7	131:9 132:8,21		137:5	CENSE 109:18,23
add 122.3 120.7 additional 112:11	136:11,22	B	briefly 119:11	113:8 132:24
112:23 119:17	anticipates 132:12	back 124:15 130:3	126:9 133:16	133:21 134:2
129:10	apologies 118:13	back-and-forth	bring 112:22	CENSE's 124:18
address 112:14,17	apologize 110:6	112:23 122:8	built 118:20	133:17
133:24 134:21,25	116:21,21	Baker 104:19		Centered 109:9
137:17	appearance 107:23	108:23,23	C	certain 116:5
addressing 129:7,8	108:17,22 109:7	balance 119:1	C 103:1 104:1	130:22
133:25	116:18	Baldwin 105:3	105:1 106:1 107:4	certainly 118:1
adequate 125:13	appearances	109:3,4	125:4 138:1,1	125:2 137:12
adjourn 134:22	107:18	Basically 120:23	cajole 122:15	Certified 138:6
137:17	appeared 102:20	bear 127:16 135:15	calendar 135:16	certify 138:7
adjourned 137:21	appearing 108:6	beginning 107:18	California 104:10	challenging 115:11
137:22	appreciate 120:4	behalf 108:6,10,14	104:16	chance 123:16
Administrative	121:19 127:12	108:24 109:4,16	call 109:20,23	check 130:11
102:12 103:2	appropriate 117:23	109:23 110:4	110:8 122:25	circulate 137:7
107:16	area 118:8	116:19 133:20	124:6,14	circulated 130:19
advised 127:18	areas 113:10	134:2,16	called 110:12 111:7	135:4
advocate 115:9	articulated 126:14	Behle 105:4 109:4	camera 110:7	City 105:5
118:21	aside 114:12	believe 110:16	116:10	clarification
advocates 105:8	aspects 128:25	112:14 114:9	capital 129:3	131:17 137:6
109:8,11 112:16	Assistant 103:6,17	115:20 121:5 123:8 127:5	captioned 107:9 carefully 127:23	clarify 134:17,25
131:3	107:25 108:5	128:13 136:20	carefully 127:23	clarifying 128:2
afternoon 107:6,19	attempt 123:7	Bellevue 103:13	carrying 136:23	clear 135:5
107:24 108:4,9,13	attempting 114:3	benefit 112:4	137:1	Cleve 104:4 106:9
108:19 109:3,10	attending 110:7	best 119:2 134:11	Carson 103:11	client 130:22 closer 134:18
109:14 110:3	Attorney 103:6,7	138:9	107:19,20 112:6,9	Club 105:21 109:8
Agencies 104:13	103:17,18 104:14 107:25 108:5	better 118:12	114:22 122:1,3	Coalition 105:19
108:18 110:25	August 102:24	134:17	129:17 134:23	109:19
ago 115:15	107:1 110:16,18	bit 116:3 117:24	135:22 136:4	Coie 103:12 107:20
agree 114:22	111:22 113:3	118:9,15,17,21	137:3	come 117:18
agreed 120:2	111:22 113:3	119:15 124:12	case 107:9,11	123:23 124:15
agreement 112:20	authority 118:2	125:25 132:11	110:14,20 111:8	comfortable 114:13
113:2,19 115:7	128:9	134:8	113:15 114:6,13	coming 118:11
119:9 120:15	authorizations	board 112:16,23	114:24 115:12	121:20
122:10 130:25	117:23	bound 116:4	117:4,5,7,8,10,11	comment 135:9
131:10,11,13 agreements 122:16	Avenue 103:19	Box 103:7	117:12 120:5,19	comments 123:4
agreements 122.10		break 116:6	124:18 125:4	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	1		1	
commission 102:2	110:10,13 111:7	109:13,15,16	debate 121:3	105:1,1 106:1,1
102:4,15 103:5	123:5,21 125:24	138:4	decade 117:8	107:4,4 138:1,1
107:10,16 110:19	126:15 133:16	couple 111:22	DECEMBER	e-mail 111:5,9,16
111:11,17 112:2	134:22 136:14	114:19 124:16	138:17	136:9
115:9,22 117:22	137:2	course 112:24	decision-maker	e-mailed 133:18
120:21 125:12	conferred 112:9	114:23 130:19	114:24	earlier 111:16,18
127:17 129:2	confirm 134:1,15	133:2,4 135:24	defer 117:24	115:2 117:3
131:23 138:16	134:19	Court 138:6	defined 120:6	125:24 126:14,17
Commission's	confusion 134:10	covering 112:25,25	depreciation 129:3	127:1,13 129:2
114:6 117:13	connection 136:21	credence 117:13	derail 116:18	130:12
118:25 125:2	consider 114:3,18	critical 113:21	Detloff 102:25	Earthjustice 105:9
Commissioner	118:24,25 120:24	criticism 134:14	138:6,14	Eastside 105:19
114:23	consideration	cross 121:10	developments	109:19 113:8
Commissioners	127:23	CRR 102:25	112:10	133:3,5,9
114:9 127:17	considerations	138:14	dex@smxblaw.c	easy 120:4
commitments	121:13	curious 120:8	104:23	effort 114:18
114:10	considering 128:6	current 133:6,6	different 117:11	127:20
Community 105:21	128:11	currently 122:7	129:13,14,16	either 124:4 125:23
Company 110:24	consolidated 102:5	135:17	134:8 135:5	137:18
Company's 114:1	107:8 110:18	customer 126:22	137:10	electric 133:10
comparable 117:10	consult 123:13	cut 132:11	difficult 111:24	ends 128:23
Complainant 102:5	CONSUMERS	D	112:19 113:1	Energize 113:8
complete 131:8	104:2		114:5 116:3	133:3,5,8
complex 112:3	Cont 104:1 105:1	D 107:4	117:20 126:1	Energy 102:7
127:8	106:1	Damon 104:20	127:13,14 128:21	103:10 104:2,8
complicated 117:4	contained 128:14	132:20	diligent 117:17	105:19 107:10
117:7 120:5	contains 115:7	date 102:24 111:2,6	diligently 115:13	108:12,15 109:19
component 128:12	131:13	111:18 113:20	Direct 110:17	112:15 130:11,13
compromise	contested 120:19	114:4,19 115:20	discretion 114:1	130:18 131:7,18
119:25 129:15	129:9	125:7 135:16	115:23	ensure 133:19
concern 116:9	continuing 121:6	137:8	discuss 110:13	enter 116:18 123:8
121:20 125:25	conversation	dates 111:20 113:17 137:5	111:7 116:7	environmental
133:19	123:22	Davison 104:4	124:16 127:25	105:8 109:8,11
concerned 119:13	correct 126:24	106:9	discussion 120:11	112:15 131:2
119:21 120:1	128:8 132:11,15	day 118:14	123:7 124:2,11,12	especially 127:7
concerns 111:10	cost 129:3	days 111:22 113:13	124:20 129:11	essentially 131:6
112:8 117:14	counsel 103:16,18	114:17,17,20	dockets 102:3	evaluating 112:2
121:13 123:4	108:3,6 109:2,13	114.17,17,20	107:7,8 110:18	evening 135:18,19
124:8 125:2,9	110:2 113:9 118:5	119:15,18	document 130:21	event 119:16
126:14 136:25	119:7,12 124:4,5	DC 104:22	Dr 121:5	evidence 118:7
137:4,14	128:6,23 129:1	deadline 126:13,16	drafted 130:21,23	129:18
confer 112:7	130:12 135:13	126:17 129:22	dragging 115:16	evidentiary 111:2
122:15	Counsel's 117:19	136:12,21,23	due 111:15 136:16	exacerbate 126:14
conference 102:9	126:1	deadlines 136:5,14		exactly 118:16
107:7,12,17	County 105:13,15	dealing 120:6	E 103:1,1 104:1,1	128:21 130:8,8
		40000 120.0	2 103.1,1 107.1,1	

avaantian 111.6	122.17 20 124.2	118:13 119:3	100.20 22 22 25	100.1 6 12 17 24
exception 111:6 Executive 104:13	133:17,20 134:2 134:15 136:10,17	123:10,11 124:22	109:20,22,22,25 132:24,24 133:2	109:1,6,12,17,24 110:1,9 113:25
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ·	*
108:18 110:25	136:18 137:7,9	124:25 125:17,19	133:13,14,22,24	115:5 116:2,13,21
expand 117:3	filing 129:14 134:9	125:21 126:5	134:1,12,19	116:24 118:12
expecting 136:24	137:8	128:5,8 129:4	hansennp@aol.c	119:3 120:3 121:1
experts 127:14	filings 125:6	135:13,14,24	105:23	122:1,13 123:2,25
expires 138:16	final 114:7,24	general 103:6,7,17	happen 122:17	124:21 125:16,20
explanation 112:6	130:20,25 131:8	107:11 108:1,5	Harbor 104:4	126:4,6,8,10,19
express 134:14	find 135:16	General's 103:18	106:10	126:25 128:20
expressed 112:8	fine 110:10 124:13	generally 128:24	hard 115:22 118:2	130:10,16 131:1,5
extensive 127:8	firm 108:24 109:4	128:25 129:6	Hayes 104:10	131:12,21 132:5
	first 116:12 132:6	130:18	hear 108:3 109:2	132:10,16,22
	fit 120:7	getting 119:22	110:1 116:16	133:1,12,15
F 138:1	Floor 104:21	give 125:14 127:24	119:11 125:2	134:12,20 135:11
facility 113:6	focus 126:21	131:23	131:2,22 132:5,25	135:23 136:2
fact 119:21 127:4	folks 123:22	given 112:8 113:14	heard 130:12	137:12
133:20	following 107:12	114:5 123:4 127:4	hearing 111:2,6,12	I
failed 122:25	111:4,12 114:10	gives 117:13	112:4 113:17	
fair 117:9	foregoing 138:8	go 116:6,12,12	114:3,13 121:10	II 102:10
fairly 117:22	forth 123:9 137:19	119:16 123:6	124:9 127:19,21	imagine 121:1
119:12 120:6,13	forward 110:15	124:8,9 125:20	132:12 134:18	importance 113:21
fall 136:12	111:8 120:19	going 110:15 111:8	135:9 137:16	important 113:19
familiar 117:21,22	129:10 136:6	116:25 118:2	help 120:21	113:23
far 114:15	137:20	119:14,17,19	helpful 111:17	impossible 114:12
fast 115:17	Fourth 103:12	120:18 121:22	116:5 123:6	include 135:3 136:6
favorable 128:17	framework 130:9	122:16 124:4	heroic 127:19	included 122:12
129:25	Francisco 104:10	126:16 127:19,22	hesitant 118:18,21	133:6 136:8
FEA 108:20 132:8	104:16	127:24 129:13,19	hesitate 125:13	includes 110:22
132:12	frankly 114:12	130:8 136:2,6	Honor 107:19	including 122:6
Federal 104:13	119:24	137:20	108:9,13,19	incorporated
108:17 110:24	Friday 112:21	good 107:6,19,24	109:10,14 110:4	130:24
feel 115:18,24	115:20 125:6	108:4,9,13,19	119:5 120:11	incredibly 115:13
121:23	friend 118:14	109:3,10,14 110:3	121:20 122:24	Indians 110:5
feeling 123:14	Front 109:8	120:16 137:4	126:24 131:16	indicated 107:14
feet 115:16	full 110:21 112:13	grant 134:4	132:1,2,7,14,19	111:3,9
felt 134:16	131:11,13 132:21	Great 135:23	134:24	information 133:11
Fifth 103:19 106:4	funds 134:4,6	Green 110:17	hope 121:12,12	informed 124:22
file 113:1 118:16	further 111:25	guess 113:16 115:6	122:15	127:18
filed 107:11,12	112:7 123:7	123:12,24 125:19	hopeful 130:24	initial 129:13
110:17 113:7,8,10	futile 123:14	135:6	hopefully 114:25	initially 125:5
113:15 114:16			124:3	input 130:24
115:2 118:6	G	Н	Howard 102:12	instance 114:8
119:10,14,23	G 107:4	hand 116:11 119:4	103:3 107:6,15,22	131:13
120:23 121:21	Gafken 103:17	122:2,23 123:10	107:24 108:2,4,7	intending 134:13
127:2,5 129:2,7	108:4,5 116:10,16	131:15	108:11,16,21	interest 130:1
129:15 130:4,6	116:25 117:1	Hansen 105:20		interesting 133:8
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

1117.00	100 21 100 1 6 12	1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2,	10610	120.10
internal 117:22	108:21 109:1,6,12	laurels 129:22	making 126:12	120:19
120:11	109:17,24 110:1,9	Law 102:12 103:2	Martinez 105:14	multiparty 110:21
Internet 118:14	113:25 115:5	104:14 107:16	109:14,15	110:23 112:13
intervenors 110:23	116:2,10,13,21,24	law@smxblaw.c	matrix 135:2 136:9	120:9 128:7,12,13
122:21 124:16	118:12 119:3	104:23	136:15,16,21	132:8,13
inviting 121:18	120:3 121:1 122:1	leading 111:20	137:8	Murphy 106:4
involved 122:8,12	122:13 123:2,25	leave 124:4	matter 112:3	
involvement	124:21 125:16,20	legal 134:7	114:17 120:13,23	$\frac{1}{N}$ 103:1 104:1
120:13,15	126:4,6,8,10,19	Let's 107:17 124:21	Mattheis 104:20	
issue 114:2 116:7	126:25 128:20	132:5	108:24	105:1 106:1 107:4
121:7 122:19	130:10,16 131:1,5	light 124:1 136:18	mean 114:15	name 107:15
126:22 127:7,8,25	131:12,21 132:5	limit 111:25	115:13 128:16	narrow 112:3
128:14 133:2,15	132:10,16,22	limited 111:23	memory 126:20	115:1
134:23 135:8	133:1,12,15	120:13,15,20	mentioned 125:23	narrowed 113:4,13
issues 110:6 113:1	134:12,20 135:11	126:21 133:3	message 124:5	necessarily 121:3
114:6 117:17	135:23 136:2	134:4	Michael 102:12	123:17 130:13
120:19 124:16	137:12	lines 111:16 116:9	103:3 107:15	134:14
126:22 129:2,3,4	July 127:5	Liotta 104:14	Microsoft 106:8	need 109:21 121:23
129:8 135:2 136:9	juncture 134:17	108:19,20 132:1,3	110:25 116:19,22	125:11 127:17
136:15,16,20	T7	132:5,7,7,10,14	Mihaly 104:9	129:23 131:7
137:8	<u>K</u>	Lisa 103:17 108:5	108:14	136:6,18
issuing 137:18	keep 135:25	lisa.gafken@atg	million 133:4,9,10	needed 113:18
	kind 123:14 129:5	103:21	mind 124:23	135:2,6
J	King 105:13,15	list 116:22	127:17 130:15	needs 118:25 119:1
Jaimini 105:9	109:13,15,16	little 118:15,17	133:24	120:22 135:9
109:11	138:4	119:15 123:23	minutes 115:15	negotiations
Jeff 103:6 107:25	Kirkland 105:22	124:12 132:11	123:20	115:13 122:9
jeff.roberson@ut	know 113:17,22	134:8 137:10	modifications	Neighborhoods
103:9	117:11,19 118:6	LNG 113:6 120:15	110:14	105:19 109:19
Jefferson 104:21	118:19 119:6,14	121:7 126:22	modified 111:1,8	neutral 128:25
join 128:6	121:21 122:4	127:7 128:11	123:9 137:19	new 111:7 122:16
joined 120:9	124:5,13 129:17	131:10,14,19	mollify 121:13	126:13 130:2,3
joining 122:21	129:18,20,20,21	Lockhart 133:17	Monday 125:8	136:19
124:17 128:11	129:23 133:3	Lockhart's 133:20	months 134:6	Nicholas 106:3
131:9,10,11,19	134:4 136:5	longer 124:12	Moser 104:3 108:9	110:4
132:8,12,21	knowledge 138:9	look 130:20 137:10	108:10	Nick 126:8
joint 105:8 109:7		looks 109:20	move 111:19	Norm 132:24
109:11 111:21	Lacey 102:16 107:1	Loop 102:16	113:17 114:3	normal 122:14
112:15 131:2	Lake 105:5	lost 134:6	125:7	Norman 105:20
135:2 136:9,15,16		lot 112:22,23	moved 111:18	109:22
136:20 137:7	laptop 110:7	120:18 121:8	113:21 114:19	Northeast 103:12
jparekh@earthj	large 115:2 Latimer 105:4	low-income 126:22	126:16	Northwest 104:21
105:12	109:4	ъл	movement 127:12	note 127:9 136:2
Judge 102:12 103:2	Laura 104:19	<u>M</u>	127:13	noted 118:23 129:6
107:6,16,22,24	108:23	main 105:4 127:25	moving 115:16	129:17 133:9
108:2,4,7,11,16	100.43	maintained 111:2		notice 137:19
	-	-	-	·

	1	1	ı	,
notified 110:19	130:7	120:14 129:12	118:1 120:10,16	110:20,22,24
nthomas@omwl	opposing 113:7,9	131:12	121:3,19 122:4,12	probably 113:13
106:6	118:5 122:7	parties 107:14	122:17 123:4	115:11 118:20
Nucor 104:18	128:10,14 129:5	110:12,20 111:5,9	125:22 127:20	137:10
108:22,24 112:12	opposition 111:13	111:10,17,25	130:1 133:11,24	problem 123:2
132:20	111:14 113:12	112:1,7,9,11,23	137:6	132:4
number 110:8	114:25 125:6	112:25 113:7,23	points 115:6 129:21	procedural 110:14
114:5,10 120:12	127:2	114:18 115:1,12	130:3 137:1	111:5 135:25
NWEC 109:8	order 114:7 120:12	115:16 116:4,6,8	policy 127:20	proceed 116:15
	123:9 135:4	117:16,21,25	Portland 104:5	Proceedings 137:22
0	136:14 137:2,19	118:7,16,24 119:8	106:11	process 117:14,22
O 107:4	Oregon 104:5	120:2 122:6,6,11	position 115:4	134:9
o0o- 107:3	106:11	122:14,18 123:3,5	128:24,25 129:13	project 104:8
objecting 133:5	organization	123:8,13,16,18	129:14 130:22	108:12,15 112:15
objections 136:25	133:23 134:16	124:11,22 125:1,5	131:6,18	130:12,14,18
137:3	organizations	125:14 126:7	positions 128:2	131:7 133:4
obligates 115:8	131:3	127:16 129:15	possible 113:17	Project's 131:18
obligating 130:22	outside 120:14	131:23 133:18,19	114:5	properly 127:18
observation 127:10	overlooked 116:20	136:7,24 137:15	possibly 111:19	proposal 116:9
observations	131:25	parties' 119:1	posthearing 136:21	124:23 125:1,5
114:23 127:1	overstep 112:17	127:11 128:2	136:23	127:11 133:7
obtaining 117:23	P	parts 129:5	preceding 111:20	136:8
obvious 122:4		party 111:4 112:12	predict 128:21	proposed 111:1,4
obviously 115:23	P 103:1,1 104:1,1	117:25 120:17	prefer 126:13,16	111:10,13 112:1
135:4	105:1,1 106:1,1	121:15 124:7	prefiled 112:5	115:24 116:4
October 111:2,3,12	107:4	Pepple 106:9	121:4,8	118:23
120:25 121:10 136:22	p.m 107:2 137:22	116:11,15,17,23	prehearing 136:14	proposing 125:7
	P.O 103:7	116:24	137:1	Prosecutor's
offered 127:8 Office 103:7,18	Pages 102:11 Palms 104:15	perfectly 110:10	prepare 111:11	105:15 109:15
105:15 109:15	Paims 104:15 Parekh 105:9	124:13	prepared 119:23	provide 121:23
Ogden 106:4	109:10,11 131:5	period 124:3	preparing 114:7,15	125:12
oh 116:13 121:15	Parsons 105:4	Perkins 103:12	present 124:23	provided 129:11
125:20 132:3	109:4	107:20	125:3	providing 125:13
135:17	part 112:21 113:19	perspective 117:19	presentation 126:2	prudency 133:5
okay 116:2,23	115:2 123:21	119:11	presentations	PSE 107:11,18,21
118:11,13 123:2	partial 110:17,23	phone 122:25	125:11,15	110:18 111:1,13
Olympia 103:8	112:16 120:9	piece 129:19	presented 115:9	113:19,21,22,24
once 120:12 123:20	128:6 131:10	pieces 118:4 128:10	presenting 118:8	117:7,7 130:12
ongoing 115:14	132:8,12	129:9,24,25 130:6	preserve 137:5	PSE's 130:12
opportunity 121:9	participants	130:7 131:7 place 115:22	pretend 129:20	public 103:16,18
136:24	102:20	plan 124:1 137:18	pretty 117:21 119:19 130:5	108:3,6 113:9 117:19 118:5
oppose 121:6	participation	plan 124:1 137:18 play 128:21	primarily 110:13	117:19 118:5
122:11	120:12 124:18	point 114:1,20	primarily 110:13	126:1 128:5,23
opposed 111:4	126:21	115:18 117:2,3,5	principle 107:13	120:1 128:3,23
113:5,6 122:7	particular 114:8	113.10 11/.2,3,3	principie 107.13	147.1 150.1 155.9

135:13	112:1 114:16	respect 128:3 131:4	Sahu 121:5	111:21 112:13,16
Puget 102:7 103:10	127:13 128:20	131:24	Salt 105:5	112:20,25 113:2
107:10 117:11	record 116:6,19	respond 121:16	San 104:10,16	113:13 114:15
pull 126:2 127:20	119:21 122:15	122:18	saying 118:15	115:1,7,13,24
135:15	123:7,18 124:3,8	Respondent 102:8	scarson@perkin	118:5 119:9,15
pulled 129:10	124:10,15,19,20	response 111:14	103:14	120:9,17 121:7,10
pulling 119:18	124:21 126:12	119:9,18,22	schedule 110:14	122:7,8,9,10,11
put 116:3 131:8	127:6 133:23	120:23 121:4,9,14	111:1,4,6,8,10	127:3,19 128:7,11
puts 115:22	referred 136:11	121:23 126:15	112:8,10 114:11	128:12,13,15,19
Puyallup 106:2	referring 115:2	127:2,4 129:11	115:8,25 116:4	128:24 129:1,12
110:2,4 120:9	129:1	133:17 136:12	118:23 122:19	129:12 130:7,21
121:2 131:22	regardless 136:12	responsive 115:3	123:9 125:3	130:25 131:4,19
	regards 127:11	129:7	127:24 135:1,25	131:25 132:9,21
Q	regulatory 127:14	return 114:21	136:6 137:20	133:7 135:5
question 135:6	reiterate 117:2,2	review 114:6	scheduled 115:24	136:13,19 137:11
questions 122:20	134:13	120:22,24	135:9,10,12,14,17	settlements 107:13
quickly 114:14	reject 115:23	reviewing 112:2	135:21	117:12 118:17
quite 125:25	rejoin 124:6,14	revise 135:1	scope 114:25 133:3	120:18 122:21
R	relative 123:24	right 109:17,24	Seattle 103:20	124:17 125:3
	relatively 115:1	121:24 123:25	105:11,16 106:5	128:4 132:13
R 103:1 104:1	124:3,10	124:9,19 125:3,16	132:20	settling 112:11
105:1 106:1 107:4 138:1	relaying 124:23	126:4,19,23,25	second 105:15	117:25,25 118:7
	remain 129:9	128:3,5 129:6,15	115:11 116:12	118:16
raise 116:8,25	remains 121:21	130:10,20 131:1	132:6 135:15	seven 117:11
120:16 123:3	remember 117:6	133:12 134:20	see 110:8 116:13	share 125:1
124:8 133:19 raised 116:11 117:3	128:5 135:18	136:10 137:12,16	119:4 123:22	shave 118:20
	repetitive 113:14	137:18	135:20	sheet 130:19,23
119:4 122:2,23 123:10 131:15	REPORTED	Rita 104:14 108:20	seen 131:8	131:9
ran 134:6	102:25	132:1,7	send 124:5	Sheree 103:11
rate 107:11 115:12	Reporter 138:6	rita.m.liotta.civ	sense 137:13	107:20
rates 133:10	represent 119:25	104:17	Sensible 105:19	short 120:6 121:14
Raul 105:14 109:15	representation	RMR 102:25	109:19	124:10
raul.martinez@k	117:9 134:7	138:14	September 111:15	shorten 118:19
105:17	representative	Roberson 103:6	111:18,19 119:24	shortening 117:20
reached 110:19	109:18 132:17	107:24,25 115:4,5	119:25 125:6,8,11	shorter 119:22
ready 115:19	133:23	Room 104:15	125:23,24 126:17	Shute 104:9 108:14
realities 112:2	represented 117:6	Rose 102:25 138:6	127:12 135:16,17	Sierra 109:8
really 113:4 117:16	representing	138:14	135:20 136:17	sign 130:25
117:20	107:21 108:1	ruling 127:24	137:9	significantly
reason 112:21	request 124:1	run 123:16	set 114:12 129:23	118:19
recall 111:3 120:11	requested 134:4	running 114:14	setting 123:9	signing 131:19
136:10	required 137:7	runway 119:22	137:19	similar 117:12
receipt 111:12	reserve 130:20	S	settlement 107:13	130:5,9
received 134:5	resolution 117:18	S 103:1 104:1 105:1	110:17,17,19,22	similarly 119:7,13
recognize 111:23	resolve 120:18	106:1 107:4	110:24 111:13,14	simply 114:16
		100.1 107.4		

	1		1	
123:8 133:19	statements 137:14	122:16 126:12	thank 107:22 108:2	118:19 119:24
134:15	stature 117:12	surprise 122:10	108:7,11,16,21	120:1,12,22
sitting 129:22	status 102:9 107:7	suspended 111:5	109:1,6,12,17,24	122:12 123:13
situated 119:7	107:12,17 110:10	136:1	109:25 110:9,10	124:4 125:10,12
situation 116:3	110:13 111:7	suspension 113:20	115:5 116:13,24	125:13,14,14
120:5 134:3	123:5,21 125:24		118:12 119:2,3,5	127:21 133:6
sjm@dvclaw.com	133:16 134:22	T	120:3 121:25	135:19,19,19
104:6	statutory 113:20	T 138:1,1	123:11,25 124:25	timeframe 120:6
skill 138:9	Steel 104:18 108:22	Tacoma 120:15	125:16 126:4,5,11	timeframes 111:24
slightly 113:17	108:25 112:12	126:22 131:14	126:19 130:10,16	timeline 118:25
somebody 117:6	132:20	take 114:17 122:25	131:1,5,16,21	timing 125:10
somewhat 113:14	step 122:14	123:13 124:2	132:10,16,19,22	today 107:7,12,17
121:13	steps 120:7	127:22	132:23 133:12	108:15 110:13
Sommer 104:3	sticking 129:21	TAKEN 102:24	134:12,20 135:22	118:14 123:5
108:10	Stone 104:20	takes 124:12	137:21	127:24,25 133:16
soon 137:19	108:24	talked 136:7	thing 113:23	134:22 137:17
sorry 116:11,17	Street 103:12	talking 111:24	129:16	today's 126:15
118:10 122:24	104:10,21 105:4	123:18 129:6	things 130:2	told 118:10
125:20,21 131:11	Strom 103:11	133:10	think 112:19 113:1	Total 125:3
132:3	107:20	tcp@dvclaw.com	113:12 116:2,19	touch 124:18
sort 121:13	strongly 118:21	106:12	117:10,13,21	133:16
Sound 102:7	submission 111:21	team 127:20	118:8 119:11	touched 128:1
103:10 107:10	submitting 119:8	telephonically	124:1 126:3,25	Tower 104:21
South 105:4	119:17	110:7	127:23 128:16,17	Trails 105:21
Southeast 102:16	Subsection 125:4	tell 122:13	129:5,9,25 130:5	transcript 138:8
Southwest 104:4	substantial 117:7	ten-to-15-minute	134:10 135:8	Transportation
106:10	sufficient 111:11	124:11	136:4,11 137:4,8	102:2,4,15 107:10
speak 130:13	suggestion 123:12	term 115:7 130:19	thinking 123:6	traveling 114:9
132:18 135:13	123:15	130:23 131:9	third 105:10	Tribe 106:2 110:2
speaking 120:8	suitable 114:7	terms 113:5 118:4	115:18	110:5 119:6 120:9
specific 122:20	Suite 103:13,19	119:22 120:14,21	Thomas 104:21	121:2,6 126:9
Specifically 110:21	104:5,15 105:5,10	121:1 122:9	106:3 110:3,4	127:8 131:22
spent 112:22	105:16,22 106:5	124:17 128:17	119:4,5 120:3,10	Tribe's 121:4
spoken 112:18	106:10	129:17,20,24	121:15,17 122:22	126:20
Square 102:16	summed 119:12	131:13,20	122:24 126:8,8,11	tried 119:1
Staff 103:5 107:23	support 115:8	testimony 111:13	126:20,24	true 138:8
108:1 110:22	116:4 118:17	111:14,21 112:5	thought 113:16	trying 112:22 121:2
115:8,19	119:14	112:20 113:2,7,9	thoughts 112:19	134:15
Staff's 115:4 124:5	supported 130:6	113:11 115:3,19	three 110:22 115:6	turn 132:6 133:22
stance 128:18	supporting 112:20	119:8,9,17,23	120:12	turnaround 121:14
standpoint 126:1	113:2 118:7	120:23 121:4,9,14	tight 119:19	two 107:13 113:6
start 107:17 129:23	128:18 129:18,25	121:23 126:15	time 111:11,25	113:10 114:4
135:19	supportive 128:24	127:2,4,9 129:2,7	112:3,22 113:12	120:18 129:5
State 138:3,7	130:18	129:11 130:2,3,4	113:18 114:12,14	136:5 137:1
stated 126:25	sure 119:20 121:17	133:17,20 134:16 136:13	114:18 117:14,20	Tyler 106:9 116:11
		130.13		

U	want 112:17 123:17	119:16 121:8	16th 111:15 119:25	4
UE-220066 102:3	125:11 126:11	127:3,15	119:25 120:25	40 115:15
107:8	127:9,25 129:19	workable 115:25	125:7 126:13	40128 103:7
UG-210918 102:4	130:1,13 134:13	123:24	1700 105:16	415-552-7272
UG-220067 102:4	135:24 136:24	worked 115:12,12	1750 104:4 106:10	104:11
107:8	wanted 116:18	117:17	18 102:24 107:1	415-743-4718
understand 112:13	117:1 119:6,10,20	working 117:17	1800 105:5	104:16
113:6,25 121:19	122:3 124:18	129:23 134:10		425-635-1400
123:14 135:2	130:11 131:17	worried 119:15	2	103:14
Unit 103:18	133:15 134:25	worthwhile 124:12	2000 103:19	450 104:5 106:10
unknown 118:9,16	135:1	T 7	20007 104:22	480.07.740 125:4
unmute 109:21	Washington 102:1	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	201 105:4	4th 111:3 121:11
unusual 134:3	102:3,15,16 103:8	Xenopoulos 104:20	202-342-0800	
update 133:13	103:13,18,20	104:20 108:24	104:22	5
updated 136:18,20	104:22 105:11,16	132:2,4,19,20,23	2022 102:24 107:1	50- 134:5
updates 131:24	105:22 106:5	Y	111:3 138:17	5th 110:16
updating 130:15	107:1,9 138:3,7	yeah 115:25 117:1	206-343-7340	
usually 135:20	wasn't 121:17	123:11 131:16	105:11 206-447-7000	6
Utah 105:5	134:13	Yochi 104:9 108:14	106:6	6 138:17
Utilities 102:2,3,15	way 104:4 106:10	yzakai@smwlaw	206-464-6595	6:00 135:18
107:9	115:19 128:9	104:11	103:20	6:30 135:18
T 7	135:3		206-909-8728	610 105:10
V	we'll 116:16 124:9	Z	105:17	621 102:16 6619 105:21
v 107:10	124:15 132:6	Zakai 104:9 108:13	21 113:13 118:19	0019 103:21
Van 104:4 106:9	we're 107:7 109:23	108:14 130:15,16	119:15,18	7
vbaldwin@parso	111:24 117:25	131:15,16	21036100 102:25	700 103:13
105:6	120:6,17 129:8,21	Zoom 122:25 124:6	138:14	7th 111:19 125:23
verbal 127:24	134:10	124:14	223 133:10	126:2
version 131:9	we've 115:8 128:1		24th 111:22 114:20	
Vicki 105:3 109:3	135:4 week 112:21	0	118:2	8
videoconference		1	26th 113:3 118:3	80,000 134:5
102:20	113:18 114:4,10 119:10	1 104.15	121:22 136:17	800 103:19
view 128:17 VIRTUAL 102:9	Weinberger 104:9	1 104:15	137:9	801-536-6918
VOLUME 102:10	108:14	1:00 107:2 1:53 137:22	28th 135:17,20	105:6
vs 102:6	welcome 133:14	1:55 137:22 102-138 102:11		810 105:10
vs 102.0	West 104:21	102-138 102:11 1025 104:21	3	84111 105:5
W	WESTERN 104:2	1025 104:21 10885 103:12	300 133:4,9	8F 104:15
W 103:17	wide-ranging	1191 105:15	31st 136:22	8th 104:21
WAC 125:4	112:24	12th 110:18 125:8	3500 106:5	9
waiting 129:22	willing 113:22	125:12 126:3,17	360-664-1186	
waived 113:20	window 112:3	127:12	103:8	901 106:4
walking 127:18	witnesses 119:16	132nd 105:21	396 104:10	917 110:8
Wallace 106:4	Woodland 102:16	133 105:22	3rd 111:2 120:25	94102 104:10
Walmart 105:2	work 113:22	161 104:15	121:10	94130 104:16
109:2,5		101 10 1.13		971-710-1150
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

106:11 971-710-1154 104:6 97201 104:5 106:11 98004 103:13 98033 105:22 98101 105:16 98104 103:20 105:11 98164 106:5 98504 103:8 9th 111:19 125:24 126:2