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

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

October 3, 2022



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u> email: <u>info@buellrealtime.com</u>



Docket Nos. UE-220066, UG-22067 and UG-210918 (Consolidated) - Vol IV - 10/3/2022

1	Page 241			Page	243
	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND) DOCKETS UE-220066, TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,) UG-220067, and) UG-210918 Complainant,) (Consolidated)) vs.) PUGET SOUND ENERGY,)) Respondent.) VUGET SOUND ENERGY,)) Respondent.) VIRTUAL SETTLEMENT HEARING VOLUME IV Pages 241 - 500 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MICHAEL HOWARD (All participants appeared via videoconference.) DATE TAKEN: OCTOBER 3, 2022 REPORTED BY: CRYSTAL R. MCAULIFFE, RPR, CCR, #2121	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued) FOR ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS: SOMMER MOSER Davison Van Cleve 1750 Southwest Harbor Way Suite 450 Portland, Oregon 97201 971-710-1154 sjm@dvclaw.com FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT: YOCHANAN ZAKAI Shute Mihaly & Weinberger 396 Hayes Street San Francisco, California 94102 415-552-7272 yzakai@smwlaw.com FOR FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES: RITA LIOTTA Attorney at Law 1 Avenue of the Palms Suite 161, Room 8F San Francisco, California 94130 415-743-4718 rita.m.liotta.civ@us.navy.mil FOR NUCOR STEEL: DAMON XENOPOULOS Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street Northwest 8th Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007 202-342-0800 dex@smxblaw.com		
	Page 242			Page	244
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A P P E A R A N C E S ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: MICHAEL HOWARD COMMISSIONERS: DAVE DANNER, Chair ANN RENDAHL, Commissioner MILT DOUMIT, Commissioner 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 DAVID STEELE Perkins Coie 10885 Northeast Fourth Street Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 425-635-1400 scarson@perkinscoie.com dsteele@perkinscoie.com Gror 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	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued) FOR WALMART: VICKI BALDWIN Parsons Behle & Latimer 201 South Main Street Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 801-536-6918 vbaldwin@parsonsbehle.com FOR THE JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES: JAIMINI PAREKH Earthjustice 810 Third Avenue Suite 610 Seattle, Washington 98104 206-343-7340 jparekh@earthjustice.org FOR KING COUNTY: BEN MAYER K&L Gates 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, Washington 98104 206.623.7580 ben.maye@klgates.com RAUL MARTINEZ King County Prosecutor's Office 1191 Second Avenue, Suite 1700 Seattle, Washington 98101 206.90.8728 raul.martinez@kingcounty.gov FOR COALITION OF EASTSIDE NEIGHBORHOODS FOR SEN ENERGY: NORMAN HANSEN Bridle Trails Community Club 6619 132nd Avenue Suite 133 Kirkland, Washington 98033 hansenn@aol.com	SIBLE	

1 (Pages 241 to 244)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 245	Page 247
1	A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued)	1 LACEY, WASHINGTON; OCTOBER 3, 2022
2 3	FOR PUYALLUP TRIBE:	2 9:00 a.m.
4	ANDREW FULLER	3 -000-
5	NICHOLAS THOMAS Ogden Murphy Wallace	4 JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. Today is
	901 Fifth Avenue	5 Monday, October 3rd, and the time is 9 a.m. We're here
6	Suite 3500 Seattle, Washington 98164	6 today for a settlement hearing in consolidated Dockets
7	206-447-7000	7 UG-220066, UG-220067, and UG-210918.
8	afuller@omwlaw.com nthomas@omwlaw.com	8 These dockets are captioned, respectively,
9		9 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
10	FOR MICROSOFT: TYLER PEPPLE	10 versus Puget Sound Energy, and in the matter of the
11	Davison Van Cleve 1750 Southwest Harbor Way	11 Petition of Puget Sound Energy for an order authorizing
	Suite 450	12 deferred accounting treatment. 13 This is a general right case filed by Puget
12	Portland, Oregon 97201 971-710-1150	
13	tcp@dvclaw.com	14 Sound Energy, or "PSE," consolidated with an accounting 15 petition.
14 15	FOR THE KROGER COMPANY:	16 The Commission is here today for purposes of
16	KURT J. BOEHM	17 considering three multi-party settlements that together
17	Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 E. Seventh Street, Suite 1510	18 dispose of all issues of the case if they are accepted.
18	Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 513.421.2255	19 We will be referring to these as the Green
10	kboehm@bkllawfirm.com	20 Direct settlement, the revenue requirement settlement,
19 20		21 and the Tacoma LNG settlement.
	* * * *	22 My name is Michael Howard. I'm an
21 22		23 Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. We'll be
23		²⁴ joined shortly by the Commissioners themselves, Chair
24 25		25 Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.
	Page 246	
	Paye 246	Page 248
1	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING	
1 2 3	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX	
2 3 4	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE	1 We are proceeding with this as a virtual
2 3 4 5	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293	 We are proceeding with this as a virtual hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please
2 3 4 5 6	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 301	 We are proceeding with this as a virtual hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they are testifying. Similar rules would apply for
2 3 4 5	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305	 We are proceeding with this as a virtual hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they are testifying. Similar rules would apply for representatives.
2 3 4 5 6	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 310	 We are proceeding with this as a virtual hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they are testifying. Similar rules would apply for representatives. I'm also going to expect that any observers
2 3 4 5 6 7	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363	 We are proceeding with this as a virtual hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they are testifying. Similar rules would apply for representatives. I'm also going to expect that any observers please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Lauren McCloy by Mr. Hansen 311	 We are proceeding with this as a virtual hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they are testifying. Similar rules would apply for representatives. I'm also going to expect that any observers please keep their microphones muted and cameras off. Let's start by taking appearances beginning
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Jet Lauren McCloy by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Roberson 385 Cross of Dan Koch by Mr. Hansen 386	 We are proceeding with this as a virtual hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they are testifying. Similar rules would apply for representatives. I'm also going to expect that any observers please keep their microphones muted and cameras off. Let's start by taking appearances beginning with PSE. If there is more than one representative for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Justin Biber by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Lauren McCloy by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Hansen 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Mr. Hansen 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Mr. Hansen 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Mr. Fuller 415	 We are proceeding with this as a virtual hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they are testifying. Similar rules would apply for representatives. I'm also going to expect that any observers please keep their microphones muted and cameras off. Let's start by taking appearances beginning with PSE. If there is more than one representative for a party, feel free to give each of your names.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Hansen 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Ms. Carson 403 Cross of Ron Roberts by Mr. Fuller 415 Bench questions 426 Closing by Ms. Carson 445	 We are proceeding with this as a virtual hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they are testifying. Similar rules would apply for representatives. I'm also going to expect that any observers please keep their microphones muted and cameras off. Let's start by taking appearances beginning with PSE. If there is more than one representative for a party, feel free to give each of your names.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Dan Koch by Ms. Carson 403 Cross of Ron Roberts by Mr. Fuller 415 Bench questions 426 Closing by Ms. Carson 450	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Jularen McCloy by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Roberson 385 Cross of Dan Koch by Ms. Carson 403 Cross of Dan Koch by Ms. Carson 403 Cross of Roberts by Mr. Fuller 415 Bench questions 426 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 455 Closing by Ms. Parekh 455	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Fadley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 306 Cross of Lauren McCloy by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Roberson 385 Cross of Ron Roberts by Mr. Fuller 415 Bench questions 426 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Parekh 456 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Stadley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Wullins by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Del Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Hansen 385 Cross of Coss of Dan Koch by Mr. Fulsen 403 Cross of Ron Roberts by Mr. Fuller 415 Bench questions 426 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Mr. Zakai 455 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Garken 461 Closing by Ms. Garken 462 Closing by Ms. Garken 462	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 381 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Hansen 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Ms. Carson 403 Cross of Ron Roberts by Mr. Fuller 415 Bench questions 426 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Parekh 455 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Gafken 462 Closing by Ms. Gafken 462 Closing by Ms. Moser 465	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.18Do we have an appearance for staff?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 298 Cross of Faralley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Ali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Jali Al-Jabir by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Jealley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Roberson 385 Cross of Dan Koch by Ms. Carson 403 Cross of Ron Roberts by Mr. Fuller 415 Bench questions 426 Closing by Ms. Carson 455 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.18Do we have an appearance for staff?19MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Kevin Higgins by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Bradley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Justin Birgins by Mr. Hansen 310 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 386 Redirect of Betty Erdahl by Mr. Hansen 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Ms. Carson 403 Cross of Ron Roberts by Mr. Fuller 415 Bench questions 426 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson on Green Direct Settlement 459 Closing by Ms. Gafken 462 Closing by Ms. Gafken 465 Closing by Ms. Carson 471 Closing by Ms. Carson 476 Closing by Ms. Carson 476 Closing by Ms. Moser 468	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.18Do we have an appearance for staff?19MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard.20Jeff Roberts, AAG on behalf of staff.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Fadley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Lauren McCloy by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 385 Cross of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 485 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Mayer 465 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Clos	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.18Do we have an appearance for staff?19MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard.20Jeff Roberts, AAG on behalf of staff.21Appearing with me this morning is Nash
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Fadley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Lauren McCloy by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 385 Cross of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 485 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Mayer 465 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Clos	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.18Do we have an appearance for staff?19MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard.20Jeff Roberts, AAG on behalf of staff.21Appearing with me this morning is Nash22Callahan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Fadley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Lauren McCloy by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 385 Cross of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 485 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Mayer 465 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Clos	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.18Do we have an appearance for staff?19MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard.20Jeff Roberts, AAG on behalf of staff.21Appearing with me this morning is Nash
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Fadley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Lauren McCloy by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 385 Cross of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 485 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Mayer 465 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Clos	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.18Do we have an appearance for staff?19MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard.20Jeff Roberts, AAG on behalf of staff.21Appearing with me this morning is Nash22Callahan.23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	VIDEOCONFERENCE SETTLEMENT HEARING INDEX October 3, 2022 EXAMINATION PAGE Bench Questions 279 Cross of Justin Bieber by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 293 Cross of Alex Kronauer by Mr. Hansen 301 Cross of Fadley Mullins by Mr. Hansen 305 Cross of Bradley Cebulko by Mr. Hansen 308 Cross of Lauren McCloy by Mr. Hansen 311 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 363 Cross of Joel Nightingale by Mr. Hansen 385 Cross of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 386 Redirect of Dan Koch by Mr. Roberson 485 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 445 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 450 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Carson 461 Closing by Ms. Mayer 465 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Closing by Ms. Moser 468 Clos	1We are proceeding with this as a virtual2hearing over the Zoom platform. We ask that you please3keep yourself on mute unless it is your turn to speak4and that witnesses only turn their cameras on when they5are testifying. Similar rules would apply for6representatives.7I'm also going to expect that any observers8please keep their microphones muted and cameras off.9Let's start by taking appearances beginning10with PSE. If there is more than one representative for11a party, feel free to give each of your names.12MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor.13I'm Sheree Strom Carson with Perkins Coie14representing PSE.15And also here with me representing PSE is16David Steele.17JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.20Jeff Roberts, AAG on behalf of staff.21Appearing with me this morning is Nash22Callahan.23JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.24Could we hear from Public Counsel?

2 (Pages 245 to 248)

	Page 249		Page 251
1	Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf	1	Energy Project sorry, Northwest Energy Coalition,
2	of Public Counsel.	2	Front and Centered, and Sierra Club.
3	And also here with me this morning Ann	3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
4	Paisner, Assistant Attorney General.	4	Could we have an appearance for King County?
5	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	5	MR. MAYER: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor.
6	Could we hear from Alliance of Western	6	This is Ben Mayer of K&L Gates for King County.
7		7	
	Energy Consumers or "AWEC"?		I'm also joined today by Senior Deputy
8	MS. MOSER: Good morning, your Honor.	8	Prosecuting Attorney, Raul Martinez.
9	Sommer Moser with Davison Van Cleve on		JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an
10	behalf of AWEC.	10	appearance for Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	11	Sensible Energy or CENSE.
12	Could we hear from The Energy Project?	12	MR. HANSEN: Good morning, Your Honor.
13	MR. ZAKAI: Good morning, you Honor.	13	Norm Hansen representing CENSE, as I'm the
14	Yochi Zakai with Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger	14	president of CENSE. Thank
15	on behalf of The Energy Project.	15	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr thank you,
16	And here with me today is Simon ffitch as	16	Mr. Hansen. Sorry. I cut you off a little.
17	well.	17	Did you want to say anything further?
18	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have an appearance	18	MR. HANSEN: No, that's all right. Thank
19	with the Federal Executive Agencies?	19	you.
20	MS. LIOTTA: Good morning.	20	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Could we have an
21	Rita Liotta with the Federal Executive	21	appearance for the Puyallup Tribe.
22	Agencies.	22	MR. FULLER: Good morning, your Honor.
23	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	23	Andrew Fuller at Ogden Murphy Wallace appearing on
24	How about Nucor Steel Seattle?	24	behalf of Puyallup Tribe.
25	MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Your Honor.	25	I also have my colleague, Nicolas Thomas,
	Page 250		Page 252
1	This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis	1	from Ogden Murphy Wallace.
2	Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle Inc.	2	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all.
3	and accompany by Laura Wynn Baker of same.	3	Given the number of the parties in the case,
4	Thank you, Your Honor.	4	I'm just going to ask.
5	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	5	Did I miss anyone?
6	Could we hear from Walmart?	6	All right. Hearing none. If your number
7	MS. BALDWIN: Good morning, Your Honor, this	7	ends in "0656," you may want to mute yourself until you
8	is Vicki Baldwin with firm of Parsons Behle & Latimer on	8	intend to speak.
9	behalf of Walmart.	9	All right. Moving on. I want to give a
10	Thank you.	10	brief roadmap for today's hearing and how we're going to
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	11	go about it. We'll begin by addressing the objections
12	Can we have an appearance for Microsoft?	12	from staff and Microsoft to cross-examination by CENSE.
13	MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, your Honor. This	13	We'll also address the first issue raised
14	is Tyler Pepple appearing on behalf of Microsoft.	14	in PSE's objections where PSE argues that only a party
15	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	15	representative should pose questions in
16	Could we have an appearance for Kroger?	16	cross-examination.
17	MR. BOEHM: Good morning, your Honor.	17	I'll also rule on the admissibility of the
18	Kurt Boehm appearing on behalf of the Kroger	18	majority of the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. After
19	Company.	19	the Commissioners join us, we will then call witnesses
20	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	20	in the order and in the manner proposed by the parties.
20	Could we have an appearance for the joint	20	This means that we will start our testimony
22	environmental advocates, which would be Sierra Club,	22	today with a Green Direct panel. No party indicated
23	Northwest Energy Coalition and Front and Centered.	23	cross for the Green Direct witnesses, but we may have
24	MS. PAREKH: Good morning, your Honor.	24	questions from the bench.
25	Jaimini Parekh with Earth Justice on behalf of Northwest	25	After that we will continue calling
		_	······································

3 (Pages 249 to 252)

· · · ·	Page 253		Page 255
1	witnesses in the order proposed by the parties.	1	MR. ROBERSON: It does, if the other parties
2	If I rule that CENSE may cross staff witness	2	will stipulate.
3	Joel Nightingale, I plan to include Nightingale on the	3	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Again, I don't
4	Energize Eastside panel.	4	anticipate there will be detailed questions or questions
5	We will address PSE's objections to specific	5	focused on Reynolds' and Ball's testimony at the hearing
6	cross-exhibits for PSE witness Dan'l Koch and that is	6	today.
7	spelled K-o-c-h at the time when CENSE cross-examines	7	All right.
8	that witness.	8	MS. CARSON: Judge Howard, I did have one
9	Time permitting, we will end the hearing by	9	question.
10	allowing the parties to give oral closing statements.	10	PSE filed a motion to strike CENSE's public
11	The parties have estimated that they will require about	11	comments that were just filed last week. We filed that
12	two hours and 35 minutes for cross-examination today.	12	motion on Friday.
13	I'm hopeful that we'll be able to conclude	13	Will you want to hear argument on that?
14	this hearing today.	14	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for raising that.
15	If we allow for a short break around the	15	Because PSE's motion does not directly deal
16	mid-morning time, approximately 10:30 a.m. or	16	with how we're conducting the hearing too, I would plan
17	11:00 a.m., we may even be able to end by midday without	17	to give CENSE the normal five-business-day timeline for
18	immediately breaking for lunch.	18	a written response and then I will consider and rule on
19	But I recognize that this is a very complex	19	the motion after that.
20	case with a large number of issues. We may need to	20	Mr. Hansen, does that sound does that
21	break for lunch to continue in the afternoon. And if we	21	make sense to you?
22	cannot finish today, we will continue tomorrow at	22	Does that sound appropriate for you?
23	9:00 a.m.	23	MR. HANSEN: Yes, it is very appropriate.
24	We will also provide an opportunity	24	Thank you, Judge.
25	for post-hearing briefs due on October 31st.	25	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2.5	to post-hearing biers due on October 31st.	2.5	Soboe noward. mank you.
	Page 254		
	Page 254		Page 256
1		1	Page 256 MS. CARSON: Yes.
1 2	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this	1 2	
	Are there any questions about how we are		MS. CARSON: Yes.
2	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this	2	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response
2 3	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given?	2 3	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday.
2 3 4	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard,	2 3 4	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised.
2 3 4 5	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be	2 3 4 5	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she	2 3 4 5 6	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the
2 3 4 5 6 7	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony at the hearing today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those witnesses. So I would I would plan on if the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony at the hearing today. So for our purposes, I believe it will be sufficient if the parties were to just stipulate to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those witnesses. So I would I would plan on if the parties are all agreeable and we stipulate to the admission of of essentially nearly all the pre-filed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony at the hearing today. So for our purposes, I believe it will be sufficient if the parties were to just stipulate to the admissibility of that testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those witnesses. So I would I would plan on if the parties are all agreeable and we stipulate to the admission of of essentially nearly all the pre-filed testimony and exhibits, then this issue would would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony at the hearing today. So for our purposes, I believe it will be sufficient if the parties were to just stipulate to the admissibility of that testimony. But if if we if we would like, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those witnesses. So I would I would plan on if the parties are all agreeable and we stipulate to the admission of of essentially nearly all the pre-filed testimony and exhibits, then this issue would would simply go away.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony at the hearing today. So for our purposes, I believe it will be sufficient if the parties were to just stipulate to the admissibility of that testimony. But if if we if we would like, that would we could also have Ms. Erdahl formally adopt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those witnesses. So I would I would plan on if the parties are all agreeable and we stipulate to the admission of of essentially nearly all the pre-filed testimony and exhibits, then this issue would would simply go away. And then we would set aside the issues of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony at the hearing today. So for our purposes, I believe it will be sufficient if the parties were to just stipulate to the admissibility of that testimony. But if if we if we would like, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those witnesses. So I would I would plan on if the parties are all agreeable and we stipulate to the admission of of essentially nearly all the pre-filed testimony and exhibits, then this issue would would simply go away.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony at the hearing today. So for our purposes, I believe it will be sufficient if the parties were to just stipulate to the admissibility of that testimony. But if if we if we would like, that would we could also have Ms. Erdahl formally adopt that testimony when she appears on the revenue requirement panel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those witnesses. So I would I would plan on if the parties are all agreeable and we stipulate to the admission of of essentially nearly all the pre-filed testimony and exhibits, then this issue would would simply go away. And then we would set aside the issues of the disputed cross-exhibits, and I'll explain that more soon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony at the hearing today. So for our purposes, I believe it will be sufficient if the parties were to just stipulate to the admissibility of that testimony. But if if we if we would like, that would we could also have Ms. Erdahl formally adopt that testimony when she appears on the revenue requirement panel. Mr. Roberson, does stipulating to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those witnesses. So I would I would plan on if the parties are all agreeable and we stipulate to the admission of of essentially nearly all the pre-filed testimony and exhibits, then this issue would would simply go away. And then we would set aside the issues of the disputed cross-exhibits, and I'll explain that more soon. All right. Thank you. So moving on to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed with the hearing today or this this roadmap I've given? MR. ROBERSON: I have one, Judge Howard, which is that staff witness Erdahl is going to be adopting the testimony of staff witnesses Ball and Reynolds. Would you prefer that she do that when she sits with the first panel, which I believe is the revenue requirement panel, or do you want to do that at the start? How do you think we should best handle that? JUDGE HOWARD: Well, at this time, I'm not anticipating there will be questions directed specifically at Deb Reynolds' and Jason Ball's testimony at the hearing today. So for our purposes, I believe it will be sufficient if the parties were to just stipulate to the admissibility of that testimony. But if if we if we would like, that would we could also have Ms. Erdahl formally adopt that testimony when she appears on the revenue requirement panel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CARSON: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: So I believe CENSE's response to that would be due this coming Friday. I see Ms. Parekh has your hand raised. MS. PAREKH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I also had a question about it adoption of testimony. We do have Eli Font and Scott Reeves from the Cadeo Group who are on the currently on the hearing right now and available to adopt the testimony of Josh Killing. And we're wondering when is the best time for them to do that. And also, would like to know if there are any questions for them to remain in the hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: At this time, I don't believe that there will be questions directed to those witnesses. So I would I would plan on if the parties are all agreeable and we stipulate to the admission of of essentially nearly all the pre-filed testimony and exhibits, then this issue would would simply go away. And then we would set aside the issues of the disputed cross-exhibits, and I'll explain that more soon.

4 (Pages 253 to 256)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

· · · · ·	Page 257		Page 259
1	Mr. Fuller has his hand raised.	1	would advise that you mute yourself if you are having a
2	MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. I thought	2	discussion for the court reporter.
3	this would be a time to inform you. And I apologize	3	MR. HANSEN: I will do that. Thank you,
4	that we weren't able to provide this objection to you	4	Judge.
5	ahead of time but the Puyallup Tribe of Indians is going	5	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, and just be please do
6	to have an objection to one of the PSE exhibits, Exhibit	6	be careful about speaking over me, because it is very
7	RJR 31, and I just wanted to notify you of that now so	7	hard for the court reporter to write down what two
8	that we can address that at the time you feel	8	people are saying at the same time.
9	appropriate.	9	And it does tend to irk me as well.
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Just a moment,	10	All right. So Microsoft's objection is
11	please.	11	granted.
12	All right. So prior to the hearing today,	12	Staff has also objected to CENSE's planned
13	we received written objections from Microsoft staff to	13	cross of its witness, Joel Nightingale.
14	PSE, other parties, such as the Energy Project,	14	Mr. Hansen, does CENSE still plan to
15	indicated that they reserved to object to the cross of	15	cross-examine Nightingale? How do you respond to the
16	their witnesses. We will also address the Tribe's oral	16	objection?
17	objection in a few moments.	17	MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. They did sign the
18	As I indicated to the parties, I will be	18	settlement agreement with respect to Energize Eastside.
19	allowing CENSE an opportunity to respond to these	19	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
20	objections at the hearing today.	20	I have considered staff's objection. I've
21	Mr. Hansen, Microsoft has objected to	21	also noted that CENSE proposes a cross-exhibit. I
22	planned cross of its witness, Irene Plenefisch. How do	22	believe it's marked JBN-9X or is it JGN-9X. Let me look
23	you respond to this objection?	23	that up.
24	MR. HANSEN: Well, it would be judge, it	24	One moment.
25	would be a benefit to us, of course, if and probably	25	Mr. Pepple, I see your hand is raised, and I
	Page 258		Page 260
1	Page 258 more efficient if we had our expert witness also	1	Page 260 will return to you in just a moment here.
1 2		1 2	
	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.)		will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X.
2	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my	2 3 4	will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection
2 3 4 5	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause.	2 3 4 5	will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm
2 3 4 5 6	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because	2 3 4 5 6	will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow
2 3 4 5 6 7	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the	2 3 4 5 6 7	will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call
2 3 5 6 7 8	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple?
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I thought.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has a pressing commitment to be elsewhere.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I thought. Mr. Hansen, I'm going to grant Microsoft's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has a pressing commitment to be elsewhere. MR. PEPPLE: I don't I won't speak for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I thought. Mr. Hansen, I'm going to grant Microsoft's objection to the cross of its witness Irene Plenefisch,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has a pressing commitment to be elsewhere. MR. PEPPLE: I don't I won't speak for her necessarily, but I think that is fine. She was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I thought. Mr. Hansen, I'm going to grant Microsoft's objection to the cross of its witness Irene Plenefisch, in order 03 in this case. We've limited the scope of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has a pressing commitment to be elsewhere. MR. PEPPLE: I don't I won't speak for her necessarily, but I think that is fine. She was planning to attend the panel anyway. So.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I thought. Mr. Hansen, I'm going to grant Microsoft's objection to the cross of its witness Irene Plenefisch, in order 03 in this case. We've limited the scope of CENSE's participation to the prudency of the Energize	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has a pressing commitment to be elsewhere. MR. PEPPLE: I don't I won't speak for her necessarily, but I think that is fine. She was planning to attend the panel anyway. So. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. We should be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I thought. Mr. Hansen, I'm going to grant Microsoft's objection to the cross of its witness Irene Plenefisch, in order 03 in this case. We've limited the scope of CENSE's participation to the prudency of the Energize Eastside issue. So I'm not seeing how crossing this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has a pressing commitment to be elsewhere. MR. PEPPLE: I don't I won't speak for her necessarily, but I think that is fine. She was planning to attend the panel anyway. So. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. We should be getting to that panel fairly soon this morning, and she
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I thought. Mr. Hansen, I'm going to grant Microsoft's objection to the cross of its witness Irene Plenefisch, in order 03 in this case. We've limited the scope of CENSE's participation to the prudency of the Energize Eastside issue. So I'm not seeing how crossing this witness ties into that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has a pressing commitment to be elsewhere. MR. PEPPLE: I don't I won't speak for her necessarily, but I think that is fine. She was planning to attend the panel anyway. So. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. We should be getting to that panel fairly soon this morning, and she can be excused after that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I thought. Mr. Hansen, I'm going to grant Microsoft's objection to the cross of its witness Irene Plenefisch, in order 03 in this case. We've limited the scope of CENSE's participation to the prudency of the Energize Eastside issue. So I'm not seeing how crossing this witness ties into that. And it is perfectly fine for you to confer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has a pressing commitment to be elsewhere. MR. PEPPLE: I don't I won't speak for her necessarily, but I think that is fine. She was planning to attend the panel anyway. So. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. We should be getting to that panel fairly soon this morning, and she can be excused after that. MR. PEPPLE: Thank you. I appreciate it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	more efficient if we had our expert witness also participate so (Discussion.) MR HANSEN: Yeah, but he's asking about my position as sorry for the pause. We should cross-examine these folks because they were the original folks that signed the the agreement. JUDGE HOWARD: If I could turn to Microsoft's counsel for a brief question. Did Microsoft join the Green Direct settlement? MR. PEPPLE: Not the Green Direct Settlement, your Honor. Microsoft joined the revenue requirement settlement. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. That is what I thought. Mr. Hansen, I'm going to grant Microsoft's objection to the cross of its witness Irene Plenefisch, in order 03 in this case. We've limited the scope of CENSE's participation to the prudency of the Energize Eastside issue. So I'm not seeing how crossing this witness ties into that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 will return to you in just a moment here. The Nightingale exhibits are labeled JBN and the proposed cross-exhibit is 9X. After considering staff's written objection and CENSE's response and the proposed cross-exhibit, I'm going to deny staff's objection. I'm going to allow CENSE to cross Mr. Nightingale and we will call Mr. Nightingale on the Energize Eastside panel. Mr. Pepple? MR. PEPPLE: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to confirm whether Ms. Plenefisch needs to stay on as a witness for the hearing or whether she can be excused. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we would the Commission would like Ms. Plenefisch to participate on the revenue requirement panel, if that unless she has a pressing commitment to be elsewhere. MR. PEPPLE: I don't I won't speak for her necessarily, but I think that is fine. She was planning to attend the panel anyway. So. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. We should be getting to that panel fairly soon this morning, and she can be excused after that.

5 (Pages 257 to 260)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 261		Page 263
1	the first argument raised in PSE's objections. PSE	1	testimony to come in without the opportunity for
2	argued that only CENSE's representative, Mr. Hansen,	2	cross-examination.
3	should be allowed to cross witnesses.	3	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I may
4	Mr. Pepple, I see your hand is still raised.	4	have a question for you in a moment.
5	You may wish to lower it unless you have a further	5	How would PSE like to respond?
6	question.	6	MS. CARSON: Well, Your Honor, I would
7	Mr. Hansen, will you agree that you will	7	respond first that this objection is new. It was not
8	pose any cross-questions on behalf of CENSE rather than	8	made by last Wednesday as you requested. I understand,
9	Mr. Lauckhart? How would you respond to this?	9	you know, you will still accept objections today, but
10	MR. HANSEN: We will plan do that, Judge.	10	PSE has not had any notice of this objection and and
11	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I	11	would like time to respond more formally.
12	I appreciate CENSE indicating that and I do agree with	12	That said, the relaxed rules of evidence
13	this first line of argument and PSE's objections. It is	13	apply to the Commission. The Commission has never, to
14	appropriate for just the representative to cross. And	14	my knowledge, prohibited or rarely prohibited evidence
15	I I also expect the party defending the witness to	15	on the grounds of hearsay.
16	only have one representative give any objections per	16	This is a self-authenticating document.
17	witness.	17	It's sworn testimony before the pollution control
18	All right. And the tribe has objected today	18	hearings board. It goes to an issue that has been
19	to the admission of PSE witness Roberts Exhibit RJR 31.	19	raised about air quality, which is an issue that's
20	MR. FULLER: Yes, Your Honor. RJR 31	20	appropriately before the pollution control hearings
21	consists of excerpts of the direct testimony written	21	board. The Commission is not the forum to get into the
22	testimony of a PSE witness. It was used as an exhibit	22	details of air quality. And so it's appropriate to
23	in the PCHB hearing regarding the air permit for the	23	bring that testimony forward to the commissioner's in
24	Tacoma LNG facility. It's use here as an exhibit to	24	this proceeding.
25	Mr. Roberts's testimony is problematic. It is a	25	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
	Page 262		Page 264
1	textbook example of hearsay.	1	MR. FULLER: May I briefly respond.
2	And we feel the exhibit should be ruled	2	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Mr. Fuller. Go ahead.
3	inadmissible under the rule of evidence 801.	3	MR. FULLER: I'd just like to also point out
4	Recently, in the Docket UT 181051 regarding	4	that this is not the complete testimony of that witness.
5	CenturyLink communications, the Commission issued	5	This is excerpts of the direct written testimony. And
6	order 06 on July 25th, '22 2022, and in that order	6	there's been no attempt to include cross-examination but
7	explained that the Commission rarely, if ever, allows an	7	the transcript of cross-examination that occurred in
8	affidavit to be filed as an exhibit to a witness's	8	that hearing. So this while this may be appropriate
9	testimony, because doing so can deny other parties their	9	testimony in the right it had been presented
10	rights to due process. And the Commission went on to	10	correctly. We feel that here, without the witness
11	explain that only if the affidavit provides facts that	11	present, is not appropriate.
12	are or can be generally accepted as true should the	12	MS. CARSON: And I would just add that we
13	Commission accept it as evidence of those facts without	13	have no objection to supplementing her testimony with
14	making the affiant available for cross-examination.	14	whatever might be appropriate.
	-	1 -	But, again, in terms of the case law that's
15	And there, the Commission found that even	15	-
	And there, the Commission found that even though the author of that challenged affidavit, quote,	16	cited, you know, we didn't have an opportunity to look
15	And there, the Commission found that even	1	-
15 16 17 18	And there, the Commission found that even though the author of that challenged affidavit, quote, may be an expert on what he describes, his statements do not have a sufficient inherent indicium of reliability	16 17 18	cited, you know, we didn't have an opportunity to look at that in advance. So this is this is a bit of a surprise.
15 16 17 18 19	And there, the Commission found that even though the author of that challenged affidavit, quote, may be an expert on what he describes, his statements do not have a sufficient inherent indicium of reliability such that the Commission is willing to accept them	16 17 18 19	cited, you know, we didn't have an opportunity to look at that in advance. So this is this is a bit of a surprise. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, both. I I
15 16 17 18 19 20	And there, the Commission found that even though the author of that challenged affidavit, quote, may be an expert on what he describes, his statements do not have a sufficient inherent indicium of reliability such that the Commission is willing to accept them without an opportunity for cross-examination.	16 17 18 19 20	cited, you know, we didn't have an opportunity to look at that in advance. So this is this is a bit of a surprise. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, both. I I would ask that I would ask that PSE file the the
15 16 17 18 19	And there, the Commission found that even though the author of that challenged affidavit, quote, may be an expert on what he describes, his statements do not have a sufficient inherent indicium of reliability such that the Commission is willing to accept them	16 17 18 19 20 21	cited, you know, we didn't have an opportunity to look at that in advance. So this is this is a bit of a surprise. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, both. I I would ask that I would ask that PSE file the the full version of this testimony in RJR-31 within seven
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And there, the Commission found that even though the author of that challenged affidavit, quote, may be an expert on what he describes, his statements do not have a sufficient inherent indicium of reliability such that the Commission is willing to accept them without an opportunity for cross-examination. That's basically what's happening here by appending the written direct testimony of a witness who	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	cited, you know, we didn't have an opportunity to look at that in advance. So this is this is a bit of a surprise. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, both. I I would ask that I would ask that PSE file the the full version of this testimony in RJR-31 within seven days. So that would be my next Monday.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And there, the Commission found that even though the author of that challenged affidavit, quote, may be an expert on what he describes, his statements do not have a sufficient inherent indicium of reliability such that the Commission is willing to accept them without an opportunity for cross-examination. That's basically what's happening here by appending the written direct testimony of a witness who is not attending this hearing and who will not be	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cited, you know, we didn't have an opportunity to look at that in advance. So this is this is a bit of a surprise. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, both. I I would ask that I would ask that PSE file the the full version of this testimony in RJR-31 within seven days. So that would be my next Monday. You know the Commission does not strictly
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And there, the Commission found that even though the author of that challenged affidavit, quote, may be an expert on what he describes, his statements do not have a sufficient inherent indicium of reliability such that the Commission is willing to accept them without an opportunity for cross-examination. That's basically what's happening here by appending the written direct testimony of a witness who is not attending this hearing and who will not be available for cross-examination, inclusion of that	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cited, you know, we didn't have an opportunity to look at that in advance. So this is this is a bit of a surprise. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, both. I I would ask that I would ask that PSE file the the full version of this testimony in RJR-31 within seven days. So that would be my next Monday. You know the Commission does not strictly follow the rules of evidence. And I would also observe
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And there, the Commission found that even though the author of that challenged affidavit, quote, may be an expert on what he describes, his statements do not have a sufficient inherent indicium of reliability such that the Commission is willing to accept them without an opportunity for cross-examination. That's basically what's happening here by appending the written direct testimony of a witness who is not attending this hearing and who will not be	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cited, you know, we didn't have an opportunity to look at that in advance. So this is this is a bit of a surprise. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, both. I I would ask that I would ask that PSE file the the full version of this testimony in RJR-31 within seven days. So that would be my next Monday. You know the Commission does not strictly

6 (Pages 261 to 264)

,			
	Page 265		Page 267
1	of the exhibits submitted by the Tribe, particularly	1	I'm going to consider all these objections
2	RXS-24 and RXS-26. And I have not heard any objection	2	as we go through the cross and we see where the
3	yet to the admission of these exhibits and I'm not	3	questions lead.
4	convinced at this point, having reviewed RJR-31, that	4	I do know that the energy project has not
5	there is prejudice resulting from letting in the full	5	joined has not given testimony, excuse me, with
б	version of this.	6	specifically on that aspect of the settlement. But the
7	So I I am going to deem R I'm going to	7	Energy Project has indicated will oppose I'm sorry.
8	deem that objection denied at this point.	8	I'm getting my issues confused.
9	MR. FULLER: Thank you, Your Honor.	9	The Energy Project has joined the revenue
10	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I will now turn	10	requirement settlement. I will allow brief questioning
11	to the admission of the pretrial testimony of exhibits.	11	and we will see where it goes, and I will consider the
12	Before the hearing, I circulated an exhibit list which	12	objections at that time.
13	included all the pre-filed testimony exhibits in this	13	MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	proceeding. This includes the three multi-party	14	JUDGE HOWARD: So as I was indicating, I
15	settlements and most recently, the cross-examination	15	have circulated an exhibit list. I'm going set aside
16	exhibits filed by September 26th.	16	the issue of admitting CENSE's cross exhibits for Dan'I
17	I have made corrections as requested by the	17	Koch. And these were filed as cross-exhibits DRK-28X
18	parties.	18	through DRK-34X. And the Commission has re-labeled
19	Mr. ffitch?	19	those these exhibits and posted them again to our
20 21	MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, I apologize. I was going to ask if we could return to the cross-examination	20 21	cases application. And they are now re-labeled as DRK-29X through DRK-35X.
21	issues, briefly, before getting to the exhibit	22	And we also have a CENSE cross-exhibit,
23	stipulation.	23	JBN-9X.
24	JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead, yes.	24	Aside from these CENSE cross-exhibits I have
25	MR. FFITCH: Just requesting some additional	25	just mentioned, are the parties willing to stipulate to
	Page 266		Page 268
1	guidance, Your Honor, on the scope of cross-examination	1	the admissibility of all the pre-file testimony and
2	in light of your rulings. As you know, The Energy	2	exhibits as I have described?
3	Project and I believe some other parties indicated	3	I turn first to the company.
4	the intention to object to a cross-examination of their	4	MS. CARSON: Yes, Your Honor, PSE is willing
5	panel witnesses who had not provided any testimony on	5	to stipulate to those exhibits being admitted into the
6	the CENSE issue in connection with the revenue	6	record.
7	requirement settlement. The witness for The Energy	7	JUDGE HOWARD: Can I would any other
8	Project in support of the settlement has not provided	8	party raise any concerns or objections to that proposal?
9	any testimony on the Energize Eastside issue. And no	9	To my proposal?
10	cross-exhibits have been identified for Mr. Cebulko on	10	All right. Hearing hearing none. All
11	that topic.	11	the pre-filed testimony and exhibits are admitted as
12	So it would be our intention to object to	12	shown on the exhibit list with the exception of JBN-9X
13	cross-examination of Mr. Cebulko on that topic.	13	and DRK-29X through DRK-35X. And as I've already
14	If I might make a proposal, Your Honor. If	14	indicated the Tribe's objection to RJR-31 is denied.
15	CENSE does wish to cross-examine the revenue requirement	15	I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to
16	panel on that question, I would propose that the bench	16	the court reporter so it may be made part of the record.
17	limit their cross-examination to those witnesses on the	17	I'd also like to speak to Public Counsel
18	panel who have provided testimony on the Energize	18	about the public comment exhibit. We had the public
19	Eastside issue. And I believe that includes the company	19	comment hearing on September 28th. Would one week from
20	and staff and perhaps one or two additional parties.	20	today be sufficient to compile and submit the public
21	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. ffitch. I am	21	comment exhibit, or would we require a bit more time
22	going to consider I'm aware that the that there	22	given the nature of this case?
23	are other parties who CENSE plans to cross on the	23	MS. GAFKEN: I believe the standard one week
	and a second manufacture and an and a second second second second second second	0.4	a la suite a suite a suite and a suite and the second suite the s
24	revenue requirement panel who have indicated they may	24	should be sufficient. We will get in contact with the
	revenue requirement panel who have indicated they may object to the cross.	24 25	should be sufficient. We will get in contact with the Commission representatives and gather those comments up.

7 (Pages 265 to 268)

	Dama 260		Dorro 071
	Page 269		Page 271
1	I'm not anticipating any problems at this time, but, you	1	Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. And I
2	know, if we do run into problems we will contact the	2	have with me the Green Direct panelists for PSE.
3	Commission and figure a solution. But at this time I	3	JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you.
4	think the one week should be just fine.	4	Could we have appearance for staff.
5	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And	5	MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard,
6	Ms. Gafken, there is I am able to hear you, but there	6	Chair Danner, Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit, Jeff
7	is a slight lag between I'm your video and your	7	Roberson, AAG for staff. Appearing with me in this
8	audio. So I would just we'll just be aware of that.	8	matter is Nash Callahan.
9	You might you may need to call in for the audio	9	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
10	portion of your of any remarks.	10	Could we hear from Public Counsel?
11	MS. GAFKEN: Okay. I'll keep an eye on	11	MS. GAFKEN: Good morning, Chair Danner,
12	that.	12	Commissioners Doumit and Rendahl. This is Lisa Gafken,
13	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's please	13	Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of Public
14	give me one moment. I'm asking the Commissioners to	14	Counsel. And also appearing with me is Ann Paisner, Assistant Attorney General.
15 16	join us in our virtual hearing space. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I'll be off	15 16	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear
17	for just a minute as I get the panel ready to start.	17	from AWEC.
18	JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.	18	MS. MOSER: Good morning, Chair Danner,
19	I see we have Commissioner Doumit.	19	Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit.
20	Commissioner Doumit, can you hear and see	20	My name is Sommer Moser and I'm appearing on
21	everyone?	21	behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers this
22	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Sure.	22	morning.
23	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry. I spoke over you	23	JUDGE HOWARD: The Energy Project.
24	there.	24	MR. ZAKAI: Good morning, Your Honor,
25	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No. I didn't let you	25	commissioners. My name is Yochi Zakai with Shute,
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Page 270		Page 272
1	finish your question. I apologize for that.	1	Mihaly & Weinberger appearing today on behalf of The
2	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I see we have		
3		2	Energy Project. Also with me today appearing on behalf
5	Commissioner Rendahl.	3	Energy Project. Also with me today appearing on behalf of The Energy Project is Simon ffitch.
4	Commissioner Rendahl. Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me?		
		3	of The Energy Project is Simon ffitch.
4	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me?	3 4	of The Energy Project is Simon ffitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive
4 5	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.	3 4 5	of The Energy Project is Simon ffitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies.
4 5 6	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge.	3 4 5 6	of The Energy Project is Simon ffitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I
4 5 7 8 9	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.	3 4 5 6 7	of The Energy Project is Simon ffitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive
4 5 7 8 9 10	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner.	3 4 5 6 7 8	of The Energy Project is Simon ffitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of The Energy Project is Simon ffitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of The Energy Project is Simon ffitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos &
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE give a brief appearance for the Commissioners, and then	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now. I believe if you mute the audio on one of them. That
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE give a brief appearance for the Commissioners, and then we will go down and have one representative from each	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now. I believe if you mute the audio on one of them. That could you could you please repeat your appearance.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE give a brief appearance for the Commissioners, and then we will go down and have one representative from each party give an appearance.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now. I believe if you mute the audio on one of them. That could you could you please repeat your
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE give a brief appearance for the Commissioners, and then we will go down and have one representative from each party give an appearance. Sorry. I didn't catch I didn't catch who	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now. I believe if you mute the audio on one of them. That could you could you please repeat your appearance. Mr. Xenopoulos, could you please repeat your appearance for the record just using one of your
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE give a brief appearance for the Commissioners, and then we will go down and have one representative from each party give an appearance. Sorry. I didn't catch I didn't catch who was speaking there.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now. I believe if you mute the audio on one of them. That could you could you please repeat your appearance. Mr. Xenopoulos, could you please repeat your appearance for the record just using one of your connections?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE give a brief appearance for the Commissioners, and then we will go down and have one representative from each party give an appearance. Sorry. I didn't catch I didn't catch who was speaking there. MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor. This	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now. I believe if you mute the audio on one of them. That could you could you please repeat your appearance. Mr. Xenopoulos, could you please repeat your appearance for the record just using one of your connections? We can we will return to Nucor.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE give a brief appearance for the Commissioners, and then we will go down and have one representative from each party give an appearance. Sorry. I didn't catch I didn't catch who was speaking there. MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Sheree Carson. Can you hear me?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now. I believe if you mute the audio on one of them. That could you could you please repeat your appearance. Mr. Xenopoulos, could you please repeat your appearance for the record just using one of your connections? We can we will return to Nucor. Could we have an appearance for Walmart.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE give a brief appearance for the Commissioners, and then we will go down and have one representative from each party give an appearance. Sorry. I didn't catch I didn't catch who was speaking there. MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor. This	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now. I believe if you mute the audio on one of them. That could you could you please repeat your appearance. Mr. Xenopoulos, could you please repeat your appearance for the record just using one of your connections? We can we will return to Nucor. Could we have an appearance for Walmart. BALDWIN: Good morning, Your Honor, and
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Commissioner Rendahl, can you hear me? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I can. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE HOWARD: And I see we have Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: Good morning. JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. All right. Ms. Carson for PSE has indicated she's going to be off camera for a moment readying some witnesses for the Green Direct panel. Could one of the co-representatives for PSE give a brief appearance for the Commissioners, and then we will go down and have one representative from each party give an appearance. Sorry. I didn't catch I didn't catch who was speaking there. MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Sheree Carson. Can you hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of The Energy Project is Simon flitch. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MS. LIOTTA: Good morning, Commissioners. I am Rita Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Nucor Steel Seattle. MR. XENOPOULOS: Good morning, Commissions. This is Damon Xenopoulos of Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew appearing for Nucor Steel Seattle, accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of same. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Xenopoulos, your phone and your computer may be having some feedback right now. I believe if you mute the audio on one of them. That could you could you please repeat your appearance. Mr. Xenopoulos, could you please repeat your appearance for the record just using one of your connections? We can we will return to Nucor. Could we have an appearance for Walmart.

8 (Pages 269 to 272)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

· · · · · ·	D 072		
	Page 273		Page 275
1	and Latimer on behalf of Walmart.	1	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, please. Thank you.
2	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Microsoft.	2	MR. XENOPOULOS: Okay. Thank you very much.
3	MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, Your Honor. Good	3	I apologize for the technical issue we were just having.
4	morning, Commissioners. This is Tyler Pepple on behalf	4	So that is Damon Xenopoulos with Stone Mattheis
5	of Microsoft.	5	Xenopoulos & Brew here representing Nucor Steel Seattle
6	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Kroger.	6	Inc., and accompanied by Laura Wynn Baker of our firm.
7	MR. BOEHM: Good morning, Your Honor, and	7	Thank you, your Honor.
8	Commissioners. Curt Boehm appearing on behalf of the	8	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Xenopoulos.
9	Kroger Company.	9	Thank you for reminding me.
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear	10	So we will now call witnesses on Green
11	from the joint environmental advocates, that is Sierra	11	Direct panel. Instead of having an attorney formally
12	Club, NWEC, and Front and Centered.	12	tender the witness for examination, I am simply going to
13	MS. PAREKH: Good morning, Your Honor,	13	ask that each witness identify themselves and the party
14	Commissioners. Jaimini Parekh with Earth Justice	14	they are appearing for, beginning with the settlement
15	representing Northwest Energy Coalition, Front &	15	witnesses for PSE.
16	Centered, and Sierra Club, the joint environmental	16	Let's also have each of the witnesses on
17	advocates.	17	this panel turn on their cameras and then I will swear
18	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear	18	in the witnesses at the same time and we will hear
19	from King County.	19	testimony from the witnesses together as a panel.
20	MR. MAYER: Thank you, Your Honor. Good	20	Could we hear for the witnesses from PSE.
21	morning, Commissioners. This is Ben Mayer of K&L Gates	21	MR. PILIARIS: Good morning, Your Honor, and
22 23	for King County. Also appearing with me is	22 23	Commissioners. This is Jon Piliaris, Director of
23 24	senior deputy prosecuting attorney Raul Martinez.	23	Regulatory Affairs for Puget Sound Energy. MR. JHAVERI: Good morning, your Honor and
24 25	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance for CENSE?	24	Commissioners. This is Birud Jhaveri, Manager for
20	appearance for CENSE?	25	Commissioners. This is blidd snaven, manager for
	Page 274		Page 276
1	MR. HANSEN: Yes. Norm Hansen appearing for	1	Pricing and Costs of Service for PSE.
2	CENSE.	2	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Hansen.	3	Could we hear from staff's witness?
4	Could we have an appearance for the Puyallup	4	MR. MCGUIRE: Yes. Good morning, Your
5	Tribe.	5	Honor. Good morning, Commissioners. This is Chris
6	MR. FULLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Good	6	McGuire, regulatory analyst with Commission staff.
7	morning, Commissioners. This is Andrew Fuller at Odgen	7	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
8	Murphy Wallace appearing on behalf of the Puyallup Tribe	8	Could we hear from public counsel's witness?
9	of Indians. My colleague, Nicolas Thomas, is also here.	9	MR. EARLE: Good morning, Your Honor. This
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	10	is Robert Earle appearing on behalf of Public Counsel.
11	And I would just inform the Commissioners	11	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
12	before we begin calling witnesses that all the pre-filed	12	And King County's witness?
13	testimony and exhibits have been admitted into the	13	MS. BRUMBAUGH: Good morning, Your Honor.
	record with the exception of cross-exhibits JBN-9X and	14	This is Rachel Brumbaugh from King County.
14		15	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
14 15	PRK-29X through DRK-35X.	1 12	-
15 16	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you	16	And could we hear from Walmart's witness?
15 16 17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that last? I got JBN-9X and what is the other	16 17	And could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex
15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that last? I got JBN-9X and what is the other set?	16 17 18	And could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex Kronauer. I'm a Senior Manager on the Energies Services
15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that last? I got JBN-9X and what is the other set? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, the CENSE cross-exhibits	16 17 18 19	And could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex Kronauer. I'm a Senior Manager on the Energies Services Team at Walmart.
15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that last? I got JBN-9X and what is the other set? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, the CENSE cross-exhibits for Dan'l Koch. And they are DRK-29X through DRK-35X,	16 17 18 19 20	And could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex Kronauer. I'm a Senior Manager on the Energies Services Team at Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. One moment.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that last? I got JBN-9X and what is the other set? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, the CENSE cross-exhibits for Dan'l Koch. And they are DRK-29X through DRK-35X, and that is using the updated numbering.	16 17 18 19 20 21	And could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex Kronauer. I'm a Senior Manager on the Energies Services Team at Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. One moment. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that last? I got JBN-9X and what is the other set? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, the CENSE cross-exhibits for Dan'I Koch. And they are DRK-29X through DRK-35X, and that is using the updated numbering. All right. We will I begin calling	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex Kronauer. I'm a Senior Manager on the Energies Services Team at Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. One moment. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Commissioner Doumit.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that last? I got JBN-9X and what is the other set? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, the CENSE cross-exhibits for Dan'l Koch. And they are DRK-29X through DRK-35X, and that is using the updated numbering. All right. We will I begin calling witnesses starting with the Green Direct panel.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex Kronauer. I'm a Senior Manager on the Energies Services Team at Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. One moment. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Commissioner Doumit. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that last? I got JBN-9X and what is the other set? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, the CENSE cross-exhibits for Dan'I Koch. And they are DRK-29X through DRK-35X, and that is using the updated numbering. All right. We will I begin calling witnesses starting with the Green Direct panel. MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex Kronauer. I'm a Senior Manager on the Energies Services Team at Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. One moment. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Commissioner Doumit. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that last? I got JBN-9X and what is the other set? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, the CENSE cross-exhibits for Dan'l Koch. And they are DRK-29X through DRK-35X, and that is using the updated numbering. All right. We will I begin calling witnesses starting with the Green Direct panel.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex Kronauer. I'm a Senior Manager on the Energies Services Team at Walmart. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. One moment. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Commissioner Doumit. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor.

9 (Pages 273 to 276)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 277		Page 279
1	realize that counsel for the Puyallup Tribe was a member	1	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Good morning,
2	of the firm of Odgen Murphy Wallace.	2	everyone. I have a few clarifying questions for the
3	I just raise for the record that I was an	3	Green Direct settlement parties.
4	associate in that firm. I think I last practiced there	4	The first one in paragraph 17 of the Green
- 5	in the neighborhood of 29 28 or 29 years ago. Never	5	Direct settlement, it updates the resource option energy
6	on a matter related to this. Totally unrelated but I	6	charge and the energy charge credit, quote: For Green
7	just wanted to raise it for the record. Thank you.	7	Direct customers currently taking service under schedule
8	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Commissioner	8	139.
9	Doumit.	9	And because the settlement provisions appear
10	As the assigned ALJ to this case, it is my	10	to be limited to customers currently taking service,
11	understanding that these were unrelated matters, as	11	does this mean that future Green Direct customers could
12	you've just indicated.	12	be subject to different resource option charges and
13	Did any of the parties wish to raise any	13	energy charge credits; is that a correct understanding
		14	of the settlement?
14	concerns or objections to that? And this is this,	15	MR. PILIARIS: This is Jon Piliaris for PSE.
15 16	again, is related to the Puyallup Tribe's participation	16	That would be my interpretation as well.
	in the case, rather than Green Direct.	17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm seeing head nods,
17	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, Nick Thomas for the		
18	Tribe. We see no issue here.	18	but if any of the witnesses could verify if they are
19	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Thomas.	19	indicating that, that would be helpful for the record. MR. EARLE: This is Robert Earle, I agree.
20	All right. Hearing no further concerns, we	20	MR. MCGUIRE: And this is Chris McGuire with
21	will swear in the witnesses for the Green Direct panel.	21	
22	The witnesses I just had identify themselves, would you	22 23	Commission Staff and I agree as well. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you very
23	all please raise your right hand.		
24	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony	24	much. Appreciate that.
25	you will give today will be the truth the truth and	25	The question relates to the proposed energy
	Page 278		Page 280
1	nothing but the truth?		
		1	charge credit which the settling parties have stated is
2	(Affirmative answers.)	1 2	charge credit which the settling parties have stated is \$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt
2 3	-	1	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt
	(Affirmative answers.)	2	
3	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party	2 3	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound
3 4	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking?	2 3 4	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the
3 4 5	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party	2 3 4 5	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge
3 4 5 6	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct	2 3 4 5 6	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about
3 4 5 6 7	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for	2 3 4 5 6 7	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC
3 4 5 6 7 8	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about
3 4 5 7 8 9	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for my audio. I will just read what I said, which is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket number is 200980.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for my audio. I will just read what I said, which is that no party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket number is 200980. And I can give folks a minute to find that,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for my audio. I will just read what I said, which is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket number is 200980. And I can give folks a minute to find that, if you would like.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 (Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for my audio. I will just read what I said, which is that no party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct settlement panel, and I've just sworn in all the witnesses and I've heard their affirmative responses. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	\$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket number is 200980. And I can give folks a minute to find that, if you would like. And my question relates to that amount that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 (Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for my audio. I will just read what I said, which is that no party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct settlement panel, and I've just sworn in all the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 \$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket number is 200980. And I can give folks a minute to find that, if you would like. And my question relates to that amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 (Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for my audio. I will just read what I said, which is that no party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct settlement panel, and I've just sworn in all the witnesses and I've heard their affirmative responses. Do we have any questions from the bench for this panel of witnesses? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 \$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket number is 200980. And I can give folks a minute to find that, if you would like. And my question relates to that amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 (Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for my audio. I will just read what I said, which is that no party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct settlement panel, and I've just sworn in all the witnesses and I've heard their affirmative responses. Do we have any questions from the bench for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 \$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket number is 200980. And I can give folks a minute to find that, if you would like. And my question relates to that amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. So if you let me know when you might have found that. If not, I can ask the question subject to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 (Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for my audio. I will just read what I said, which is that no party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct settlement panel, and I've just sworn in all the witnesses and I've heard their affirmative responses. Do we have any questions from the bench for this panel of witnesses? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I do, Your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 \$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket number is 200980. And I can give folks a minute to find that, if you would like. And my question relates to that amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. So if you let me know when you might have found that. If not, I can ask the question subject to check.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 (Affirmative answers.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. No party indicated I'm sorry. Was someone speaking? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. No party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, you are cutting in and out for me. I don't know if it's for others as well. You might want to repeat that. JUDGE HOWARD: Am I cutting in and out for other people attending the call? (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Hopefully that goes away. I will call in on a cell phone if I need to for my audio. I will just read what I said, which is that no party indicated that plan to cross the Green Direct settlement panel, and I've just sworn in all the witnesses and I've heard their affirmative responses. Do we have any questions from the bench for this panel of witnesses? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I do, Your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 \$47.8 per megawatt hour, and that it is \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the variable portion of Puget Sound Energy's power cost adjustment rate, which the Commission approved as the basis for the energy charge credit and the 2020 power cost only rate case. And so I'm going to ask a question about this this amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. Does anyone do people have access to that or do I need to ask this question subject to check? I have a docket number, if that would help. MR. EARLE: Thank you, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that docket number is 200980. And I can give folks a minute to find that, if you would like. And my question relates to that amount that was agreed to in the 2020 PCORC settlement. So if you let me know when you might have found that. If not, I can ask the question subject to check. MR. PILLARIS: This is Jon Piliaris. I

10 (Pages 277 to 280)

	Page 281		Page 283
1	check or not until we hear it.	1	just as a clarifying point. I think staff and Public
2	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So I will ask	2	Counsel have a different perspective on what the rate in
3	it subject to check.	3	the settlement is.
4	Would you accept, subject to check, that	4	From from the point of view of Public
5	paragraph 11(A)(1)(b) that's paragraph 11(A)(1)(b) of	5	Counsel, the point of the Green Direct credit is to
6	the 2020 PCORC settlement states that the variable power	6	compensate Green Direct customers for the value that the
7	cost adjustment baseline rate is \$39.346 per megawatt	7	Green Direct TPAs provide the system.
8	hour.	8	And so Public Counsel believes that the
9	So can the settling parties explain the	9	rate that is in the settlement is a reasonable
10	basis for this statement and the settlements in this	10	approximation of that and is a rate that the parties are
11	case that the proposed energy charge credit in this	11	able to agree on.
12	settlement is only \$2 per megawatt hour higher than the	12	From public counsel's point of view, the
13	rate approved in the 2020 PCORC.	13	right way to understand what's happening with the Green
14	MR. MCGUIRE: Commissioner Rendahl, this is	14	Direct program is essentially the legislature said,
15	Chris McGuire.	15	well, we want to provide consumers with the ability to
16	First, I can verify I do have the	16	have more green power.
17	settlement agreement up from the the PCORC, and I can	17	PSE went out and purchased PPAs on Green
18	confirm that the the amount you cited is accurate.	18	Direct customers' behalf. Those PPAs are paid by Green
19	I think the the variable rate cited in	19	Direct customers.
20	the PCORC is different than the variable rate if you	20	In order to make the Green Direct customers
21	would calculate it today.	21	whole, they should be compensated for the value of those
22	So the rate the Green Direct credit rate	22	contracts.
23	that is identified in the current settlement isn't	23	Likewise, other all customers should pay
24	necessarily \$2 higher than the PCORC variable rate. It	24	for the value that those PPAs have brought to the
25	is higher than the current variable rate.	25	system.
	Page 282		Page 284
1	Page 282 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to	1	Page 284 So it's it's a different take than
1 2		1 2	
	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to		So it's it's a different take than
2	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that	2	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green
2 3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed,	2 3	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's
2 3 4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement.	2 3 4	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission.
2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it?	2 3 4 5	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for	2 3 4 5 6	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it?	2 3 4 5 6 7	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as a result of Green Direct resources being on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states that the settling parties agree that the settlement is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as a result of Green Direct resources being on the company's system.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states that the settling parties agree that the settlement is intended to establish a durable methodology for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as a result of Green Direct resources being on the company's system.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states that the settling parties agree that the settlement is intended to establish a durable methodology for calculating the energy credit for Green Direct customers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as a result of Green Direct resources being on the company's system. So it's not going to be precisely the variable rate. It's going to be the variable rate plus	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states that the settling parties agree that the settlement is intended to establish a durable methodology for calculating the energy credit for Green Direct customers and is intended to be used in future cases.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as a result of Green Direct resources being on the company's system. So it's not going to be precisely the variable rate. It's going to be the variable rate plus some amount of additional costs that PSE is avoiding.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states that the settling parties agree that the settlement is intended to establish a durable methodology for calculating the energy credit for Green Direct customers and is intended to be used in future cases. So if if one of the settling parties
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as a result of Green Direct resources being on the company's system. So it's not going to be precisely the variable rate. It's going to be the variable rate plus some amount of additional costs that PSE is avoiding. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So does any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states that the settling parties agree that the settlement is intended to establish a durable methodology for calculating the energy credit for Green Direct customers and is intended to be used in future cases. So if if one of the settling parties determines in the future that the adjusted value of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as a result of Green Direct resources being on the company's system. So it's not going to be precisely the variable rate. It's going to be the variable rate plus some amount of additional costs that PSE is avoiding. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So does any other witness wish to respond in addition to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states that the settling parties agree that the settlement is intended to establish a durable methodology for calculating the energy credit for Green Direct customers and is intended to be used in future cases. So if if one of the settling parties determines in the future that the adjusted value of the Green Direct PPAs is no longer serves as a reasonable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as a result of Green Direct resources being on the company's system. So it's not going to be precisely the variable rate. It's going to be the variable rate plus some amount of additional costs that PSE is avoiding. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So does any other witness wish to respond in addition to Mr. McGuire?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states that the settling parties agree that the settlement is intended to establish a durable methodology for calculating the energy credit for Green Direct customers and is intended to be used in future cases. So if if one of the settling parties determines in the future that the adjusted value of the Green Direct PPAs is no longer serves as a reasonable proxy for the company's avoided cost, did the settlement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So maybe to clarify, the basis for the power cost adjustment that was in the PCORC settlement hasn't necessarily changed, but the calculation of it might have changed based on how the power cost adjustment was agreed to end the PCORC settlement. Is that a better way of describing it? MR. McGUIRE: Well, the methodology for calculating the rate has actually changed. The rate that was agreed to in the PCORC was a result of a settlement and is represents only the variable rate, whereas the Green Direct credit in the current settlement reflects well, it uses a proxy for calculating the avoided cost that should reflect both the variable the variable cost of power as well as some additional benefits that are experienced by PSE as a result of Green Direct resources being on the company's system. So it's not going to be precisely the variable rate. It's going to be the variable rate plus some amount of additional costs that PSE is avoiding. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So does any other witness wish to respond in addition to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So it's it's a different take than than staff. And I emphasize it because I think that it's important if there is a successor to this first Green Direct program, it's important to have the principles in in place and on the record for the Commission. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Does any other witness wish to respond? Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification. It helps me in looking at the the joint testimony where it's referenced on page 19 about basing it on the method used in the PCORC settlement, so I appreciate that clarification. My last question relates to the statement in the Green Direct settlement at paragraph 20 which states that the settling parties agree that the settlement is intended to establish a durable methodology for calculating the energy credit for Green Direct customers and is intended to be used in future cases. So if if one of the settling parties determines in the future that the adjusted value of the Green Direct PPAs is no longer serves as a reasonable

11 (Pages 281 to 284)

	Page 285		Page 287
1	before the Commission? Or is this a a hope and	1	expectation is that would not occur either.
2	aspiration that this method will hold and will be	2	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.
3	durable in future cases?	3	Anyone else wish to offer an opinion?
4	MR. PILLARIS: As with any settlement,	4	All right. Thank you.
5	Commissioner Rendahl, there's there's an expectation	5	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any
6	that the parties the signatories of the party to the	6	further questions from the bench for this panel?
7	agreement will abide by that. However, circumstances	7	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I don't have any, Your
8	sometimes change beyond everybody's comprehension, at	8	Honor. Thank you.
9	least at the time.	9	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
10	And so the there's always the possibility	10	Then, in that case, I would like to thank
11	that it could be re-opened. But I think from at least	11	the witnesses for their testimony.
12	the company's perspective, the hope is that this will be	12	I'd also like to remind the witnesses that
13	durable for at least the foreseeable future.	13	the earlier question asked by Commissioner Rendahl
14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I see Rachel	14	subject to check under the Commission rules, the
15	Brombaugh on the screen.	15	witnesses would have and the parties sponsoring them
16	Did you wish to respond?	16	would have five days following the receipt of the
17	MS. BROMBAUGH: Thank you, Commissioner.	17	hearing transcript from this proceeding to make any
18	One of the aspects of the settlement that	18	corrections to their testimony.
19	was so attractive to the County was the the	19	So I would encourage you to check your
20	consistency and durability of the proposed mechanism.	20	testimony when you receive that transcript and make any
21	And we certainly do not anticipate	21	corrections if you need to.
22	intervening in future cases because of this we have	22	Thank you, again, for your testimony. You
23	neither the skill nor generally the capacity our	23	may turn off your cameras.
24	our time is better spent governing the residents of King	24	We will now call the witnesses on the
25	County. I just wanted to add that.	25	revenue requirement and policy panel.
	Page 286		
			Page 288
1	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I	1	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's
2	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that.	2	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party
2 3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish	2 3	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing
2 3 4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment?	2 3 4	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I
2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I	2 3 4 5	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up.
2 3 4 5 6	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the	2 3 4 5 6	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer.
2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the duration of the rate plan?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness excused.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the duration of the rate plan? MR. PILIARIS: Again, "prohibited" is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness excused. MR. MAYER: Thank you, Judge Howard.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the duration of the rate plan? MR. PILIARIS: Again, "prohibited" is probably fairly strong black and white.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness excused. MR. MAYER: Thank you, Judge Howard. MS. BROMBAUGH: Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the duration of the rate plan? MR. PILIARIS: Again, "prohibited" is probably fairly strong black and white. But I think there is a very strong	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness excused. MR. MAYER: Thank you, Judge Howard. MS. BROMBAUGH: Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the duration of the rate plan? MR. PILIARIS: Again, "prohibited" is probably fairly strong black and white. But I think there is a very strong expectation, I would say, over this only two-year period	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness excused. MR. MAYER: Thank you, Judge Howard. MS. BROMBAUGH: Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. So with the revenue requirement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the duration of the rate plan? MR. PILIARIS: Again, "prohibited" is probably fairly strong black and white. But I think there is a very strong expectation, I would say, over this only two-year period that this should not be re-opened during that point in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness excused. MR. MAYER: Thank you, Judge Howard. MS. BROMBAUGH: Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. So with the revenue requirement policy panel, let's have the witnesses for this panel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the duration of the rate plan? MR. PILIARIS: Again, "prohibited" is probably fairly strong black and white. But I think there is a very strong expectation, I would say, over this only two-year period that this should not be re-opened during that point in time. And, in fact, it is not likely that there will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness excused. MR. MAYER: Thank you, Judge Howard. MS. BROMBAUGH: Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. So with the revenue requirement policy panel, let's have the witnesses for this panel identify themselves and the party they are appearing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does any other settling party witness wish to comment? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I appreciate you all being available and answering the questions I had this morning. I don't have any further. I don't know if my colleagues do. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing is nobody expects to re-open this, but it's possible that they're not prohibited from doing so. But just some clarification. Are they prohibited for doing so for the duration of the rate plan? MR. PILIARIS: Again, "prohibited" is probably fairly strong black and white. But I think there is a very strong expectation, I would say, over this only two-year period that this should not be re-opened during that point in time. And, in fact, it is not likely that there will be a venue for this issue to be re-opened.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Just as with the Green Direct panel, let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor. I'm sorry. I see Ben Mayer has his hand up. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mayer. MR. MAYER: Yes. Thank you, Chair Danner. And, Judge, if I could just make one request. As I think I said before, Rachel Brombaugh has limited availability today. If she could be excused now that the Green Direct panel is over, I would make that request. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from any of the parties? Hearing none, I would consider that witness excused. MR. MAYER: Thank you, Judge Howard. MS. BROMBAUGH: Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. So with the revenue requirement policy panel, let's have the witnesses for this panel identify themselves and the party they are appearing for.

12 (Pages 285 to 288)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 289		Page 291
1	swear you in and hear testimony from the witnesses as a	1	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2	panel.	2	And Kroger.
3	So could we have the PSE witnesses identify	3	MR. BIEBER: Good morning. This is Justin
4	themselves.	4	Bieber with the Kroger Company.
5	MS. FREE: Good morning, Your Honor, and	5	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
6	Commissioners, this is Susan Free. I'm the Director of	6	And could we hear fro Nucor's witness?
7	Revenue Requirements and Regulatory Compliance for PSE.	7	MR. HIGGINS: Good morning, Your Honor.
8	MR. PILIARIS: And again, for the record,	8	This is Kevin Higgins appearing on behalf of Nucor Steel
9	Your Honor, Commissioners, this is Jon Piliaris,	9	in Seattle.
10	Director of Regulatory Affairs for PSE.	10	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
11	MR. JHAVERI: Your Honor, this is Birud	11	And Microsoft's witness.
12	Jhaveri, Manager for Pricing and Cost of Service for	12	MS. PLENEFISCH: Good morning. Irene
13	PSE.	13	Plenefisch. Senior Director of Government Affairs for
14	MR. JACOB: Good morning. I'm Josh Jacob,	14	Microsoft here in Washington State.
15	Vice President Clean Energy Strategy for Puget Sound	15	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
16	Energy.	16	So I will swear in each of you here at the
17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	17	same time.
18	I believe that was all the PSE witnesses for	18	MS. CARSON: Your Honor Your Honor, if I
19	this panel.	19	could interrupt for just a minute.
20	Could we have could we hear from Staff's	20	I believe that John Taylor, another PSE
21	witnesses.	21	witness, is available online.
22	MS. ERDAHL: Good morning, Commission. This	22	John, if you are there and could turn your
23	is Betty Erdahl from Commission Staff.	23	camera on.
24	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	24	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Taylor, can you hear us?
25	Could we hear from AWEC?	25	Mr. Taylor, are you able to hear me?
	Page 290		Page 292
1	Page 290 MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins	1	Page 292 MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to
1 2		1 2	
	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins		MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to
2	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC.	2	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me?
2 3	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This	2 3	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.
2 3 4	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition.	2 3 4	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of
2 3 4 5	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This	2 3 4 5	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MR. AL-JABIR: Good morning, Your Honor,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MR. AL-JABIR: Good morning, Your Honor, Commissions. This is Ali Al-Jabir. I'm an energy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all. I see that CENSE plans five minutes of cross-examination
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MR. AL-JABIR: Good morning, Your Honor, Commissions. This is Ali Al-Jabir. I'm an energy consultant with the firm of Brubaker and Associates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all. I see that CENSE plans five minutes of cross-examination for each of the following witnesses on this panel.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MR. AL-JABIR: Good morning, Your Honor, Commissions. This is Ali Al-Jabir. I'm an energy consultant with the firm of Brubaker and Associates appearing on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all. I see that CENSE plans five minutes of cross-examination for each of the following witnesses on this panel. Bieber, Kronauer, Higgins, Mullins, Cebulko,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MR. AL-JABIR: Good morning, Your Honor, Commissions. This is Ali Al-Jabir. I'm an energy consultant with the firm of Brubaker and Associates appearing on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all. I see that CENSE plans five minutes of cross-examination for each of the following witnesses on this panel. Bieber, Kronauer, Higgins, Mullins, Cebulko, Al-Jabir, McCloy, and Plenefisch. And I've already
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MR. AL-JABIR: Good morning, Your Honor, Commissions. This is Ali Al-Jabir. I'm an energy consultant with the firm of Brubaker and Associates appearing on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from Walmart's witness?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all. I see that CENSE plans five minutes of cross-examination for each of the following witnesses on this panel. Bieber, Kronauer, Higgins, Mullins, Cebulko, Al-Jabir, McCloy, and Plenefisch. And I've already granted Microsoft's objection to the cross-examination
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MR. AL-JABIR: Good morning, Your Honor, Commissions. This is Ali Al-Jabir. I'm an energy consultant with the firm of Brubaker and Associates appearing on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all. I see that CENSE plans five minutes of cross-examination for each of the following witnesses on this panel. Bieber, Kronauer, Higgins, Mullins, Cebulko, Al-Jabir, McCloy, and Plenefisch. And I've already granted Microsoft's objection to the cross-examination of Plenefisch.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MR. AL-JABIR: Good morning, Your Honor, Commissions. This is Ali Al-Jabir. I'm an energy consultant with the firm of Brubaker and Associates appearing on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex Kronauer. I'm a senior manager on the energy services	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all. I see that CENSE plans five minutes of cross-examination for each of the following witnesses on this panel. Bieber, Kronauer, Higgins, Mullins, Cebulko, Al-Jabir, McCloy, and Plenefisch. And I've already granted Microsoft's objection to the cross-examination of Plenefisch. Although the other parties have reserved or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. MULLINS: Good morning. Brad Mullins with AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from NWEC's witness? MS. MCCLOY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Lauren McCloy with Northwest Energy Coalition. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Sierra Club. MS. SMITH: Good morning. Gloria Smith for Sierra Club. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project. MR. CEBULKO: Good morning. Brad Cebulko with The Energy Project. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Federal Executive Agencies. MR. AL-JABIR: Good morning, Your Honor, Commissions. This is Ali Al-Jabir. I'm an energy consultant with the firm of Brubaker and Associates appearing on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear from Walmart's witness? MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. This is Alex	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Can you able to hear me? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. MR. TAYLOR: All right. Sorry about that. Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners. John Taylor, a managing partner with Atrium Economics on behalf of Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Ms. Carson, for bringing that up. So I will swear in each of these witnesses at the same time. For the witnesses Piliaris, Jhaveri, and Kronauer, I would consider you still under oath from your earlier affirmation. So I'll swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hand. (Affirmative responses.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, all. I see that CENSE plans five minutes of cross-examination for each of the following witnesses on this panel. Bieber, Kronauer, Higgins, Mullins, Cebulko, Al-Jabir, McCloy, and Plenefisch. And I've already granted Microsoft's objection to the cross-examination of Plenefisch.

13 (Pages 289 to 292)

	Page 293	Page 295
1	of their settlement panel witnesses, I am going to	1 consider, although they may not be the only criteria.
2	remind CENSE that its participation in this proceeding	2 BY MR. HANSEN:
3	is specifically limited to the prudency of the Energize	3 Q. Can you repeat that? I was having a problem
4	Eastside project. This was set out in order 03 in this	4 with the transmission here.
5	proceeding. So I'm going to expect that CENSE's	5 I'll repeat the question.
6	questioning of these panel witnesses ties back to the	6 Do you disagree with his testimony on the four
7	prudency of Energize Eastside.	7 factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review?
8	With that, Mr. Hansen, you may proceed.	8 A. So without speaking to the criteria that the
9	Which witness do you intend to direct your	9 WUTC would look at, these do not appear to be
10	questions to first?	10 unreasonable criteria to consider, although they may not
11	MR. HANSEN: Justin Bieber, I believe.	11 be the only criteria.
12	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed.	12 Q. Okay. What, in your mind, is the difference
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION	13 between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full
14	BY MR. HANSEN:	14 prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart?
15	Q. Okay. Well, just to summarize a little bit.	15 A. Are you asking me about the difference between
16	They all signed the original agreement and they agreed	16 those two types of reviews?
17	to the threshold prudence. And we're trying to	17 Q. Yeah. I'm asking we're trying to understand
18	understand what that threshold prudence actually means.	18 what a a threshold prudence is.
19	So I have some questions here.	19 And so in trying to understand that, we're
20	Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for	20 the question is what is the difference between a
21	CENSE, Exhibits RL-1T, page 17.	threshold prudence and a and a full prudency review.
22	A. Give me a moment while I pull that up.	A. I would expect a prudency review to determine
23	Q. Okay. Thank you.	23 whether a decision meets the threshold prudence
24	A. Could you repeat the page and section number?	24 criteria. So I'm not aware of a distinction,
25	Q. Yes, it's RL-1T, page 17.	25 necessarily, between the two types of reviews that you
	D	
	Page 294	Page 296
1		
1 2	A. Okay.	1 are referring to.
	A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors	1 are referring to.
2	A. Okay.	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand
2 3	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review.
2 3 4	A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review.	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that
2 3 4 5	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term?
2 3 4 5 6	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us.
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question. BY MR. HANSEN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's a way to sit a little closer to the microphone or 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's a way to sit a little closer to the microphone or something, and I'm not sure if it is a receiving of the 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of need.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's a way to sit a little closer to the microphone or something, and I'm not sure if it is a receiving of the sound or if it's an internet issue. 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's a way to sit a little closer to the microphone or something, and I'm not sure if it is a receiving of the sound or if it's an internet issue. MR. BIEBER: Okay. Can you hear me better 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow, also known as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's a way to sit a little closer to the microphone or something, and I'm not sure if it is a receiving of the sound or if it's an internet issue. MR. BIEBER: Okay. Can you hear me better now? 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow, also known as a Power Flow Study?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's a way to sit a little closer to the microphone or something, and I'm not sure if it is a receiving of the sound or if it's an internet issue. MR. BIEBER: Okay. Can you hear me better now? JUDGE HOWARD: Slightly. 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow, also known as a Power Flow Study? A. Are you asking if I'm generally aware how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's a way to sit a little closer to the microphone or something, and I'm not sure if it is a receiving of the sound or if it's an internet issue. MR. BIEBER: Okay. Can you hear me better now? JUDGE HOWARD: Slightly. Let's proceed with this for the moment. 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow, also known as a Power Flow Study? A. Are you asking if I'm generally aware how transmission needs are identified?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's a way to sit a little closer to the microphone or something, and I'm not sure if it is a receiving of the sound or if it's an internet issue. MR. BIEBER: Okay. Can you hear me better now? JUDGE HOWARD: Slightly. Let's proceed with this for the moment. MR. BIEBER: Okay. So in response to the 	1 are referring to. 2 Q. So what we're just trying to understand 3 what the threshold prudency review. 4 Is there some documentation that refers to that 5 particular term? 6 It seems to be new to us. 7 JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I 8 would caution you to to try to limit what you're 9 saying to questions. 10 MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. 11 JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there 12 was was more of a statement. 13 MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have 14 another question. 15 BY MR. HANSEN: 16 Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of 17 need. 18 Are you aware that the need for a transmission 19 line is demonstrated through a load flow, also known as 20 a Power Flow Study? 21 A. Are you asking if I'm generally aware how 22 Q. Are you an expert in load flow studies?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Okay. Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that the that the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with this testimony on the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudence review? A. Give me a chance to to read the four factors. JUDGE HOWARD: While Mr. Bieber is reviewing that, is the court reporter able to capture what Mr. Bieber is saying? It does sound a little bit like the audio is a little diminished to me. MR. HANSEN: It's a little muffled, true. COURT REPORTER: Yes, it's the same for me. JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. Mr. Bieber, if there's a way to sit a little closer to the microphone or something, and I'm not sure if it is a receiving of the sound or if it's an internet issue. MR. BIEBER: Okay. Can you hear me better now? JUDGE HOWARD: Slightly. Let's proceed with this for the moment. 	 are referring to. Q. So what we're just trying to understand what the threshold prudency review. Is there some documentation that refers to that particular term? It seems to be new to us. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I would I would caution you to to try to limit what you're saying to questions. MR. HANSEN: Oh, okay. JUDGE HOWARD: That last sentence there was was more of a statement. MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay. I have another question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow, also known as a Power Flow Study? A. Are you asking if I'm generally aware how transmission needs are identified?

14 (Pages 293 to 296)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

2	Page 297		Page 299
1	at power flow is certainly one component of when you	1	I just sent that to you.
2	determine the need for a new transmission line.	2	MR. KRONAUER: Okay.
3	Q. Please refer to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4,	3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Baldwin.
4	looking at pages 20 through 37.	4	MR. HANSEN: So do you have that, Alex?
5	A. Looking up pages 20 to 27	5	MR. KRONAUER: I am opening it. Yes, I have
6	Q. Yeah, 20	6	
0 7			this document.
	A. Okay. The title on page 20, if I'm looking at		MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you.
8	the correct document, is the seven fatal flaws found so	8	BY MR. HANSEN:
9	far.	9	Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors
10	Q. Right. Yeah, here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to	10	that WUTC looks for in prudency review.
11	seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies.	11	Do you disagree with his testimony on the four
12	Do you have any reason to disagree with	12	factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review?
13	Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal	13	A. I do not disagree, no.
14	flaws?	14	Q. Okay. What in your mind is the difference
15	Somebody is running a vacuum cleaner or	15	between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full
16	something.	16	prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart?
17	Okay. I will repeat the question.	17	A. Well, I haven't really had much of a chance to
18	Please turn to do you have any reason to	18	review his testimony. So I mean, I wouldn't really have
19	disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of the	19	an opinion on the difference between the two.
20	seven fatal flaws?	20	Q. Okay. The first factor requires a demonstration
21	A. I have not reviewed the validity of his claims.	21	of need.
22	Q. Okay. You have not provided any testimony in	22	Are you aware that the need for a transmission
23	this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside;	23	line is demonstrated through a load flow, also known as
24	correct?	24	Power Flow Study?
25	A. Yes, that is well yes, that is correct.	25	A. I am not. I am certainly not an expert in that
	Page 298		D 200
			Page 300
1	-	1	
1	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much.	1	field.
2	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very	2	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit
2 3	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much.	2 3	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37.
2 3 4	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you.	2 3 4	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also
2 3 4 5	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	2 3 4 5	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another	2 3 4 5 6	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel?	2 3 4 5 6 7	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for Mr. Bieber?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for Mr. Bieber? MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for Mr. Bieber? MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for Mr. Bieber? MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for Mr. Bieber? MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for Mr. Bieber? MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Here, again, please turn to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MS. BALDWIN: Objection. My my witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Here, again, please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. Exhibit RL-1T,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MS. BALDWIN: Objection. My my witness has just testified that he has no experience with this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for Mr. Bieber? MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Here, again, please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. Exhibit RL-1T, page 17.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MS. BALDWIN: Objection. My my witness has just testified that he has no experience with this type of he's not an expert on these types of things.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for Mr. Bieber? MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Here, again, please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. Exhibit RL-1T, page 17. MR. KRONAUER: So I apologize. I don't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MS. BALDWIN: Objection. My my witness has just testified that he has no experience with this type of he's not an expert on these types of things. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for Mr. Bieber? MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Here, again, please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. Exhibit RL-1T, page 17. MR. KRONAUER: So I apologize. I don't have that testimony in front of me.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MS. BALDWIN: Objection. My my witness has just testified that he has no experience with this type of he's not an expert on these types of things. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that I'm going to grant that objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Here, again, please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. Exhibit RL-1T, page 17. MR. KRONAUER: So I apologize. I don't have that testimony in front of me. Would somebody be able to send me that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MS. BALDWIN: Objection. My my witness has just testified that he has no experience with this type of he's not an expert on these types of things. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that I'm going to grant that objection. Mr. Hansen, you may ask if Mr. Kronauer has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Here, again, please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. Exhibit RL-1T, page 17. MR. KRONAUER: So I apologize. I don't have that testimony in front of me. Would somebody be able to send me that testimony so I can take a look at it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MS. BALDWIN: Objection. My my witness has just testified that he has no experience with this type of he's not an expert on these types of things. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that I'm going to grant that objection. Mr. Hansen, you may ask if Mr. Kronauer has any firsthand knowledge of this document, but I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That ends my questions. Thank you very much. MR. BIEBER: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Mr. Hansen, do you intend to turn to another witness on this panel? MR. HANSEN: Yes, we do. To Alex Kronauer. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. You may proceed. Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Before you proceed with that, do we have any redirect for MR. BOEHM: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr. Hansen. You may proceed with questioning Kronauer. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Here, again, please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. Exhibit RL-1T, page 17. MR. KRONAUER: So I apologize. I don't have that testimony in front of me. Would somebody be able to send me that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	field. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4, looking at pages 20 to 37. MS. BALDWIN: And if I may, Alex, I also sent that to you. MR. KRONAUER: Okay. Yes. MS. BALDWIN: This is Vicki Baldwin for the record. MR. KRONAUER: Yeah. Okay. Fatal flaws in PSE attempts justify Energize Eastside. Okay. I have this in front of me. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Yeah. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies? Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MS. BALDWIN: Objection. My my witness has just testified that he has no experience with this type of he's not an expert on these types of things. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that I'm going to grant that objection. Mr. Hansen, you may ask if Mr. Kronauer has

15 (Pages 297 to 300)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

· · ·	Page 301		Page 303
1	MR. HANSEN: Okay. I'll reiterate that	1	determination allows cost to be provisionally recovering
2	question, then.	2	in rates through a tracker. But those costs can
3	BY MR. HANSEN:	3	ultimately be challenged.
4	Q. Do you have any firsthand knowledge of this	4	So I believe that that you know, in my
5	testimony?	5	understanding in my nonlegal understanding is that a
6	A. I do not, no.	6	threshold prudence allows for a tracker to be
7	Q. Okay. You have not provided testimony in this	7	established and provisional recovery.
8	proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside;	8	Q. I'll repeat the question.
9	correct?	9	What, in your mind, is the difference between a
10	MR. KRONAUER: That's correct.	10	threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency
11	MR. HANSEN: Thank you.	11	review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart?
12	The next that completes my question.	12	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen?
13	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any redirect for	13	MR. HANSEN: Yes.
14	Mr. Kronauer?	14	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I believe the
15	MS. BALDWIN: No. No redirect.	15	witness did answer your question. It does sound like
16	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	16	counsel was about to jump in with an asked-and-answered
17	Mr. Hansen, you may proceed with your next	17	objection, which I would grant.
18	witness.	18	So I suggest you move to your next line
19	Do you intend to call Higgins?	19	your next question.
20	MR. HANSEN: Yes.	20	MR. HANSEN: Okay. All right.
21	THE COURT: All right.	21	BY MR. HANSEN:
22	MR. HIGGINS: I am here.	22	Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION	23	need.
24	BY MR. HANSEN:	24	Are you aware that the need for a transmission
25	Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony	25	line is demonstrated through a load flow, also known as
	Page 302		Page 304
1	Page 302 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17.	1	Page 304 Power Flow Study?
1 2		1	
	for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17.		Power Flow Study?
2	for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available?	2	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon
2 3	for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just	2 3	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor.
2 3 4	for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17.Do you have that available?A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please.	2 3 4	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to
2 3 4 5	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. 	2 3 4 5	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only.
2 3 4 5 6	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate.
2 3 4 5 6 7	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for – the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for – the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for – the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for - the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question. If there is an objection, we do need to wait
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart? A. Well, let me say at the outset that I am not an 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question. If there is an objection, we do need to wait for me to make a ruling on it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart? A. Well, let me say at the outset that I am not an attorney, so I will not attempt to differentiate between 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question. If there is an objection, we do need to wait for me to make a ruling on it. I I will I will allow I just wanted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart? A. Well, let me say at the outset that I am not an attorney, so I will not attempt to differentiate between a threshold prudence or another type of prudence. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question. If there is an objection, we do need to wait for me to make a ruling on it. I I will allow I just wanted to make that emphasize that point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart? A. Well, let me say at the outset that I am not an attorney, so I will not attempt to differentiate between a threshold prudence or another type of prudence. Also add that I simply participated in this case 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question. If there is an objection, we do need to wait for me to make a ruling on it. I I will I will allow I just wanted to make that emphasize that point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart? A. Well, let me say at the outset that I am not an attorney, so I will not attempt to differentiate between a threshold prudence or another type of prudence. Also add that I simply participated in this case only on the gas docket, not the electric docket, which 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question. If there is an objection, we do need to wait for me to make a ruling on it. I I will I will allow I just wanted to make that emphasize that point. But I will allow you to ask the question you just asked, but will you please restate it to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart? A. Well, let me say at the outset that I am not an attorney, so I will not attempt to differentiate between a threshold prudence or another type of prudence. Also add that I simply participated in this case only on the gas docket, not the electric docket, which this Energize Eastside Project is concerned with. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question. If there is an objection, we do need to wait for me to make a ruling on it. I I will I will allow I just wanted to make that emphasize that point. But I will allow you to ask the question you just asked, but will you please restate it to the witness.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for - the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart? A. Well, let me say at the outset that I am not an attorney, so I will not attempt to differentiate between a threshold prudence or another type of prudence. Also add that I simply participated in this case only on the gas docket, not the electric docket, which this Energize Eastside Project is concerned with. But my understanding in the context of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: A. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question. If there is an objection, we do need to wait for me to make a ruling on it. I I will I will allow I just wanted to make that emphasize that point. But I will allow you to ask the question you just asked, but will you please restate it to the witness. MR. HANSEN: So, Judge, you want me to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T page 17. Do you have that available? A. I do have it available if you will give me just a moment, please. Q. Okay. Thank you. A. Yes, I have it. Thank you. Q. Okay. Thank you. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors for the WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I don't have a reason to disagree with the four factors listed in his testimony. Q. Okay. Thank you. What, in your mind, is the difference between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart? A. Well, let me say at the outset that I am not an attorney, so I will not attempt to differentiate between a threshold prudence or another type of prudence. Also add that I simply participated in this case only on the gas docket, not the electric docket, which this Energize Eastside Project is concerned with. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Power Flow Study? MR. XENOPOULOS: Your Honor, this is Damon Xenopoulos on behalf of Nucor. Mr. Higgins, as he indicated, testified to natural gas issues only. Mr. Hansen is asking him about electric transmission issues, and I don't believe that is appropriate. Thank you. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Just to confirm that, I say that you have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I'm going to kind of awkwardly and abruptly jump in, again, over your question. If there is an objection, we do need to wait for me to make a ruling on it. I I will I will allow I just wanted to make that emphasize that point. But I will allow you to ask the question you just asked, but will you please restate it to the witness.

16 (Pages 301 to 304)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

,	Page 305		Page 307
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Will you you may repeat	1	the only the only factor.
2	your last question.	2	Q. Are you an expert in load flow studies?
3	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you.	3	A. I have reviewed similar studies in the past.
4	BY MR. HANSEN:	4	Q. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-4,
5	Q. You had not provided any testimony in this	5	looking at pages 20 to 37.
6	proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside;	6	A. Okay.
7	correct?	7	Q. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal
8	A. Correct.	8	flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies.
9	MR. HANSEN: Okay. That completes my	9	Do you have any reason to disagree with
10	questions. Thank you.	10	Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	11	flaws?
12	Any redirect for Mr. Higgins?	12	A. You know, reviewing the testimony of Dan'l Koch,
13	MR. XENOPOULOS: No redirect, Your Honor.	13	I do believe that these are not, you know, necessarily
14	Thank you.	14	accurate. I think they have that Puget has presented
15	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, you may proceed	15	their load flow study and the other reasons why they
16	to your next witness.	16	need to replace this line in their testimony. And I
17	Is that Bradley Mullins?	17	I found that information to be more more compelling
18	MR. HANSEN: Yes, Your Honor.	18	than this.
19	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. You may proceed.	19	Q. Okay. Thank you. Last question.
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION	20	You have not provided any testimony in this
20	BY MR. HANSEN:	21	proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside;
22	Q. Okay. My first question is please turn to	22	correct?
23	Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T, page	23	A. Not not specific to to the prudency, no.
24	17.	24	MR. HANSEN: Okay. That completes my
25	A. Okay.	25	questions, Your Honor.
	Dama 200		Dama 200
	Page 306		Page 308
1	Q. Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors	1	JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect of Mr. Mullins?
2	that WUTC looks for in a prudency review.	2	MS. MOSER: No, thank you, Your Honor.
3	Do you disagree with his testimony on the four	3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
4	factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review?	4	Mr. Hansen, you may proceed with your next
5	A. Well, I don't think these are unreasonable	5	witness.
6	factors. I don't think that they are, you know,	6	Is that Bradley Cebulko?
7	comprehensive necessarily.	7	MR. HANSEN: Yes, it is, Your Honor.
8	Q. What what, in your mind, is the difference	8	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Go ahead.
9	between a threshold prudence demonstration and a full	9	CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	prudency review conducted by Mr. Lauckhart?	10	BY MR. HANSEN:
11	A. Well, in this case where we're dealing with	11	Q. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for
12	provisional capital additions, the the threshold	12	CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T, page 17.
13	prudence decision is just an agreement with the parties	13	A. Yes, I'm there.
14	that the that the amount the decision was prudent	14	Q. Okay. Thank you.
15	and that it can be included in provisionally in	15	Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors
16	revenue requirement, subject to the sort of true-up	16	that WUTC looks for in a prudency review.
17	process that was agreed to.	17	Do you disagree with his testimony of the four
18	Q. The next question.	18	factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review?
19 20	The first factor requires a demonstration of	19 20	MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, I'm going to object
20 21	need, are you aware that the need for a transmission	20	to this question. Mr. Hansen hasn't established that
21 22	line is demonstrated through a load flow, also known as Power Flow Study?	21	
22	Power Flow Study?	22	Mr. Cebulko has firsthand knowledge of this testimony.
23 24	A. A Power Flow Study is potentially one of the analyses that might be considered when evaluating the	23	We are willing to stipulate that Mr. Cebulko has not provided testimony with regard to the prudence
25	need for a new transmission line, but not necessarily	25	of the Energize Eastside Project.
23			or the Energize Editions i Tojeot.

17 (Pages 305 to 308)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

1	Page 309	Page 311
1	I would also object to the basis that these	1 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any redirect for
2	questions go beyond the scope of Mr. Cebulko's filed	2 Al-Jabir?
3	testimony in this case.	3 MS. LIOTTA: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
4	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	4 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
5	I am sharing some of the concerns noted by	5 Mr. Hansen, I believe your last witness on
6	Mr. ffitch.	6 this panel was Ms. McCloy.
7	Mr. Hansen, if we are going to be asking	7 MR. HANSEN: Yes, Your Honor.
8	Mr. Cebulko questions about this testimony, could you	8 CROSS-EXAMINATION
9	could you first ask if he is familiar with with the	9 BY MR. HANSEN:
10	testimony and then proceed from there.	10 Q. There again, have you had a chance to review the
11	If he is familiar.	11 testimony on this issue?
12	MR. HANSEN: Okay.	12 A. Yes, I have reviewed Mr. Lauckhart's testimony.
13	BY MR. HANSEN:	13 Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony
14	Q. Are you familiar with the testimony?	14 for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T, page 17.
15	A. No, I am not. I first pulled it up when you	15 A. Yes, I have it pulled up.
16	started asking this line of questions to the other	16 Q. Okay. Thank you.
17	panelists.	17 Here, Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors
18	Q. Just the last question to be complete.	18 that WUTC looks for in a prudency review.
19	You have not provided any testimony in this	19 Do you disagree with his testimony on the four
20	proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside;	20 factors the WUTC looks for in a prudency review?
21	correct?	21 MS. PAREKH: Objection, Your Honor. Calls
22	A. That's correct.	22 for a legal opinion.
23	MR. HANSEN: That completes my questions.	23 Mr. Hansen is asking Ms. McCloy to testify
24 25	Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you,	 regarding the legal factors required when evaluating prudency. It is an inappropriate question for a
20	JUDGE HOWARD. Air light. Thank you,	
	Page 310	Page 312
1	Mr. Hansen.	1 witness, Your Honor.
2	Any redirect for Mr. Cebulko?	2 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
3	MR. FFITCH: No, Your Honor. Thank you.	3 I am going to deny the objection. While
4	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	4 the way I explained this in when I deny objections
5	Mr. Hansen, you may proceed with your next	5 like this in my cases is that frequently policy
6	witness.	6 questions in our context are in this gray area between a
7	I believe that is Ali Al-Jabir.	7 purely policy question and purely legal question.
8	MR. HANSEN: Yes, it is. Thank you.	8 So this does not strike me as a purely legal
9 10	C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN:	 9 question, so I'm allowing Mr. Hansen to ask this 10 guestion.
11	Q. I guess the first question on that, have you	10 question. 11 And, Mr. Hansen, you may repeat the question
12	reviewed the testimony?	12 for clarity.
13	A. I'm sorry. Could you clarify which testimony	13 BY MR. HANSEN:
14	you are referring to?	14 Q. Okay. Do you disagree with his testimony on the
15	Q. Well, please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony	15 four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review?
16	for CENSE, Exhibit RL-1T, page 17.	16 A. I agree that the four factors are part of what
17	A. Yes, sir. If you are referring to his pre-filed	17 the UTC considers in a prudency review. I can't make
18	initial testimony, I have not reviewed that. I did	18 any judgment of his testimony on the four factors
19	obtain a copy of it as you were questioning some of the	19 because I am not familiar with the project and I did not
20	other witnesses, but I have not reviewed it myself.	20 conduct a prudency evaluation on the project.
21	Q. Okay. Our last question here, then, is you	21 Q. Okay. Question.
22	have not provided any testimony in this proceeding on	22 You have not provided any testimony in this
23	the prudency of Energize Eastside; correct?	23 proceeding on the prudency of Energize Eastside;
24		
24	A. That is correct.	24 correct?
25	 A. That is correct. MR. HANSEN: That completes my questions. 	24correct?25A. Yes.

18 (Pages 309 to 312)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 313		Page 315
1	MR. HANSEN: That completes my questions,	1	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do.
2	Your Honor.	2	Your Honor, I guess I will start. And I
3	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	3	will start with a bench request for the parties. And
4	Any redirect for McCloy?	4	maybe this is for PSE, but if other parties need to
5	MS. PAREKH: No, Your Honor.	5	cooperate in that, please go ahead.
6	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I believe this	6	In Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation
7	would be a good time to take a mid-morning break. Let's	7	and agreement on revenue requirement and all other
8	take a break until a short break until 10:40 a.m. We	8	issues except Tacoma LNG and Green Direct, on page 5 on
9	will go back on the record at 10:40 a.m.	9	line 5 it says that a full set of revenue requirement
10	All right. We are off the record. Thank	10	workpapers has also been provided to parties and which
11	you.	11	can be provided in whole or in part in response to a
12	(A break was taken from	12	bench request.
13	10:32 a.m. to 10:40 a.m.)	13	So I'm going to make a bench request right
14	JUDGE HOWARD: It is 10:40 a.m.	14	now for the full set of the revenue requirement
15	I'm not planning on doing any full roll	15	workpapers supporting settlement.
16	call. I'm going to look and see well, I'm just going	16	(Bench request.)
17	to ask, are the witnesses on this panel back on the	17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And we will be
18	call?	18	understand, Judge Howard, we will be sending any bench
19	MR. AL-JABIR: Yes, I am. This is Ali	19	requests that come out of this hearing after the hearing
20	Al-Jabir on behalf of FEA.	20	for all the parties to respond to; correct?
21	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Thank you.	21	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I I will make note of
22	I see we have the PSE witnesses.	22	any bench requests we put into the record today, and
23	Do we have Ms. Erdahl?	23	we'll issue those in writing as well.
24	MS. ERDAHL: I'm here.	24	Would a seven-day turnaround be sufficient
25	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank	25	for the company?
	Page 314		Dago 216
			Page 316
1	you.	1	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days
1 2	you. We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith.	1 2	
	•		MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days
2	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith.	2	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now.
2 3	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests,
2 3 4	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks.	2 3 4 5 6	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just
2 3 4 5	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is	2 3 4 5	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity.
2 3 4 5 6	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well.	2 3 4 5 6	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just
2 3 4 5 6 7	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the revenue requirement in this case and that cost recovery
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record. The time is 10:42 a.m. We're returning 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the revenue requirement in this case and that cost recovery will be considered in future trackers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record. The time is 10:42 a.m. We're returning after a short break. We are currently on the revenue requirement and policy panel. We have just finished the planned cross from 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the revenue requirement in this case and that cost recovery will be considered in future trackers. Is that something that the parties can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record. The time is 10:42 a.m. We're returning after a short break. We are currently on the revenue requirement and policy panel. We have just finished the planned cross from CENSE, which the only party that indicated cross for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the revenue requirement in this case and that cost recovery will be considered in future trackers. Is that something that the parties can confirm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record. The time is 10:42 a.m. We're returning after a short break. We are currently on the revenue requirement and policy panel. We have just finished the planned cross from CENSE, which the only party that indicated cross for this panel. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the revenue requirement in this case and that cost recovery will be considered in future trackers. Is that something that the parties can confirm Ryan, Ryan, you are not muted. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record. The time is 10:42 a.m. We're returning after a short break. We are currently on the revenue requirement and policy panel. We have just finished the planned cross from CENSE, which the only party that indicated cross for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the revenue requirement in this case and that cost recovery will be considered in future trackers. Is that something that the parties can confirm Ryan, Ryan, you are not muted. Thank you. Okay. So do I need to repeat the question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record. The time is 10:42 a.m. We're returning after a short break. We are currently on the revenue requirement and policy panel. We have just finished the planned cross from CENSE, which the only party that indicated cross for this panel. We have now turned to any bench questions 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the revenue requirement in this case and that cost recovery will be considered in future trackers. Is that something that the parties can confirm Ryan, Ryan, you are not muted. Thank you. Okay. So do I need to repeat the question to the parties?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record. The time is 10:42 a.m. We're returning after a short break. We are currently on the revenue requirement and policy panel. We have just finished the planned cross from CENSE, which the only party that indicated cross for this panel. We have now turned to any bench questions 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the revenue requirement in this case and that cost recovery will be considered in future trackers. Is that something that the parties can confirm Ryan, Ryan, you are not muted. Thank you. Okay. So do I need to repeat the question to the parties? MS. FREE: Commissioner Rendahl, this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 We have Mr. Mullins, Ms. McCloy, Ms. Smith. MS. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MULLINS: I'm here as well as. Thanks. MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, Mr. Higgins is here as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. MR. BIEBER: And Justin Bieber as well. JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Do I have the Commissioners with us? I see Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I'm here. JUDGE HOWARD: And we have Commissioner Doumit. And we have Commissioner Rendahl. All right. Let's be back on the record. The time is 10:42 a.m. We're returning after a short break. We are currently on the revenue requirement and policy panel. We have just finished the planned cross from CENSE, which the only party that indicated cross for this panel. We have now turned to any bench questions 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CARSON: Yes, we can do it in seven days or shorter than that. Five days. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. I am going to to note seven days for now. In the event we have other bench requests, that deadline would likely apply to all of them, just for simplicity. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And so for the settling parties, also referring to Exhibit A to the settlement stipulation and agreement and turning to pages 7 and 8 of that Exhibit A, it lists a number of items or adjustments starting with "CEIP" and ending with "delay and reliability spending." And so I guess, first, I'd like to confirm that these items or adjustments are excluded from the revenue requirement in this case and that cost recovery will be considered in future trackers. Is that something that the parties can confirm Ryan, Ryan, you are not muted. Thank you. Okay. So do I need to repeat the question to the parties?

19 (Pages 313 to 316)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

·	Page 317		Page 319
1		1	
1 2	Regulatory Compliance for PSE. I can take a first stab	2	specifically for for that one, is there a common
3	at that. I can confirm that the items listed here on	3	understanding of the revenue requirement associated with that shift in spending or is that amount not not
		4	
4 5	the referenced pages are not included in the settlement	5	agreed to and not known at this time. MS. FREE: I think that it has been
	revenue requirement.	6	
6 7	Some of them will be in future filings.	7	incorporated into the calculations. And this Exhibit A
	Some of them will not be requested in the future. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So could you	8	explains how the revenue requirement of the settlement
8 9		9	has been determined.
	identify which of these in the list are identified in a		And the workpapers that will be part of the
10	separate tracker.	10 11	bench request will show the final capital that is
11	MS. FREE: Certainly. The CEIP, which is	12	included and how it was actually included in the
12	the the Clean Energy Implementation Plan, and the	13	settlement versus which could be compared to the
13	TEP, which is the Transportation Electrification Plan,	14	original filing and you could see the differences.
14	those are the first two bullets listed and they will be	15	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And with your
15	in a separate tracker under the settlement. That it's	16	answer to that question, is is the same did those
16	not included in the current record requirement for the	17	workpapers then will those explain what is in the
17	settlement.	18	settlement; what is out of the settlement; what might
18	The Dry Ash is the third bullet. For	18	come in a in a later provisional request for capital
19	Colstrip, that will not be brought forward again for		recovery?
20	rate recovery.	20	MS. FREE: So
21	The fourth bullet, Tacoma LNG Facility will	21	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: For each of these
22	also be in a separate tracker but is not included in the	22 23	for each of these that we're talking about on pages 7
23	revenue requirement for the settlement.		and 8.
24 25	The fifth bullet, the general reduction in	24 25	MS. FREE: So for what's included in the
20	gas rate base is included in the actually, is	25	filing, as far as capital, I would point you to
	Page 318		Page 320
1		1	
1 2	included in the settlement revenue requirement.	1	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give
1 2 3	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included	1 2 3	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up.
2	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue	2	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm
2 3	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included	2 3	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that.
2 3 4	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet	2 3 4	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list
2 3 4 5	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement.	2 3 4 5	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the
2 3 4 5 6	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue	2 3 4 5 6	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second
2 3 4 5 6 7	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected? It says here, shifted from 2023 to 2024.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps. So you can see certain things that are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected? It says here, shifted from 2023 to 2024. And I'm assuming that means that those costs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected? It says here, shifted from 2023 to 2024. And I'm assuming that means that those costs would not be reflected until the 2024 provisional	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps. So you can see certain things that are removed that that impacts the revenue required by a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected? It says here, shifted from 2023 to 2024. And I'm assuming that means that those costs would not be reflected until the 2024 provisional capital adjustment period.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps. So you can see certain things that are removed that that impacts the revenue required by a certain amount and we show that in the workpapers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected? It says here, shifted from 2023 to 2024. And I'm assuming that means that those costs would not be reflected until the 2024 provisional capital adjustment period. MS. FREE: That is correct. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps. So you can see certain things that are removed that that impacts the revenue required by a certain amount and we show that in the workpapers. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected? It says here, shifted from 2023 to 2024. And I'm assuming that means that those costs would not be reflected until the 2024 provisional capital adjustment period. MS. FREE: That is correct. In our original filing there were 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps. So you can see certain things that are removed that that impacts the revenue required by a certain amount and we show that in the workpapers. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So to clarify so you said certain things will not be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected? It says here, shifted from 2023 to 2024. And I'm assuming that means that those costs would not be reflected until the 2024 provisional capital adjustment period. MS. FREE: That is correct. In our original filing there were investments that had appeared in 2023. And in an effort 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps. So you can see certain things that are removed that that impacts the revenue required by a certain amount and we show that in the workpapers. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So to clarify so you said certain things will not be included going forward. I assumed that is in reference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected? It says here, shifted from 2023 to 2024. And I'm assuming that means that those costs would not be reflected until the 2024 provisional capital adjustment period. MS. FREE: That is correct. In our original filing there were investments that had appeared in 2023. And in an effort to reduce the impacts of the rate increase in 2023, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps. So you can see certain things that are removed that that impacts the revenue required by a certain amount and we show that in the workpapers. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So to clarify so you said certain things will not be included going forward. I assumed that is in reference to the Colstrip Dry Ash expenses?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 included in the settlement revenue requirement. We've made that adjustment and it's included in the calculation of what's presented in the revenue requirement for the settlement. The same with the second-to-the-last bullet on page 8. Renewable natural gas has been removed and it is not included in the settlement revenue requirement. And the the delay in reliability spending that delay has been incorporated into the revenue requirement settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, starting with that last one, can you explain how the delay has been reflected? It says here, shifted from 2023 to 2024. And I'm assuming that means that those costs would not be reflected until the 2024 provisional capital adjustment period. MS. FREE: That is correct. In our original filing there were investments that had appeared in 2023. And in an effort to reduce the impacts of the rate increase in 2023, we've shifted those programs those some of those 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Exhibit I to the settlement. The exhibit I'll give you a moment to pull that up. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. I'm going to take your word on that. MS. FREE: Okay. So Exhibit I is a list all of the capital that's included since the end of the test year in this case through the end of the second rate year, 2024. And so that is that is an affirmative document that will show what's included. In the workpapers that you will get in the bench request, we provide a step by step, sort of a reconciliation between what was in our original filing and the different adjustments that we make. And you can see the value for each of those steps. So you can see certain things that are removed that that impacts the revenue required by a certain amount and we show that in the workpapers. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So to clarify so you said certain things will not be included going forward. I assumed that is in reference to the Colstrip Dry Ash expenses? MS. FREE: Yes. That is an example.

20 (Pages 317 to 320)

Page 321 page 321 1 requirement that will not be brought forward similar to the Dry Ash expenses? 3 MS, FREE: I think - the Dry Ash is really the one thing that will not were be brought forward signin. 1 I - I think the general reduction to gas rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - I's a general kind of derivation, so that - I's hard to answer the signulation to that. 2 I - I think the general reduction to gas rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - I's a general kind of derivation, so that - I's hard to answer the signulation to that. 3 I - I think the general reduction to gas rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - I's a general kind of derivation so the so signulation to that. 3 I - I think the general reduction to gas rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - I's a general kind of derivation so the so signulation to that. 3 I - I think the general reduction to gas rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - I's a general kind of derivent veloan the were signulation to that. 3 I - I think the general reduction to gas rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - I's a spoulation to that. 3 I - I think the general reduction, so that - I's hard to answer the signulation to that. 4 I - I think the general reduction, so that - I's hard to answer the signulation to that. 5 Mol The Collins Shotter RENDAHL: So the net resouch to the requested also indicate for Tacoma LNG casts - ther is the settlement of LNG provides an estimate of that. 2 Mol The page 10 is of that as a provides an think soccus that the contrusis on w						
2 the Dry Ash exponses? 2 Commission assess PSE's multiples rate plan using any or a plan us		Page 321		Page 323		
3 MS. FREE: I think the Dry Ash is really all of the 71 proposed matrics. Let me just put that 5 again. again. are wing hav will not ever be brought forward 6 I - I think the general reduction to gas I mean, we have five SD umeasures, 17 7 measures on various topics: and then the revenue 8 kind of reduction, so that - it's hard to answer the So, again, are we proposing that these - 9 stopiation to that. So, again, are we proposing that the commission assess the 10 Eventually, well have a different budget In 11 Int. But I think to directly answer your question. The settlement icelarly has a lot of metrics. 12 nutlyser rate plan but may come forward with a If 13 mutiyser rate plan but may come forward with a If 14 codMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Lat me If 15 nutlyser rate plan with workpapers that So does the - will the workpapers that 16 mutiyser rate plan with workpapers that So does the - will the workpapers that 16 mutiyser rate plan with workpapers that So does the - will the workpapers that 17 mutiyser rate plan with workpapers that So does the - will the workpapers that	1	requirement that will not be brought forward similar to	1	Are the settling parties proposing that the		
4 the one thing that will not ever be brought forward again. 5 11 think the general reduction to gas 1 7 rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - it's a general 5 8 kind of reduction, so that - it's hard to answer the subition of hat. 50, again, are we proposing that these - the commission assess the multiyear rate plan is the softenent clarght answer the softenent clarght and the softenent clarght answer these answer the sof	2		2			
5 again. 5 Imean, we have five SQI measures, 17 6 Imean, we have five SQI measures, 17 7 rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - it's a general kind of reduction, so that - it's hand to answer the spanned to that. 5 Imean, we have five SQI measures, 17 7 rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - it's a general kind of reduction, so that - it's hand to answer the spanned to that. 5 So, again, are we proposing that the composing that t	3		3	all of the 71 proposed metrics. Let me just put that		
6 1I think the general reduction to gas 6 measures on various topics and then the revenue 7 rate base at the bottom of page 7 is – it's a general 8 5 50, again, are we proposing that these – 9 sipulation to that. 50, again, are we proposing that these – 50, again, are we proposing that these – 11 and a different rate plan that will have gas rate based 10 The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics? 13 is just to Costing Dry Ash. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So then the reveaued 11 14 multiyear rate plan but may come forward with a 11 16 15 a droundsto for wat you are just taiking about, which 15 a foundation for wat you are just taiking about, which 16 multiyear rate plan 16 is determining measures. 17 17 measures and potentially even incentive of mechanisms. 10 10 18 numbityear rate plan but may come forward with a 16 16 16 19 poolMisSiONER RENDAHL: All right. Let me 10 10 10 10 10 medusets for reacover in the next POA 20 20 10 21 So does the – will th	4	the one thing that will not ever be brought forward	4	out there.		
7 rate base at the bottom of page 7 is - if s general kind of reduction, so that - it's hat to answer the sipulation to that. 7 requirement settlement. 49 measures. 10 Eventually, well have a different budget 1 8 So, again, are we proposing that these it are you proposing that the composing that these it are you proposing that the composing that these it are you proposing that the composing that the c	5	again.	5	I mean, we have five SQI measures, 17		
8 kind of reduction, so that it's hard to answer the 8 So, again, are we proposing that these 9 stipulation to that. Feedback 11 and a different rate plan that will have gas rate based Imit. Builtyear rate plan using these metrics? 12 in it. But think to directly answer your question, Imit. But question, Chair Domer. 13 it's just to Costing Dry Ash. The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics. 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So then the renewable Imit. But question, Chair Domer. 16 multiyear rate plan. The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics. 17 multiyear rate plan. The measures and potentially even incomise of metrics. 18 MS. FREE: Yes; that's correct. The measures and potentially even incontive of mechanisms. 19 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Let me The metrics are intensed for exactly what you were 20 you set or recovery in the next PGA The metrics in the scorecard + and the company will seek - will include in its 21 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement and you gave an anite (a direct in the settlement on LNG provides an estimate of that. 22 you the page number. The metrics in the scorecard - and, in 22 You the page number. So t	6	I I think the general reduction to gas	6	measures on various topics; and then the revenue		
 stipulation to that: Eventually, will have a different budget and a different rate plan that will have gas rate based it is just to Colstin Duy Ash. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So then the renevable multiyear rate plan budget rate plan budget rate plan using measures a determining targets for these metrics: And most of these metrics: You might recall in testimony Dr. Lowy proposed a scorecard that the company the scorecard that the commission was intended for exactly what you were taiking about. The metrics in the scorecard of the company will set be aparted document? Page 322 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement a agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that. And in you'll give me a minute, I can give you the page number. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: 1 think, because there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for that later, livill defer to my colleagues if they have ant pruseions netated to the general revenue requirement or varail. And so I would defer to my colleagues if they have ant pruseions net revenue requirement topics. CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. Im sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it of. Thad some questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics. CHAIR DANNER: This is pays. The Commission must in approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyear rate plan; bit to corref? MS. FREE: Okay. CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. Im sorry. I	7	rate base at the bottom of page 7 is it's a general	7	requirement settlement, 49 measures.		
10 Eventually, well have a different to loget in the sufferent to plan that will have gas rate based 10 multiyear rate plan that will have gas rate based 11 and a different to plan that will have gas rate based 11 MR. PILLARIS: So I can start with the 12 it's just to Costing Dry Ash. 13 The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics. 13 multiyear rate plan but may come forward with a 13 The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics. 13 multiyear rate plan but may come forward with a 16 is determining measures - determining targets for those 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Let me 16 17 15 so does the - will he wortpapers that 18 You might recail the company 16 request for recovery - the recovery - the recovery - the next PGA 17 17 we've requested also indicate for Tacoma LNG costs 14 The metrics in the scorecard - and in 18 agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that. 14 The metrics in the scorecard - are 18 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement 25 page 322 Page 322 10 MS. FREE: Neg, the company is standpoint, if 14 The metrics in the scorecard - are 14 additional finder the sequestion information that could 15 16 15 COMMISSIO	8	kind of reduction, so that it's hard to answer the	8	So, again, are we proposing that these		
11 and a different rate plan that will have gas rate based 11 MR. PILARRS: So I can start with the 12 in it. But 1 think to directly answer your question, it's just to Colstrip Dry Ash. 12 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So then the renewable 13 The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics. 14 an durid gas would be - it is not included in this nuttyear rate plan but may come forward with a 14 And most of those metrics are intended primarily to set 15 multyear rate plan but may come forward with a 16 is determining measures - determining targets for those 16 is determining measures - determining targets for those measures and potentially even incentive of mechanisms. 17 measures and potentially even incentive of mechanisms. You might recall in testimony Dr. Lowry 18 MS. FREE: Yes; that's correct. 10 You might recall in testimony Dr. Lowry 19 proposed a scorecard, and the scorecard that the company will sek - will include in its 22 10 MS. FREE: Yes; then earge and that the company will sek - will include in its 23 11 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement 24 Page 322 12 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement of that, becacual settinement on LNG corovery in the next PGA	9		9			
12 in it. But I think to directly answer your question, 12 response to that question. Chair Danner. 13 it's just to Colsting Dry Ash. 13 The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics. 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So then the renewable 13 The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics. 15 natural gas would be it is not included in this 13 The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics. 15 multyear rate plan but may come forward with a 15 a foundation for what you are just talking about, which 16 multyear rate plan but may come forward with a 16 is determining tragestor of the company of the cornective of mechanisms. 17 MS. FREE: Yas; that's correct. 16 You might recall in testimony Dr. Lowry 18 we've requested also indicate for Tacoma LNG costs What is what is the cornective of the company will seek - will include in its 18 request for recovery - to recovery in the next PGA What is what is the cornective of what's in the 25 year or will that be the separate document? Page 322 Page 322 11 Ser REE: Net the autural settlement on LNG and we have a panel for the are stragets in that scorecard - are include - they are inclusive of what's in the 26 Mol you'I give me	10		10	multiyear rate plan using these metrics?		
13 it's just to Colking Dry Ash. 13 The settlement clearly has a lot of metrics. 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So then the renewable 14 And most of those metrics are intended primarily to set a foundation for what you are just talking about, which 16 multiyear rate plan? 16 is determining measures – determining targets for those measures – determining targets for those 17 multiyear rate plan? 10 mouthyse of the company in the seconcard that the company in the seconcard that the company in the seconcard that the company in the company in the company in the seconcard that the company in the seconcard that the company in the company is tandpoint. 21 Wast the company in the seconcard that the company is tandpoint. 14 23 year or will that be the separate document? 14 24 request for Excess the actual settlement agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that. 24 25 year or will that be the separate document? 25 26 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement agreement or LNG and we have a panel for that later, will defer those questions on the general requirement overal. 14 26 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, 1	11		11			
14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So then the renewable 14 And most of those metrics are intended primarily to set 15 multiyear rate plan but may come forward with a 15 a foundation for what you are just talking about, which 16 multiyear rate plan but may come forward with a 16 is determining measures - determining tragets for those 17 MS, FREE: Yes; that's correct. 17 18 You might recall in testimony Dr. Lowry 20 So does the - will he workpapers that 19 proposed a scorecard, and the scorecard that the company 21 so does the - will he workpapers that 12 What is - what is - what is the card - 23 these storecard, and the scorecard - and, in 14 24 request for recovery - for recovery in the next PGA 25 25 year or will that be the separate document? 25 26 multiyear rate plan option 14 The metrics in the scorecard - and, in 27 MS, FREE: So the actual settlement 23 add is you'll give ma a minute, I can give 28 you the page number. 26 Dialant 14 29 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because 14 The metrics as addition in formation that could o	12	in it. But I think to directly answer your question,	12	response to that question, Chair Danner.		
15 natural gas would be it is not included in his 15 a foundation for what you are just talking about, which 16 multiyear rate plan but may come forward with a 15 is determining measures determining targets for those 17 multiyear rate plan? 16 is determining targets for those 18 MS. FREE: Ves; that's correct. 18 You might recall in testimony Dr. Lowry 19 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Let me 10 10 10 10 11 12 We very encicentive of mechanisms. 21 we ver equested also indicate for Tacoma LNG costs 11 16 talking about. 12 11 11 12 What is what is what is what is the card 12 </td <td>13</td> <td>it's just to Colstrip Dry Ash.</td> <td>13</td> <td></td>	13	it's just to Colstrip Dry Ash.	13			
16 multiyear rate plan but may come forward with a 16 is determining measures determining targets for those 17 multiyear rate plan? measures and potentially even incentive of mechanisms. 18 MS. FREE: Yes; that's correct. 17 19 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Let me 18 10 bod as the will the workpapers that 19 20 put forward was intended for exactly what you were 21 So does the will the workpapers that 12 22 we've requested also indicate for Tacoma LNG costs what the company will seek will indicude in its 23 what the company will seek will new orkpapers that 14 24 request for recovery - for recovery in the next PGA 25 25 year or will that be the separate document? 14 26 Page 322 Page 324 1 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement 2 3 And if you'll give me a minute, I can give 1 The metrics in the scorecard are 3 included they are inclusive of what's in the 25 4 OMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I 1 The metrics as additional informatico the company <	14		14			
17 multivear rate plan? 17 measures and potentially even incentive of mechanisms. 18 MS. FREE: Yes; that's correct. 18 You might recall in testimony Dr. Lowry 20 IsoRose the will the workpapers that 19 proposed a scorecard, and the scorecard that the company 21 we've requested also indicate for Tacoma LNG costs 18 What is what is what is the card 22 what the company will seek will include in its 20 What is what is what is the card 23 we've requested also incluste for Tacoma LNG costs What is what is what is the card 24 request for recovery for recovery in the next PGA 22 What is what is what is the card 25 year or will that be the separate document? Page 322 Page 322 24 1 The metrics in the scorecard and, in fact, there are targets in that scorecard are included they are inclusive of what's in the 25 you the page number. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because 50 The metrics an additional information, if 26 measures to evaluate the performance of the company under the multiyear rate plan, I would defer to my colleagues if 10 CMAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm 10		•	15			
13 MS. FREE: Yes; that's correct. 18 You might recall in testimony Dr. Lowry 19 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Let me 19 proposed a scorecard, and the scorecard that the company 21 So does the will the workpapers that 19 proposed a scorecard, and the scorecard that the commany 22 So does the will the workpapers that 10 What the company will seek - will include in its 23 what the company will seek - will include in its 10 the correcard that the Commission will use to judge the 24 request for recovery for recovery in the next PGA 25 page 3222 24 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement 25 and if youll give me a minute, I can give 25 you the page number. 26 The metrics in the scorecard and, in 26 acreament on LNG and we have a panel for 1 The metrics in the scorecard and, in 26 scorecard. So the settlement on NG and we have a panel for 16 26 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I 16 So l guess from the company standpoint, if 27 that later, I will defer those questions related to the general 10 the Commission were to use or were to look to <t< td=""><td>16</td><td>multiyear rate plan but may come forward with a</td><td>16</td><td></td></t<>	16	multiyear rate plan but may come forward with a	16			
19 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Let me look at my questions here. 19 proposed a scorecard, and the scorecard that the company put forward was intended for exactly what you were talking about. 21 So does the - will be workpapers that we've requested also indicate for Tacoma LNG costs what the company will seek - will include in its request for recovery in the next PGA 20 What is what is what is the card talking about. 22 What is what is what is the card what the company will seek will include in its request for recovery in the next PGA 20 25 year or will that be the separate document? Page 322 Page 322 Page 324 1 The metrics in the scorecard and, in garcement for LNG provides an estimate of that. 3 And if you'll give me a minute, I can give you the page number. 1 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: 1 think, because there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for that later, I will defer those questions until later. 1 The metrics in the scorecard are included they are inclusive of what's in the scorecard. 10 don't have any further questions related to the general revenue requirement overall. 1 The metrics an the company's standpoint, if the commission look to the scorecard or that and then rey on the metrics as additional information that could color its judgment of the performance and probably inform discussions in later multiyeer rate plan, proceedings. 1	17	multiyear rate plan?	17			
20 look at my questions here. 20 but forward was intended for exactly what you were 21 we've requested a look indicate for Tacoma LNG costs What is what is what is the card 23 what the company will seek will include in its 20 24 request for recovery for recovery in the next PGA 20 25 year or will that be the separate document? 21 Page 322 Page 324 1 No. FREE: So the actual settlement gage 322 Page 322 Page 324 The Colspan="2">Page 324 the settlement or LNG and we have a panel for the settlement or LNG and we have a panel for <td <="" colspan="2" td=""><td>18</td><td>•</td><td>18</td><td></td></td>	<td>18</td> <td>•</td> <td>18</td> <td></td>		18	•	18	
21 So does the will the workpapers that 21 talking about. 22 we've requested also indicate for Tacoma LNG costs 4 3 what the company will seek will include in its 24 request for recovery for recovery in the next PGA 25 year or will that be the separate document? 26 Page 322 1 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement 2 agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that. 3 And if you'll give me a minute, I can give 4 you the page number. 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because 6 there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for 7 that later, I will defer those questions until later. 8 NS. FREE: Okay. 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I 10 don't have any further questions nelated to the general revenue requirement overall. 1 11 rely on the multiyear rate plan, I would a I would advise 12 CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm 13 Thad some questions I wanted to ask about 16 I had some questions I wanted to ask about <	19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Let me	19			
22 we've requested also indicate for Tacoma LNG costs what the company will seek will include in its 23 request for recovery for recovery in the next PGA 24 request for recovery for recovery in the next PGA 25 year or will that be the separate document? 24 Page 322 1 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that. 3 And if you'll give me a minute, I can give 4 you the page number. 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because 6 there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for 11 that later, I will defer those questions until later. 8 MS. FREE: Okay. 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I 10 don't have any further questions related to the general 11 revenue requirement overall. 12 And a to I would defer to my colleagues if 13 they have other questions on the revenue requirement 14 portics. 15 CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm 16 I had some questions I wanted to ask about performance metres.	20	look at my questions here.	20	put forward was intended for exactly what you were		
 what the company will seek will include in its request for recovery for recovery in the next PGA year or will that be the separate document? Page 322 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that. And if you'll give me a minute, I can give you the page number. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for that later, I will defer those questions until later. MS. FREE: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I don't have any further questions related to the general revenue requirement overall. And is 0 would defer to my colleagues if they have other questions on the revenue requirement topics. CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it opfic. So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425. And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in approving the multiyeer rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyeer rate plan approving the multiyeer rate plan approving the multiyeer rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyeer rate So there is one incentive mechanism. So where an and the multiyeer rate plan prove a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyeer rate So where is one incentive mechanism. So there is one incentive mechan	21	So does the will the workpapers that	21	talking about.		
24 request for recovery - for recovery in the next PGA 24 performance of the utility under the multiyear rate 25 year or will that be the separate document? 24 performance of the utility under the multiyear rate 24 mage arror will that be the separate document? 24 performance of the utility under the multiyear rate 24 mage arror will that be the separate document? 24 performance of the utility under the multiyear rate 25 mage arror will that be the separate document? Page 322 Page 322 1 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement The metrics in the scorecard - are included they are inclusive of what's in the 3 And if you'll give me a minute, I can give you the page number. So the settlement only added to the 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because fmeasures to evaluate the performance of the company's standpoint, if 6 there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for measures to evaluate the performance of the company 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I measures to evaluate the performance of the company 10 don't have any further questions related to the general rely on the multiyear rate plan, I would - I would advise 11 they have other questions on the revenue re	22	we've requested also indicate for Tacoma LNG costs	22	What is what is what is the card		
25 year or will that be the separate document? 25 plan? Page 322 1 MS. FREE: So the actual settlement agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that. 3 And if you'll give me a minute, I can give 1 The metrics in the scorecard and, in 3 And if you'll give me a minute, I can give 2 fact, there are targets in that scorecard are 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because 5 So I guess from the company's standpoint, if 6 there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for 5 So I guess from the company's standpoint, if 7 that later, I will defer those questions related to the general 5 So I guess from the company's standpoint, if 10 don't have any further questions related to the general 10 the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then 11 revenue requirement overall. 10 they have other questions I wanted to ask about 10 16 sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it 11 11 The sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it 12 17 And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of 18	23		23	the scorecard that the Commission will use to judge the		
Page 322Page 3221MS. FREE: So the actual settlement agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that. And if you'll give me a minute, I can give you the page number.1The metrics in the scorecard and, in fact, there are targets in that scorecard are included they are inclusive of what's in the settlement. So the settlement only added to the scorecard.5COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: 1 think, because there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for that later, I will defer those questions until later. MS. FREE: Okay.So I guess from the company's standpoint, if the Commission were to use or were to look to measures to evaluate the performance of the company under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise they have other questions on the revenue requirement topics.10And so I would defer to my colleagues if they have other questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.1011Thad some questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.1112And some questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.1513Thad some questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.1614The asome questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.1714Thad some questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.1815CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm off.1816Thad some questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.1817off.1118Thad some questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.1819Thad some questions I wanted to ask	24	request for recovery for recovery in the next PGA	24	performance of the utility under the multiyear rate		
1MS. FREE: So the actual settlement2agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that.3And if you'll give me a minute, I can give4you the page number.5COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because6there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for7that later, I will defer those questions until later.8MS. FREE: Okay.9COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I10don't have any further questions related to the general11revenue requirement overall.12And so I would defer to my colleagues if14topics.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm16sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it17off.18I had some questions I wanted to ask about19performance metrics.20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in22approving the multyear rate plan approve a set of23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas24or electric company operating under a multyear rate24or electric company operating under a multyear rate	25	year or will that be the separate document?	25	plan?		
2agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that.2fact, there are targets in that scorecard are3And if you'll give me a minute, I can give3included they are inclusive of what's in the4you the page number.3included they are inclusive of what's in the5COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because5So I guess from the company's standpoint, if6there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for6So I guess from the company's standpoint, if7that later, I will defer those questions until later.8MS. FREE: Okay.So I guess from the company's standpoint, if10don't have any further questions related to the general10the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then11revenue requirement overall.10the Questions on the revenue requirement14topics.CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm1516sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to trun it1617off.1818I had some questions I wanted to ask about19performance metrics.1120So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in22approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the		Page 322		Page 324		
3And if you'll give me a minute, I can give you the page number.3included they are inclusive of what's in the settlement only added to the scorecard.5COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for 75So I guess from the company's standpoint, if that later, I will defer those questions until later. MS. FREE: Okay.5So I guess from the company's standpoint, if the Commission were to use or were to look to measures to evaluate the performance of the company under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then rely on the metrics as additional information that could topics.10don't have any further questions related to the general revenue requirement overall.10the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then rely on the metrics as additional information that could color its judgment of the performance and probably inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan proceedings.14topics.14proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm off.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm off.18I had some questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.18detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics in this multiyear rate plan, is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually there's one new incentive mechanism.21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in performance measures that will be used to assess a gas o relectric company operating under a multiyear rate approving the multiyear r	1	MS. FREE: So the actual settlement	1	The metrics in the scorecard and, in		
4you the page number.4settlement. So the settlement only added to the5COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because5So I guess from the company's standpoint, if6there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for6So I guess from the company's standpoint, if7that later, I will defer those questions until later.7the Commission were to use or were to look to8MS. FREE: Okay.8measures to evaluate the performance of the company9COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I9under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise10don't have any further questions related to the general10the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then11revenue requirement overall.11rely on the metrics as additional information that could12And so I would defer to my colleagues if12color its judgment of the performance and probably13they have other questions on the revenue requirement14proceedings.14topics.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm1516sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it16gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that,19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan, is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism.22approving the multiyear rate plan approve a	2	agreement for LNG provides an estimate of that.	2	fact, there are targets in that scorecard are		
5COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for that later, I will defer those questions until later.5scorecard.7that later, I will defer those questions until later.6So I guess from the company's standpoint, if the Commission were to use or were to look to measures to evaluate the performance of the company under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then rely on the metrics as additional information that could and so I would defer to my colleagues if they have other questions on the revenue requirement topics.10the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then rely on the metrics as additional information that could color its judgment of the performance and probably inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan proceedings.13they have other questions on the revenue requirement topics.14color its judgment of the performance and probably inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan proceedings.14topics.14proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm off.15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that, you know, we would be providing an incentive or a detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in a approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas 242123	3	And if you'll give me a minute, I can give	3	included they are inclusive of what's in the		
6there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for that later, I will defer those questions until later.6So I guess from the company's standpoint, if the Commission were to use or were to look to8MS. FREE: Okay.8measures to evaluate the performance of the company under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise9COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I don't have any further questions related to the general 119under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise10don't have any further questions related to the general 12And so I would defer to my colleagues if topics.101113they have other questions on the revenue requirement topics.12color its judgment of the performance and probably inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan proceedings.1314topics.14proceedings.1515CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm off.15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that, you know, we would be providing an incentive or a detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics19performance metrics.10MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in 22approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas 2423So there is one incentive mechanism.23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas 24	4	you the page number.	4	settlement. So the settlement only added to the		
7that later, I will defer those questions until later.7the Commission were to use or were to look to8MS. FREE: Okay.8measures to evaluate the performance of the company9COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I9under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise10don't have any further questions related to the general10the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then11revenue requirement overall.10the y have other questions on the revenue requirement1113they have other questions on the revenue requirement13inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan14topics.14proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that16sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it16gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that,19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan, is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in22approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of23So there is one incentive mechanism.24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the	5	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think, because	5	scorecard.		
8MS. FREE: Okay.8measures to evaluate the performance of the company under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise9COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I9under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise10don't have any further questions related to the general10the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then11revenue requirement overall.11rely on the metrics as additional information that could12And so I would defer to my colleagues if12color its judgment of the performance and probably13they have other questions on the revenue requirement13inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan14topics.14proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that16sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it16gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that,19performance metrics.18detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILLARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in22approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of22So there is one incentive mechanism.23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24I will also note that embedded within the	б	there is the settlement on LNG and we have a panel for	6	So I guess from the company's standpoint, if		
9COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I don't have any further questions related to the general revenue requirement overall.9under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then rely on the metrics as additional information that could12And so I would defer to my colleagues if they have other questions on the revenue requirement topics.10the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then rely on the metrics as additional information that could14topics.11revenue requirement topics.1315CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm off.15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that, you know, we would be providing an incentive or a detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan approve a set of approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyear rate23So there is one incentive mechanism. LIARIS: Well also note that embedded within the	7		7	the Commission were to use or were to look to		
10don't have any further questions related to the general revenue requirement overall.10the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then rely on the metrics as additional information that could color its judgment of the performance and probably13they have other questions on the revenue requirement topics.10the Commission look to the scorecard for that and then rely on the metrics as additional information that could color its judgment of the performance and probably inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan proceedings.14topics.14proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm off.15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that, you know, we would be providing an incentive or a detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan approve a set of approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the	8	MS. FREE: Okay.	8	measures to evaluate the performance of the company		
11revenue requirement overall.11rely on the metrics as additional information that could12And so I would defer to my colleagues if12color its judgment of the performance and probably13they have other questions on the revenue requirement12inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan14topics.14proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that16sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it16gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that,17off.118detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in22performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24I will also note that embedded within the	9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So at this point, I	9	under the multiyear rate plan, I would I would advise		
12And so I would defer to my colleagues if12color its judgment of the performance and probably13they have other questions on the revenue requirement13inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan14topics.14proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that16sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it16gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that,17off.118I had some questions I wanted to ask about1819performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in22performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the	10	· · · · · · ·	10			
13they have other questions on the revenue requirement topics.13inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan proceedings.14topics.13inform discussions in later multiyear rate plan proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it off.15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that, you know, we would be providing an incentive or a detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan approve a set of approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyear rate13inform discussions in later multiyear rate proceedings.14proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that, you know, we would be providing an incentive or a detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyear rate23So there is one incentive mechanism. I will also note that embedded within the		•				
14topics.14proceedings.15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that16sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it16gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that,17off.16gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that,18I had some questions I wanted to ask about18detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in22performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the		· -	12			
15CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I'm15CHAIR DANNER: All right. So but that16sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it16gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that,17off.17you know, we would be providing an incentive or a18I had some questions I wanted to ask about18detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in22performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the		they have other questions on the revenue requirement	13			
16sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it off.16gets to my question, though. There's nothing here that, you know, we would be providing an incentive or a detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics18I had some questions I wanted to ask about performance metrics.18detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.19in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyear rate23So there is one incentive mechanism. I will also note that embedded within the		•	14			
17off.17you know, we would be providing an incentive or a18I had some questions I wanted to ask about18detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the				.		
18I had some questions I wanted to ask about18detriment to the utility based on any of these metrics19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in22approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of22the settlement related to demand response.23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the		sorry. I was trying to find my mute button to turn it				
19performance metrics.19in this multiyear rate plan; is that correct?20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in22approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of22the settlement related to demand response.23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the						
20So we have an RCW, and that's 80.28.425.20MR. PILIARIS: Well, there's actually21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyear rate21there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in the settlement related to demand response.23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyear rate23So there is one incentive mechanism.24I will also note that embedded within the		•				
21And in paragraph 7 it says, "The Commission must in approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of performance measures that will be used to assess a gas or electric company operating under a multiyear rate21 there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in the settlement related to demand response. 2321there's one new incentive mechanism that is proposed in the settlement related to demand response. 2324or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the		•				
22approving the multiyear rate plan approve a set of22the settlement related to demand response.23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the				-		
23performance measures that will be used to assess a gas23So there is one incentive mechanism.24or electric company operating under a multiyear rate24I will also note that embedded within the						
24 or electric company operating under a multiyear rate 24 I will also note that embedded within the						
25 plan." 25 scorecard are the company's existing SQIs which include						
	25	plan."	25	scorecard are the company's existing SQIs which include		

21 (Pages 321 to 324)

2	Page 325		Page 327
1	predominantly penalty mechanisms for failure to meet	1	benchmarks and incentive mechanism. I think that's a
2	the the prescribed measures.	2	great program. Great work plan. And this is
3	CHAIR DANNER: Okay		complimenting this, but it stands alone on its own that
4	MR. PILIARIS: So embedded, again, within		you have an array of measures or metrics that are
5	the set of metrics that are agreed upon within the		measuring across the Commission's regulatory outcomes
6	settlement are those measures that include incentives	6	and goals in this case that you can use to evaluate the
7	and penalties that the Commission can rely upon, I	7	success of the multiyear rate plan.
8	think, in conformance with the statute.	8	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.
9	CHAIR DANNER: All right. So it would be	9	Lauren McCloy.
10	your view, then, that this combination of the SQIs and	10	MS. MCCLOY: Thank you, Chair Danner. I was
11	DR would be, themselves, a set of performance measures	11	just going to echo the comments of Mr. Cebulko and WECC
12	that will be used to assess the electrical company	12	agrees that really what's established in this
13	operating under a multiyear rate plan as required by the		settlement is the foundation for what we hope will be,
14	RCW?		you know, a more robust policy framework adopted through
15	MR. PILIARIS: Well, not alone.		Docket U-210590 to define how the Commission wants to
16	As I said, the scorecard includes more than		use these performance measures going forward as they
17	just those that include incentive mechanisms and		relate to multiyear rate plans.
18	penalties. There are other measures on that scorecard.	18	So we support what's in the settlement as a
19	For example, related to energy efficiency		first step towards a broader movement to perform its
20	related to ED performance and whatnot; so those would be		base regulation.
21	inclusive of that.	21	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.
22	I guess I would my interpretation of the	22	And my concern, though, is to make sure that
23	statute is that the statute requires that there be		we are in compliance with RCW 80.28.425, and so I I
24 25	measures. It really actually doesn't require that there		may recommend to parties that in the post-hearing briefs that you address the the performance measures here do
20	be incentives or penalty mechanisms. That's the	2.5	that you address the the performance measures here do
	Page 326		Page 328
			Page 328
1	those are additional features that could be added. At	1	conform in the statute.
1 2	those are additional features that could be added. At least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall	1 2	
		2	conform in the statute.
2	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall	2	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among
2 3	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head.	2 3	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the
2 3 4	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of
2 3 4 5	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project.	2 3 4 5 6 7	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to
2 3 4 5 6	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf.
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting to build a baseline in this multiyear rate plan 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their testimony what the how those would be calculated.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting to build a baseline in this multiyear rate plan identifying what you want to track and what you want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their testimony what the how those would be calculated. There may be some that have a little bit there may be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting to build a baseline in this multiyear rate plan identifying what you want to track and what you want to measure and then being able to evaluate and see that as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their testimony what the how those would be calculated. There may be some that have a little bit there may be some that are a little less clear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting to build a baseline in this multiyear rate plan identifying what you want to track and what you want to measure and then being able to evaluate and see that as you evaluate the multiyear rate plan satisfies the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their testimony what the how those would be calculated. There may be some that have a little bit there may be some that are a little less clear. And it would be the company's intention to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting to build a baseline in this multiyear rate plan identifying what you want to track and what you want to measure and then being able to evaluate and see that as you evaluate the multiyear rate plan satisfies the requirement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their testimony what the how those would be calculated. There may be some that have a little bit there may be some that are a little less clear. And it would be the company's intention to the extent that there seem to be some ambiguity that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting to build a baseline in this multiyear rate plan identifying what you want to track and what you want to measure and then being able to evaluate and see that as you evaluate the multiyear rate plan satisfies the requirement. As as you're well aware, there's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their testimony what the how those would be calculated. There may be some that have a little bit there may be some that are a little less clear. And it would be the company's intention to the extent that there seem to be some ambiguity that the company would work with, particularly the stakeholders
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting to build a baseline in this multiyear rate plan identifying what you want to track and what you want to measure and then being able to evaluate and see that as you evaluate the multiyear rate plan satisfies the requirement. As as you're well aware, there's the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their testimony what the how those would be calculated. There may be some that have a little bit there may be some that are a little less clear. And it would be the company's intention to the extent that there seem to be some ambiguity that the company would work with, particularly the stakeholders that were proponents of the particular metrics to ensure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting to build a baseline in this multiyear rate plan identifying what you want to track and what you want to measure and then being able to evaluate and see that as you evaluate the multiyear rate plan satisfies the requirement. As as you're well aware, there's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their testimony what the how those would be calculated. There may be some that have a little bit there may be some that are a little less clear. And it would be the company's intention to the extent that there seem to be some ambiguity that the company would work with, particularly the stakeholders
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 least that's my reading of the statute, as I can recall it off the top of my head. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And I see Brad Cebulko has his hand up. MR. CEBULKO: Thank you, Chair Danner. Brad Cebulko of The Energy Project. A couple pieces here. First, I wasn't sure if I clearly heard Mr. Piliaris, but in the settlement stipulation, paragraph I think it's 60, on page 36, is except for the DR PIM, the main response, there will be no targets or benchmarks at this time. I am not an attorney but my understanding and the reading of the statute is that it's not required to have benchmarks, targets, incentives, or penalties associated with measures. I think just simply starting to build a baseline in this multiyear rate plan identifying what you want to track and what you want to measure and then being able to evaluate and see that as you evaluate the multiyear rate plan satisfies the requirement. As as you're well aware, there's the Commission's generic PPR proceeding in Docket U-210590 where the Commission is building a record to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	conform in the statute. And let me ask, is there an agreement among the settling parties on how to calculate all the proposed measures? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I'll start. As you'll note there's a laundry list of metrics. And, generally speaking, the intention was to use as many as possible that could be essentially pulled off the shelf. In other words, things the company already reports on in various forms and bringing it into one into one one unit. There are new ones, the many of the newer ones in the settlement were actually proposed in various pieces of testimony by the various parties. And so I I believe that the parties had in their mind or in their testimony what the how those would be calculated. There may be some that have a little bit there may be some that are a little less clear. And it would be the company's intention to the extent that there seem to be some ambiguity that the company would work with, particularly the stakeholders that were proponents of the particular metrics to ensure that there was some agreement going in that we were

22 (Pages 325 to 328)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 329	Page 33	31
1	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.	1 programs is independent of the incentive that's put on	
2	And then let me ask in witness Lowry's	2 top of that. Or the financial incentive is put on top	
3	testimony, and this is in MNL-IT on page 29, line 17 and	3 of that. So there should not be a double accounting or	
4	19.	4 double recovery of those costs.	
5	Ms. Lowry describes the DR PIM incentive,	5 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.	
6	and it's based on a percentage of the, quote, estimated	6 And then going back to that one page in	
7	lifetime costs of developing and administering the DR	7 MNL-1T. And, again, your witness Lowry defines what is	5
8	program, inclusive of the DER and DR request for	8 meant by incremental DR capacity. And I want to make	
9	proposal.	9 sure I got my I have my arms around this.	
10	What are the estimated lifetime costs of	10 In 2023 and this is up on line 5 of	
11	developing and administering the program?	11 page 29, the target is 5 megawatts and the company only	у
12	MR. PILIARIS: I believe those would be	12 achieves 3 megawatts in DR program reduction of	
13	determined at the time the programs were developed.	13 coincident peak demand.	
14	So I can't say with any specificity what	14 PSE's incremental DR capacity for 2023 is	
15	those are right now, because those are yet to be fully	15 three megawatts and there would be no incentive.	
16	defined or scoped.	16 In 2024, the target is six megawatts and the	
17	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. I assume that those,	17 company, again, only achieves three megawatts of	
18	once they are determined, they would be updated over	18 reduction. So PSE's incremental DR capacity for 2024 is	S
19	time; is that the way you envision this?	19 3 megawatts and there would be no incentive.	
20	MR. PILIARIS: Well, no. I believe, there	20 Am I reading that right?	
21	is a fair amount of discourse around this issue as to	21 MR. PILIARIS: The mechanics are correct. I	
22	whether the incentive should be based on actual results	22 would note, however, that the numbers, the targets	
23	or anticipated results.	23 themselves have grown substantially in the settlement,	
24	And my understanding of Dr. Lowry's view of	24 whereas now we're committing to 40 megawatts of dema	and
25	the matter was that the look back would be the	response capacity by the end of 2024.	
	5 220	Daga 22	
	Page 330	Page 33	32
1			32
1 2	approach where you are looking back would require it	1 But I think the mechanics are correct. If	32
2	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over	1 But I think the mechanics are correct. If 2 the company falls short there is no incentive.	32
2 3	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that	 But I think the mechanics are correct. If the company falls short there is no incentive. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify, 	32
2 3 4	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in.	 But I think the mechanics are correct. If the company falls short there is no incentive. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify, the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed 	
2 3 4 5	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier	 But I think the mechanics are correct. If the company falls short there is no incentive. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify, the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed incremental calculation that's provided in by witness 	
2 3 4	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front	 But I think the mechanics are correct. If the company falls short there is no incentive. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify, the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed incremental calculation that's provided in by witness Lowry; is that correct? 	
2 3 4 5 6 7	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we	 But I think the mechanics are correct. If the company falls short there is no incentive. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify, the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed incremental calculation that's provided in by witness Lowry; is that correct? MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates	 But I think the mechanics are correct. If the company falls short there is no incentive. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify, the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed incremental calculation that's provided in by witness Lowry; is that correct? MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one clarification around what you say, calculation. There 	
2 3 4 5 6 7	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund.	 But I think the mechanics are correct. If the company falls short there is no incentive. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify, the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed incremental calculation that's provided in by witness Lowry; is that correct? MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one clarification around what you say, calculation. There is there is still some uncertainty as to how the 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some	1 But I think the mechanics are correct. If 2 the company falls short there is no incentive. 3 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify, 4 the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed 5 incremental calculation that's provided in by witness 6 Lowry; is that correct? 7 MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one 8 clarification around what you say, calculation. There 9 is there is still some uncertainty as to how the 10 capacity reduction will be calculated. 11 And so what we agreed to was that it would 12 be consistent with the way it would be calculated in	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy	S
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission	S
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required	S
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And	S
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be derived from the PIM, the performance incentive mechanism, to assuage any concerns in that regard.	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And	S
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be derived from the PIM, the performance incentive mechanism, to assuage any concerns in that regard. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And is there is	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And17so, therefore, there will be some kind of compliance18calculation.	S
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be derived from the PIM, the performance incentive mechanism, to assuage any concerns in that regard.	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And17so, therefore, there will be some kind of compliance18calculation.	S
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be derived from the PIM, the performance incentive mechanism, to assuage any concerns in that regard. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And is there is there any risk that we're going to have duplicative recovery of the administrative costs or the development	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And17so, therefore, there will be some kind of compliance18calculation.19And so what we're proposing here in the20settlement is that they be calculated consistently.	S
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be derived from the PIM, the performance incentive mechanism, to assuage any concerns in that regard. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And is there is there any risk that we're going to have duplicative	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And17so, therefore, there will be some kind of compliance18calculation.19And so what we're proposing here in the20settlement is that they be calculated consistently.	s
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be derived from the PIM, the performance incentive mechanism, to assuage any concerns in that regard. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And is there is there any risk that we're going to have duplicative recovery of the administrative costs or the development costs, or do you think that that is not an issue?	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And17so, therefore, there will be some kind of compliance18calculation.19And so what we're proposing here in the20settlement is that they be calculated consistently.21So once that's, I guess, fully vetted within	s
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be derived from the PIM, the performance incentive mechanism, to assuage any concerns in that regard. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And is there is there any risk that we're going to have duplicative recovery of the administrative costs or the development costs, or do you think that that is not an issue? MR. PILIARIS: I don't believe it is. I	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And17so, therefore, there will be some kind of compliance18calculation.19And so what we're proposing here in the20settlement is that they be calculated consistently.21So once that's, I guess, fully vetted within22the CEIP docket, that would be where we will have out	s
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be derived from the PIM, the performance incentive mechanism, to assuage any concerns in that regard. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And is there is there any risk that we're going to have duplicative recovery of the administrative costs or the development costs, or do you think that that is not an issue? MR. PILIARIS: I don't believe it is. I mean, what we're talking about here is an incentive.	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And17so, therefore, there will be some kind of compliance18calculation.19And so what we're proposing here in the20settlement is that they be calculated consistently.21So once that's, I guess, fully vetted within22the CEIP docket, that would be where we will have ou23answer.	s
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	approach where you are looking back would require it would drive quite a bit of probably disagreement over the calculations themselves and the assumptions that were borne in. Rather, his position was it would be easier to implement, administratively anyway, to agree up-front what a reasonable assumption not unlike the way we agree up-front as to the costs going into into rates prospectively subject to refund. I think his position was that if we just used estimates, it would be easier to implement this this particular PIM. I'd also note that given some degree, I think, of discomfort generally around this PIM, the company agreed to limit the financial benefits potential benefits that could be derived from the PIM, the performance incentive mechanism, to assuage any concerns in that regard. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And is there is there any risk that we're going to have duplicative recovery of the administrative costs or the development costs, or do you think that that is not an issue? MR. PILIARIS: I don't believe it is. I mean, what we're talking about here is an incentive. Essentially, an incentive payment for performance. And	1But I think the mechanics are correct. If2the company falls short there is no incentive.3CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And just to clarify,4the settling parties are adopting PSE's proposed5incremental calculation that's provided in by witness6Lowry; is that correct?7MR. PILIARIS: Well, I think with one8clarification around what you say, calculation. There9is there is still some uncertainty as to how the10capacity reduction will be calculated.11And so what we agreed to was that it would12be consistent with the way it would be calculated in13compliance with the company's clean energy14implementation plan requirements. The Commission15notes the response is one element of its required16element of its clean energy implementation plan. And17so, therefore, there will be some kind of compliance18calculation.19And so what we're proposing here in the20settlement is that they be calculated consistently.21So once that's, I guess, fully vetted within22CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.	s

23 (Pages 329 to 332)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Dama 222		
	Page 333		Page 335
1	MS. MCCLOY: Thank you.	1	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, of course.
2	I agree with Mr. Piliaris' explanation. As	2	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.
3	you see in section in sub (d), this was a critical	3	And, Mr. Piliaris, in your own testimony
4	piece of making this PIM work for NWEC is we do think	4	specific to the DR PIM and all the other proposed
5	the methodologies should be consistent with the way it	5	metrics, I wanted to talk about the annual reporting.
6	is calculated in the CEIP.	6	Will the performance metrics in SQI annual
7	CHAIR DANNER: And so we're looking at 40	7	reporting include all 71 metrics provided in the
8	megawatts by 2024, but the target for 2023 is still	8	settlement?
9	five; is that correct?	9	MR. PILIARIS: Yes.
10	MR. PILIARIS: I don't believe there is a	10	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all
11	target for 2023. I think it is essentially a two-year	11	I wanted to get clarification on.
12	target.	12	And that's all the questions I have related
13	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you.	13	to performance-based.
14	And are the settling parties proposing	14	Commissioner Rendahl, do you have more
15	peak reductions for both winter and summer, or is it	15	questions?
16	just winter as proposed by PSE?	16	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a follow-up on
17	MR. PILIARIS: Again, speaking for the	17	that question.
18	company, I would say that we would look to the CEIP	18	So is it the intent of the settlement that
19	docket as the basis for how that will be determined.	19	settling and non-settling parties would have an
20	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.	20	opportunity to review and provide feedback on the metric
21	And then, again, going back to Lowry's	21	and the PIM calculations prior to the proposed annual
22	testimony, PSE proposed not to include the EV load	22	report or would that happened after the report to the
23	the electric vehicle load in the DR PIM to avoid double	23	Commission?
24	counting load related to the EV PIM.	24	MR. PILIARIS: I believe the settlement is
25	Since the EV PIM is not part of the	25	silent on that particular issue.
	Dama 224		
	Page 334	1	Page 336
1	Page 334	1	Page 336
1	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter	1	The company is open to some review of that
2	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles?	2	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided.
2 3	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the	2 3	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in
2 3 4	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the	2 3 4	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review
2 3 4 5	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated.	2 3 4 5	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time.
2 3 4 5 6	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.)	2 3 4 5 6	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said
2 3 4 5 6 7	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better. Maybe, Mr. Piliaris, would you mind	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the CEIP, or is that separate just to this multiyear rate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better. Maybe, Mr. Piliaris, would you mind repeating your your answer to that last question, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the CEIP, or is that separate just to this multiyear rate plan settlement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better. Maybe, Mr. Piliaris, would you mind repeating your your answer to that last question, if you can recall it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the CEIP, or is that separate just to this multiyear rate plan settlement? MR. PILIARIS: I'm not sure that I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better. Maybe, Mr. Piliaris, would you mind repeating your your answer to that last question, if you can recall it. MR. PILIARIS: I believe it's the same as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the CEIP, or is that separate just to this multiyear rate plan settlement? MR. PILIARIS: I'm not sure that I'm following the question as it relates to the CEIP.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better. Maybe, Mr. Piliaris, would you mind repeating your your answer to that last question, if you can recall it. MR. PILIARIS: I believe it's the same as the prior three, which was the the answer will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the CEIP, or is that separate just to this multiyear rate plan settlement? MR. PILIARIS: I'm not sure that I'm following the question as it relates to the CEIP. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just in terms of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better. Maybe, Mr. Piliaris, would you mind repeating your your answer to that last question, if you can recall it. MR. PILIARIS: I believe it's the same as the prior three, which was the the answer will be found in the CEIP docket.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the CEIP, or is that separate just to this multiyear rate plan settlement? MR. PILIARIS: I'm not sure that I'm following the question as it relates to the CEIP. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just in terms of the performance measures and clearly the DR PIM is something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better. Maybe, Mr. Piliaris, would you mind repeating your your answer to that last question, if you can recall it. MR. PILIARIS: I believe it's the same as the prior three, which was the the answer will be found in the CEIP docket. CHAIR DANNER: All right. I think that's an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the CEIP, or is that separate just to this multiyear rate plan settlement? MR. PILIARIS: I'm not sure that I'm following the question as it relates to the CEIP. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just in terms of the performance measures and clearly the DR PIM is something that is going to be evaluated in the CEIP.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better. Maybe, Mr. Piliaris, would you mind repeating your your answer to that last question, if you can recall it. MR. PILIARIS: I believe it's the same as the prior three, which was the the answer will be found in the CEIP docket.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the CEIP, or is that separate just to this multiyear rate plan settlement? MR. PILIARIS: I'm not sure that I'm following the question as it relates to the CEIP. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just in terms of the performance measures and clearly the DR PIM is something that is going to be evaluated in the CEIP. You answered for a lot of those questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	settlement, will PSE include reductions in winter coincident peak demand relating to vehicles? MR. PILIARIS: Again, I would answer the same way, which is, I would point to the CEIP is the basis for how it will be calculated. (Discussion on audio.) COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge Howard, I'm also having some difficulty it's somewhat muffled coming from the PSE witnesses. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can PSE is the reception better after having muted that line? MS. CARSON: Can you hear me clearly? JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you fairly clear. MR. PILIARIS: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I think that might be a bit better. Maybe, Mr. Piliaris, would you mind repeating your your answer to that last question, if you can recall it. MR. PILIARIS: I believe it's the same as the prior three, which was the the answer will be found in the CEIP docket. CHAIR DANNER: All right. I think that's an accurate recollection of what I heard him say.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The company is open to some review of that information to the extent that it can be provided. There will be a fairly short turnaround, particularly in the first year, so that might limit the amount of review time. But the company is open to as I said earlier, some are going to be more clear-cut than others. Some where we think there's going to be some ambiguity, we'll try to reach out very early to make sure we're calculating in a way that's consistent with party's expectations, which should hopefully limit the need necessarily for a lengthy pre-review process. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And is that something that would also happen in the context of the CEIP, or is that separate just to this multiyear rate plan settlement? MR. PILIARIS: I'm not sure that I'm following the question as it relates to the CEIP. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just in terms of the performance measures and clearly the DR PIM is something that is going to be evaluated in the CEIP.

24 (Pages 333 to 336)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

·	Page 337		Page 339
1	on that during the CEIP. I'm just wondering if there's	1	
1 2	any discussion about other performance measures on how	1 2	MS. FREE: Yes, that is how the tracker is
3	they would be reported and analyzed in the CEIP or is	3	designed. Any any cost related to the plant,
4	that solely within this settlement.	4	Units 3 and 4 that still remain at December 2025 will be
4 5	MR. PILIARIS: My interpretation is it is	5	offset against production tax credits, and so,
6	solely within the settlement.	6	therefore, won't need to be in rates after 2025.
6 7	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I just wanted		And the agreement also provides that any
8	to clarify that. Okay. Thanks. I have nothing	8	
9	further.	9	major maintenance events that are amortizing beyond 2025, that portion that amortizes beyond 2025 will
10	CHAIR DANNER: And I have no other questions	10	not be recovered.
11	on that. I do have some questions regarding the	11	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And one last question
12	Colstrip tracker, if I may.	12	on this. The revenue requirement settlement, it states
13	In the revenue requirement settlement, PSE	13	that PSE will will move Colstrip rate base and
14	agrees to exclude all the capital investments	14	expense into a separate tracker.
15	associated with the Colstrip Dry Ash disposal system.	15	Can you confirm that the proposed tracker
16	And that's in the settlement, paragraph 23(j).	16	will include all rate base and operating expenses for
17	Can you confirm that the Dry Ash system	17	Colstrip?
18	discussed in the settlement refers to the dry waste	18	MS. FREE: It will include all rate base for
19	disposal system discussed by PSE witness Ron Roberts in	19	Colstrip except for the transmission lines.
20	his Exhibit RJR-1CT. Just want to make sure that we're	20	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you.
21	talking about the same things.	21	So those are my questions on Colstrip.
22	MS. FREE: Great. This is Susan Free for	22	I do have one more question on low income.
23	PSE and I can confirm that those are the same thing.	23	In paragraph 38 of the settlement, the
24	CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Thank you.	24	parties state that the funding increase for help will be
25	And the revenue requirement settlement does	25	consistent with RCW 80.28.425(2).
25	And the revenue requirement settlement does	25	consistent with NOW 00.20.423(2).
	Page 338		Page 340
1	not include transmission-related costs in the proposed	1	What is the amount of the funding increase
2	Colstrip tracker.	2	for help?
3	Could the settling parties explain how	3	MR. JHAVERI: I can take that Chairman
4	transmission lines that are related to the Colstrip	4	Danner, if you can give me just a minute.
5	facility would remain used and useful for Washington	5	CHAIR DANNER: Sure.
6	customers even after the retirement of Colstrip Units 3	6	MR. JHAVERI: So if you would turn to
7	and 4?	7	Exhibit BDJ-JDT-9.
8	MS. FREE: I'm not intimately familiar with	8	CHAIR DANNER: I'm sorry. Give that to me
9	that, but I would say that I am generally aware that	9	again.
10	there's there's there's potential uses for that	10	MR. JHAVERI: Sure. Exhibit BDJ-JDT. And
11	line other than Colstrip, and so I'm anticipating that	11	I'm sorry for the record I'm Birud Jhaveri.
12	that will be what keeps those lines used and useful.	12	So so the proposed total increase for the
13	CHAIR DANNER: So it's the potential.	13	2023/2024 low income program year would be \$6.3 million.
14	There's nothing that would currently be serving	14	And for the 2024 program year, it would be just shy of
15	customers, but it would be it would be infrastructure	15	\$1 million additional incremental.
16	that would be used in the future.	16	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So the funding so
17	MS. FREE: Correct.	17	funding increase is is exactly a million.
18	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you.	18	MR. JHAVERI: Correct. In '24.
19	Another question. In the discussion of the	19	CHAIR DANNER: All right. All right. Thank
20	Colstrip tracker, the settlement provides the, quote:	20	you. That's all I have.
21	"Costs amortized after 2025 would not be recovered in	21	So thank you very much.
22	rates."	22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And I have
23	Can you confirm that the settlement removes	23	some questions about power costs for the settlement
24	Colstrip costs other than decommissioning and	24	panel.
25	remediation costs from PSE's rates by December 31, 2025?	25	The revenue requirement settlement provides

25 (Pages 337 to 340)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 341		Page 343
1	that PSE will update its power costs for recovery in	1	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes.
2	2023 as a part of its compliance filing at the	2	MS. FREE: The company is definitely
3	conclusion of this case. It also provides that PSE will	3	committed to do walk-throughs with parties and answer
4	include a list of bulleted items in its power cost	4	any questions that they have in in the PCA compliance
5	update, which may include new and updated resources.	5	filing. It is a, roughly, I think, five- or six-month
6	Does PSE intend to submit any new power	6	time frame that that it doesn't have to be finalized,
7	purchase agreements in its compliance filing for 2023	7	that filing, until September of the same year.
8	power cost that were not already described in the	8	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.
9	company's initial testimony?	9	And continuing on related to power purchase
10	MS. FREE: This is Susan Free for PSE. And	10	agreements.
11	we are aware of one new contract that would be included	11	The settlement provides that the costs of
12	in the compliance filing.	12	any PPAs which I'll use for short for distributed
13	The settlement provides that the prudency	13	energy resources, battery resources, and demand response
14	for that will be in the following years' PCA annual	14	costs are eligible for potential earnings on PPAs
15	compliance filing.	15	pursuant to statute RCW 80.28.410.
16	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So in the 2024 power	16	Do the settling parties take any position on
17	cost compliance filing or the 2023 filing?	17	whether the costs of other PPAs aside from those listed
18	MS. FREE: 2023.	18	in the settlement are eligible for potential earnings
19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So you would	19	under the statute.
20	be identifying that with specifics in that filing?	20	MR. PILIARIS: I guess this is Jon
21	MS. FREE: Correct.	21	Piliaris I'll start.
22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that filing	22	The intention of this at least from the
23	provides a pretty the plan under the settlement is to	23	company's standpoint, this particular provision is that
24	make that filing in the April 2023 power cost adjustment	24	it's fairly clear in the statute that
25	filing and this is a pretty short time frame for	25	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Mr. Piliaris, can I
-	5 i ;		
	Page 342		Page 344
1	reviewing the resources.	1	ask you to just slow down a bit, given that it is still
2	Has PSE already provided information about	2	a little bit garbled.
3	these new resources to the other parties in its	3	MR. PILIARIS: My apologies.
4	discovery responses? Is this something that the parties	4	So the company's understanding of the intent
5	have already been made aware of?	5	behind this particular provision in the settlement is
6	MS. FREE: So this is a this contract is	6	that the statute is fairly clear as to the fact that
7	very recently entered into. So it has not been provided	7	utility scales power purchase agreements can be eligible
8	to parties.	8	for earnings.
9	I will say that the length of time for a PC	9	The statute is less clear about non-utility
10	annual compliance filing mirrors that of our	10	scale, so things like demand response, distributed
11	power-cost-only rate cases.	11	solar, and the like.
12	And so I think there is sufficient time	12	And the settlement here essentially signals
13	within those proceedings to look at new contracts.	13	an agreement among the parties that, in fact, they are
14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So all of this	14	in agreement that they too should be eligible for
15	information would be included in the PCA filing?	15	earnings opportunities.
16	MS. FREE: Correct.	16	And I guess, in fact, speaking only for the
17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And PSE is	17	company, it would seem like these particular types of
18	planning to work with interested parties to address	18	resources would be the ones that you would want to
19	public counsel's concerns about the timing.	19	incent through some sort of intensive like an earning
20	MS. FREE: I'm not aware of the concerns	20	opportunity.
21	that Public Counsel has about the timing.	21	So that was that was essentially the
22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think they	22	background at least from the company's standpoint in
23	expressed in their testimony concern about the short	23	this area of the settlement.
24	time frame, but	24	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.
25	MS. FREE: In the annual compliance filing?	25	Are there any other settling parties who

26 (Pages 341 to 344)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

,			
	Page 345		Page 347
1	wish to comment on that? I'm not seeing any hands	1	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: In the revenue
2	oh, Ms. McCloy, please go ahead.	2	requirement settlement in paragraph 51, the settling
3	MS. MCCLOY: Thank you, Commissioner	3	parties refer to a "staff-led process."
4	Rendahl.	4	Why is the Commission staff the best party
5	I would agree with Mr. Piliaris' statement,	5	to direct this process?
6	although I would add that the Commission certainly	6	Anyone on the panel can answer.
7	retains the flexibility to decide whether it's	7	MR. PILIARIS: This is Jon Piliaris again.
8	reasonable and appropriate to authorize the incentive	8	I'll certainly defer to Commission Staff and not push
9	rate of return. It wasn't the intent of the settling	9	them out into this. But I think it's normally and
10	parties to remove the Commission's discretion.	10	orderly the case that staff or not at least not
11	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I	11	uncommon that staff would open up a docket and lead a
12	appreciate that.	12	process or some kind of an investigation. And so
13	Any other any other comments?	13	this is really just a continuation of that of that
14	Okay. And this is my last question about	14	historical practice.
15	the power cost issue.	15	Of course, the Commission itself could do so
16	Just to go back to my understanding of	16	as well.
17	public counsel's concerns about the revenue requirement	17	And I don't think the parties and again,
18	settlement that they argue, to my understanding, is	18	I'm I'll speak only for the company, but the company
19	that the Commission should require that the prudence of	19	would not object to the Commission itself actually
20	power cost be reviewed in the next general rate case as	20	leading such a process, but I don't know that the
21	opposed to through this power cost adjustment process.	21	settling parties wanted to presume or direct the
22	So how did the settling parties respond to	22	Commission to take undertake such an effort. So the
23	public counsel's concern that the settlement does not	23	fallback was that the Commission Staff agreed that they
24	provide sufficient process for reviewing the prudence of	24	would, at least, lead that effort.
25	power costs?	25	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Thank you.
	Page 346		Page 348
1	I've heard the statement that six months is	1	Staff, any comments?
2	a sufficient time, just like the peak work.	2	MS. ERDAHL: Yes, this is Betty Erdahl.
3	Is there anything else anyone wishes to add	3	I agree with Mr. Piliaris that Staff did not
4	want on that?	4	want to commit the Commission to something in
5	MR. PILIARIS: If I might I would at	5	particular.
6	least note that what what the settlement entails is	6	We support a Commission-led process and
7	not a change to the status quo. There is already a	7	we're we think that all utilities should be involved
8	prudence review that occurs each year through that	8	and stakeholders so that it encompasses everybody not
9	annual PCA review process.	9	just a company-by-company process.
10	So a prudence review actually does occur on	10	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.
11	a regular basis in that proceeding.	11	And that sort of goes to my last question
12	The only thing that is being added are new	12	here which is how are the voices and the concerns of low
13	resource some additional resources, but I would	13	income and disadvantaged customers be included in the
14	submit that the settlement is actually not changing much	14	development of the plan?
15	in this particular regard in terms of the amount of time	15	MR. PILIARIS: And, again, this is Jon
16	afforded to parties to review new power purchases.	16	Piliaris. They would be invited, absolutely, to
17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I appreciate that.	17	participate in such a proceeding so that their voices
18	Thank you.	18	could be heard.
19	I have no other questions on this topic.	19	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing more from me
20	My colleagues may have questions on other	20	on that topic, Your Honor. Unless the other
21	topics.	21	Commissioners have a question.
22	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor.	22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Not on this topic,
23	Commission Doumit here. I have a few questions on the	23	but I do have some questions about the the excuse
24	distributional equity analysis, if I might, please.	24	me, electric vehicle supply equipment. Let's just say
25	JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead.	25	that. Electric vehicle supply equipment plan payment

27 (Pages 345 to 348)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

Image: Provisions. COMMISSIONER DOUMT: On August 16, 2022, 2 And the revenue requirement settlement in paragraph 57 asys that PSE shall make minimum payment methods available at all publicly available electric vehicle supply equipment howned or supported by the utilities so that the catalona to clean energy tax credits and some other measures. 7 I-would just like altification 8 from the settling parties what it means to be supported by the utilities so it could be dear as to what this is to focused on. 11 Lauren McCloy. 12 MS. MCCLOY: Thanks, Commissioner Rendahl. 13 I'm happy to speak first on that. 14 The law includes items studies on two dy out parties that the equipment, that thore are electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is supported by PSE dollars, whether thats, you know, three established under the California standards. 15 consistent with thoes standards. 16 cought with the minimum payment methods that are established. 17 the settelement requirement hare is consistent with the standards. 16 the settlement requirement hare is consistent with the standards. 20 the settlement requirement hare is consistent with the standards. 21 the settlement requirement hare is consistent with the standards. 22 the settlement requirement hare		Page 349		Page 351
2 And the revenue requirement settement in methods available at all publicly available electric vhicle supply equipment-owned or supported by the utility to increase access to all customers. the President signed the inflation Reduction Act into the whicle supply equipment-owned or supported by the utility to increase access to all customers. 7 I would just like a little claffication from the setting parties what it means to be supported by the utilities so it could be clear as to what this is focuted on. The law includes items including incentives statched to clean energy tax credits and some other measures. 11 Luren McCloy. How do you parties think the benefits of the IRA could go to customers duing the pendency of this multiyeer rate Jpan? 12 MS. MCCLOY. The intent of this was that if there are electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is supported by PSE dollars, whether that s, you know, through alion cather or through direct capital The could ago adt that the security in a rule subsidiated under the California standards. 12 Low da so adt that the Washington state and as released draft rules which are consistent with mose standards. The exert that they would displace 13 The settlement requirement here is consistent with the sated mean trequirement here is consistent with the sated mean trequinemeant here to anawa trend stat can get, buit sated wit	1		1	
3 paragraph 57 says that PSE shall make minimum payment 3 law. I hope Your Honor can take judicial notice of that 4 methods available at all publicly available electric 4 4 utility to increase access to all customers. 1 6 utility to increase access to all customers. 1 7 I would just like all little clafification 7 8 from the setting parties what it means to be supported 9 9 IRA could go to customers during the pendency of this 10 Lawren McCloy. 11 11 Lawren McCloy. 11 12 Lawren McCloy. 11 13 I'm happy to speak first on that. 12 14 The interiof this was that if there are 13 15 supported by PSE clafits, sout know. 16 16 supported by PSE clafits, sout know. 16 17 through an incentive or through direct capital 17 18 through an incentive or through direct capital 17 19 costation the meminum payment methods that are 18 20 orthis issue and has released draft rules which are 19		•		-
4 methods available at all publicly available electric 4 fact. 5 welkide supply equipment-owned or supported by the utility to increase access to all customers. 7 7 I would just like a little clarification 7 7 I would just like a little clarification 7 7 I would just like a little clarification 7 8 How do you parties think the benefits of the by the utilities so it could be clear as to what this is 16 form the setting parties what it means to be supported by PSE dollars, whether that. 10 11 Lauren McCloy. 11 12 MS. MCCLOY: Thanks, Commissioner Rendahl. 13 14 The intent of this was that if there are electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is 14 15 supported by PSE dollars, whether that's, you know, 16 16 supported by PSE dollars, whether that's to supported by the cash how and the california standards. 17 16 usould also add that the Vashingion State 18 17 usould also add that is to say that we believe 20 21 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the estetlement requirement here is consistent				5
5 welricle supply equipment-owned or supported by the uillity to increase access to all customers. 5 The law includes trains including incentives attached to clean energy tax credits and some other measures. 7 I would just like a little clarification from the settling parties what it means to be supported by the uiltities or it could be clear as to what this is focused on. 6 11 Lauren McCloy. 11 Has anybody thought about that one? 12 MS. MCCLOY: Thanks, Commissioner Rendahl. 12 13 The hanyo to speak first on that. 13 14 The intent of this was that if there are electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is supported by PSE claims, whicher thats, you know, investment in the equipment, that those would need to comply with the minimum payment methods that are estabilised under the california standards. 10 12 I would also add that the Washington State 20 13 Operatment of Agriculture is consistent with the draft rule issue and has released draft rule with are settiment requirement here is consistent with the draft rule issue and has released draft rule which are settiment requirement here is consistent with the draft rule issue and has released draft rule which are settiment requirement here is consistent with the draft rule issue and has released draft rule which are settiment requirement here is consistent with the settiment requirement here is consistent with the settiment requirement here is consistent with the settiment requirement here is consistent with the settinement is not giong to confli				
6 utility to increase access to all customers. 6 attached to clean energy tax credits and some other measures. 7 I would just like a little clarification 7 measures. 8 from the setting parties what it means to be supported by the utilities so it could be clean as to what this is 7 Hack could go to customers during the pendency of this 11 Lauren McCloy. Has anybody throught about that one? Please proceed. 12 MS. MCCLOV: Tranks, Commissioner Rendahl. 11 Has anybody throught about that one? 13 The intent of this was that if there are 11 14 The intent of this was that if there are 11 15 supported by PSE dollars, whether that's, you know, 11 16 customers and is working on programs rolling to the extent that we're successful in securing those trunds. 12 16 comsistent with hose standards. 20 To the extent that they would displace 17 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the datis is dotyed in the standard that's adopted in the setter is not in conflict. 11 to - to customers with essentially free money from the sent of dyriculture's rulemaking. And I they have not adopted the final rule. 13 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you 31 to - to c				
7 I would just like a little claiffication 7 8 from the settling parties what it means to be supported 9 9 by the utilities so it could be clear as to what this is 1 10 Lauren MCCloy. 1 11 Lauren MCCloy. 1 12 MS. MCCLOY: Thanks, Cormissioner Rendahl. 10 13 I'm hapy to speak first on that. 13 14 The intent of this was that if there are 14 15 supported by PSE dollars, whether that thes, you know, 16 16 supported by PSE dollars, whether that sts, you know, 16 16 isoupported by PSE dollars, whether that sts, you know, 17 16 isoupported by PSE dollars, whether that sts, you know, 16 16 isoupported by PSE dollars, whether thats, you know, 17 16 isoupported, yo PSE dollars, whether thats, you know, 17 17 through an incentive or through direct capital 17 18 would also add that fiw Wasahington State 18 20 bepatriment of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking 10 21 had so all thata is to as positient with t				-
a from the settiling parties what it means to be supported b y the utilities so it could be clear as to what this is in Groused on. 11 Lauren McCloy. IIRA could go to customers during the pendency of this 12 MS. MCCLOY: Tranks, Commissioner Rendahl. IIRA could go to customers during the pendency of this 13 Im happy to speak first on that. III 14 The intent of this was that if there are IIII 15 electric vehice charging stations or EVSE that is IIIII 16 supported by PSE dollars, whether that's, you know, IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	-	-		
9 by the utilities so it could be dear as to what this is 9 IRA could go to customers during the pendency of this multiyear rate plan? 11 Lauren McCloy. 10 multiyear rate plan? 11 12 MS. MCCLOY: Thanks, Commissioner Rendahl. 12 Please proceed. 11 13 Tm happy to speak first on that. 13 14 The intent of this was that if there are 14 14 The intent of this was that if there are 14 Please proceed. 17 15 electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is 15 The opportunities that the IRA presents for 16 supported by PSE dollars, whether thats, you know, 16 Pliaris for PSE. 15 16 restabilished under the California standards. 10				
10 focused on. 10 multiyear rate plan? 11 Lauren McCloy. 11 Has anybody thought about that one? 12 MS. MCCLOY: Thanks, Commissioner Rendahl. 12 Please proceed. 13 The intent of this was that if there are 13 MR. PILLARIS: 1 guess this is Jon 14 The intent of this was that if there are 14 MR. PILLARIS: 1 guess this is Jon 15 supported by PSE dolars, whother that's, you know, 17 recupanty is currently very deep in 16 supported by PSE dolars, whother that's, you know, 16 revaluating the opportunities that the IRA presents for 16 comply with the minimum payment nethods that are 18 It is supported by PSE dolars, whother that's, you know, 17 17 the stablished under the California standards. 18 It's likely that this will take some time to 20 peaptriment of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking 17 To the extent that they would displace 21 Invoid also add that the Washington State 21 To the extent that they would obviously 23 anticipated my next, question, whith was, given that the 11 the settlement requirement fag. 24 CoM				• •
11 Lauren McCloy. 11 Has anyody though tabout that one? 12 MS. MCCLOY: Thanks, Commissioner Rendahl. 12 Please proceed. 14 The intent of this was that if there are 13 MR. PILLARIS: I guess this is Jon 15 electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is 13 MR. PILLARIS: I guess this is Jon 16 supported by PSE dollars, whether that's, you know, 16 evaluating the opportunities that the IRA presents for 17 through an incentive or through direct capital 17 customers and is working on proposals to secure thinding. 18 investment in the equipment, that those would need to 18 Its likely that this will take some time to 19 consistent with those standards. 10 To the extent that they would displace 20 projected costs within the filing, that would obviously be accounted for in the annual review process. 21 Its supported by PSE andards. 24 Its more likely the case, however, that 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 to - to customers with essentially free money from 24 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 1 to - to customers with essentially free money from <		-		
12 MS.MCGLOY: Thanks, Commissioner Rendahl. 12 Please proceed. 13 I'm happy to speak first on that. 13 MR. PILIARIS: I guess this is Jon 14 The intent of this was that if there are electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is 13 MR. PILIARIS: I guess this is Jon 15 electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is 13 The company is currently very deep in evaluating the opportunities that the RA presents for customers and is working on proposals to secure funding. 16 supported by PSE dollars, whether that's, you know, investment in the equipment, that those would need to comply with the minimum payment methods that are established under the California standards. 10 results would also add that the Washington State 21 I would also add that the Washington State 21 To the extent that they would displace 22 Department of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking on this issue and has released draft rules which are consistent with thoe standards. 21 To the extent that they would displace 23 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 these will be more additive, basically more benefits 24 consistent with the draft rule issued by the Department of Ag. 3 So they will be taken into account. The company is going after as many funds as it can get, but as you know, there are a lot of otherst going after these same fu				
13 Im happy to speak first on that. 13 MR.PULLINS: I guess this is Jon 14 The intent of this was that if there are 14 Pillaris for PSE. 16 supported by PSE dollars, whether that's, you know, 16 evaluating the opportunities that the IRA presents for 17 through an incentive or through direct capital 17 customers and is working on proposals to secure funding and get the programs rolling to the 18 investment in the equipment, that those would need to 18 Its likely that this will take some time to 19 cestabilished under the California standards. 19 secure the funding and get the programs rolling to the 21 I would also add that the Washington State 20 To the extent that we're successful in securing those funds. 22 Department of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking 21 To the extent that the would obviously 24 consistent with those standards. 22 Be accounted for in the annual review process. 24 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 26 to - to customers with essentially free money from 26 standards, I just wani		-		
14 The intent of this was that if there are electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is 14 Piliaris for PSE. 15 electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is 15 The company is currently very deep in 16 supported by PSE collars, whether that's, you know, 16 wallating the opportunities that the IRA presents for 17 through an incentive or through direct capital 17 customers and is working on proposals to secure funding. 18 investment in the equipment, that those would need to 18 18 18 19 comply with the minimum payment methods that are established under the California standards. 20 20 bepartment of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking on this issue and has released draft rules which are 21 To the extent that we would obviously 23 bepartment requirement here is consistent with the 23 be accounted for in the annual review process. 14 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 14 To the extent that the is dual dual by the Department of Ag. 24 comMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you 3 So they will be taken into account. The company is going after as many funds as it can get, but as you know, there are a lot of others go				
15 electric vehicle charging stations or EVSE that is 15 The company is currently very deep in 16 supported by PSE dollars, whether thats, you know, 16 evaluating the opportunities that the IRA presents for 17 through an incentive or through direct capital 17 investment in the equipment, that those would need to 18 19 comply with the minimum payment methods that are 19 escure the funding and get the programs rolling to the 21 I would also add that the Washington State 21 To the extent that we're successful in securing those funds. 22 Department of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking 22 To the extent that we're successful in securing those funds. 23 on this issue and has released draft rules which are 23 be accounted for in the annual review process. 24 consistent with those standards. 24 It's more likely the case, however, that 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 the settlement requirement Af Q. 26 CoMMISSIONER RENDAHL: OKay. And you 3 So they will be taken into account. The 26 standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard 5 secure the california standard that's adopted in the 7				-
16 supported by PSE dollars, whether that's, you know, 16 evaluating the opportunities that the IRA presents for 17 through an incentive or through direct capital 17 18 investment in the equipment, that those would need to 16 evaluating the opportunities that the IRA presents for 19 comply with the minimum payment methods that are 18 It's likely that this will take some time to 20 established under the California standards. 20 rescure the funding and get the programs rolling to the 21 I would also add that the Washington State 21 To the extent that they would displace 22 Department of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking 21 To the extent that the yould displace 23 on this issue and has released draft rules which are 23 It's more likely the case, however, that 24 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 1 It's more likely the case, however, that 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 Page 350 26 refers to ~-ifers to California EVSE 5 sattement requirement, there is consistent with the 26 statement is not going to conflict with the Washington 5 Settement is not going to conf				
17 through an incentive or through direct capital 17 customers and is working on proposals to secure funding. 18 investment in the equipment, that those would need to 18 19 20 20 21 19 21 19 21 18 18 18 10 10 16 14				
18 investment in the equipment, that those would need to 19 comply with the minimum payment methods that are 19 comply with the minimum payment methods that are 19 established under the California standards. 21 I would also add that the Washington State 20 22 Department of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking 21 23 on this issue and has released draft rules which are 22 24 consistent with those standards. 24 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 24 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 24 25 ranticipated my next question, which was, given that the 1 26 statelement refers to refers to California EVSE 5 26 statelement is not going to conflict with the washington 7 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And I 9 9 State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking, not 7 10 think you added that it is ont in conflict. 10 11 MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict. 10 12 they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in 13				
19 comply with the minimum payment methods that are 19 secure the funding and get the programs rolling to the 20 established under the California standards. 20 21 I would also add that the Washington State 20 22 Department of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking 21 23 on this issue and has released draft rules which are 23 24 consistent with those standards. 24 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 24 26 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 25 1 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 25 2 draft rule issued by the Department of Ag. 26 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Cokay. And you 3 4 anticipated my next question, which was, given that the standard 10 the - from the federal government. 7 in the - the California standard that's adopted in the 5 same funds. 7 in the - the California standard that's adopted in the 6 same funds. 7 in the - the California standard that's adopted in the 7 10 8 settlement is				
20 established under the California standards. 20 extent that we're successful in securing those funds. 21 I would also add that the Washington State 21 To the extent that we're successful in securing those funds. 22 Department of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking 21 To the extent that they would displace 23 on this issue and has released draft rules which are 22 projected costs within the filing, that would obviously 24 consistent with those standards. 24 It's more likely the case, however, that 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 It's more likely the case, however, that 26 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 25 It's more likely the case, however, that 26 the settlement requirement of Ag. 26 the - from the federal government. 27 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you 3 So they will be taken into account. The 28 statelement refers to - refers to California EVSE 5 sandards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard 29 State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I 9 Ill quickly comment. That those the benefits of the 20 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.				
21 I would also add that the Washington State 21 To the extent that they would displace 22 Department of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking 22 projected costs within the filing, that would obviously 23 on this issue and has released draft rules which are 23 be accounted for in the annual review process. 24 consistent with those standards. 24 1the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 Ite settlement requirement here is consistent with the 2 draft rule issued by the Department of Ag. 2 5 So they will be taken into account. The 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you 3 So they will be taken into account. The 4 anticipated my next question, which was, given that the 5 so they will be taken into account. The 5 state Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I 7 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you. 8 settlement is not in conflict. 11 MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict. 14 consideration. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 11 15 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 11 11 MS. MCCLOY: It is not in c			1	
22 Department of Agriculture is currently in a rulemaking on this issue and has released draft rules which are consistent with those standards. 22 projected costs within the filing, that would obviously be accounted for in the annual review process. 24 consistent with those standards. 24 1t's more likely the case, however, that these will be more additive, basically more benefits 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the draft rule issued by the Department of Ag. 1 to to customers with essentially free money from the from the federal government. 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you anticipated my next question, which was, given that the settlement refers to refers to California EVSE standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard in the the California standard that's adopted in the settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I think you added that it is not in conflict. 1 Ill stiming, not considered in the settlement. And given the sort of broad range of incentives and things that might be available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding they werent included in the settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 16 And I believe I don't have any more ahead. 10 CoMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 17 questions on the EVSE topic. 11 Nothing further on that line, Your Honor, unless Commissioners have questions. I have	21			
23 on this issue and has released draft rules which are 23 be accounted for in the annual review process. 24 consistent with those standards. 24 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 1 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 26 2 draft rule issued by the Department of Ag. 1 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you 3 4 anticipated my next question, which was, given that the 1 to to customers with essentially free money from 5 settlement refers to refers to California EVSE 3 So they will be taken into account. The 6 standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard 1 to to customers with essentially free money from 1 in the the California standard that's adopted in the 3 So they will be taken into account. The 6 standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard 7 MR. MULLINS: This is Brad with AWCC and 10 think you added that it is not in conflict. 10 11 Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not 12 they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in 12 broaca range of incentives and things that might be	22	-	22	
24 consistent with those standards. 24 It's more likely the case, however, that 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 It's more likely the case, however, that 25 And so all that is to say that we believe 24 It's more likely the case, however, that 26 Page 350 Page 352 1 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the 1 to to customers with essentially free money from 2 draft rule issued by the Department of Ag. 3 So they will be taken into account. The 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you 3 So they will be taken into account. The 4 anticipated my next question, which was, given that the 5 as you know, there are a lot of others going after these 5 standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard 7 in the the California standard that's adopted in the 7 9 State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I 9 I'I' quickly comment. That those the benefits of the 10 think you added that it is not in conflict. 10 11 MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict. 12 they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in 12 toroad range of incentives and th	23			
25 And so all that is to say that we believe 25 these will be more additive, basically more benefits Page 350 Page 350 Page 352 1 the settlement requirement here is consistent with the draft rule issued by the Department of Ag. 1 to to customers with essentially free money from the from the federal government. 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you 3 So they will be taken into account. The company is going after as many funds as it can get, but as you know, there are a lot of others going after these same funds. 6 standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard in the the California standard that's adopted in the settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington 8 9 State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I 9 10 think you added that it is not in conflict. 10 11 MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in conflict with the current rule that is under 10 12 they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in consideration. 11 CoMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 16 And I believe I don't have any more questions on the EVSE topic. 11 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you. 17 Questions on the EVSE topic. Okay. I have no further questions on the eVSE topic. 14<	24	consistent with those standards.	24	-
1the settlement requirement here is consistent with the draft rule issued by the Department of Ag.1to to customers with essentially free money from3COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you anticipated my next question, which was, given that the settlement refers to refers to California EVSE standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard r in the the California standard that's adopted in the settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I think you added that it is not in conflict.1to to customers with essentially free money from the from the federal government. So they will be taken into account. The company is going after as many funds as it can get, but as you know, there are a lot of others going after these same funds.6state Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I think you added that it is not in conflict. they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in conflict with the current rule that is under consideration.9If all quickly comment. That those the benefits of the Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not considered in the settlement. And given the sort of broad range of incentives and things that might be available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding they weren't included in the settlement. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.16And I believe I don't have any more ahead.17Okay. I have no further questions on the EVSE topic.182Okay. I have no further questions on the abad.20Okay. I have no further questions on the ahead.102COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a<	25	And so all that is to say that we believe	25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1the settlement requirement here is consistent with the draft rule issued by the Department of Ag.1to to customers with essentially free money from3COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you3So they will be taken into account. The company is going after as many funds as it can get, but as you know, there are a lot of others going after these same funds.5settlement refers to refers to California EVSE56standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard r in the the California standard that's adopted in the77in the the California to conflict with the Washington89State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I910think you added that it is not in conflict.1011MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with1112they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in conflict with the current rule that is under1213conflict with the current rule that is under1214consideration.1215COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.1516And I believe I don't have any more1617questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling ahead.1718parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go ahead.1820Okay. I have no further questions on the2022COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a2222COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22				
2draft rule issued by the Department of Ag.2the from the federal government.3COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you3So they will be taken into account. The4anticipated my next question, which was, given that the3So they will be taken into account. The5settlement refers to refers to California EVSE5as you know, there are a lot of others going after these6standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard7in the the California standard that's adopted in the77in the the California standard that's adopted in the7COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington8MR. MULLINS: This is Brad with AWEC and9State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I9I'll quickly comment. That those the benefits of the10think you added that it is not in conflict.10Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not11MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with11considered in the settlement. And given the sort of12they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.15Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,16And I believe I don't have any more16COMMIS		Page 350		Page 352
3COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And you3So they will be taken into account. The4anticipated my next question, which was, given that the4company is going after as many funds as it can get, but5settlement refers to refers to California EVSE5as you know, there are a lot of others going after these6standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard6same funds.7in the the California standard that's adopted in the7COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington8MR. MULLINS: This is Brad with AWEC and9State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I9I'll quickly comment. That those the benefits of the10think you added that it is not in conflict.10Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not11MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with11considered in the settlement. And given the sort of12they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.15they weren't included in the settlement.16And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless C	1		1	
4anticipated my next question, which was, given that the settlement refers to refers to California EVSE4company is going after as many funds as it can get, but as you know, there are a lot of others going after these same funds.6standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard in the the California standard that's adopted in the settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington6Same funds.7in the the California standard that's adopted in the settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington7COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington8MR. MULLINS: This is Brad with AWEC and9State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I9I'll quickly comment. That those the benefits of the10think you added that it is not in conflict.10Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not11MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in consideration.12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under13available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.1516And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please	2			-
5settlement refers to refers to California EVSE5as you know, there are a lot of others going after these6standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard6same funds.7in the the California standard that's adopted in the7COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington8MR. MULLINS: This is Brad with AWEC and9State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I9I'll quickly comment. That those the benefits of the10think you added that it is not in conflict.10Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not11MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with11considered in the settlement. And given the sort of12they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under13available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.1516And I believe I don't have any more1617questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling1718parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go1819ahead.2020Okay. I have no further questions on the2021EVSE topic.2122COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a2223COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Hon				-
6standards, I just wanted to make sure that the standard in the the California standard that's adopted in the settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington 96same funds.7in the the California standard that's adopted in the settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington 98COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you. MR. MULLINS: This is Brad with AWEC and 99State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I 1091'll quickly comment. That those the benefits of the 1010think you added that it is not in conflict. 11101011MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with 121112they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in conflict with the current rule that is under1213conflict with the current rule that is under1314consideration.1415COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.16And I believe I don't have any more17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling ahead.19ahead.20Okay. I have no further questions on the 2021EVSE topic.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a 2223COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a 2224COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a 22				
7in the the California standard that's adopted in the settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington7COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington8MR. MULLINS: This is Brad with AWEC and9State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I9I'll quickly comment. That those the benefits of the10think you added that it is not in conflict.10Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not11MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with11considered in the settlement. And given the sort of12they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under13available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.1516And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ahead.19Okay. I have no further questions on the20JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.20Okay. I have no further questions on the21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.2221COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOU				
8settlement is not going to conflict with the Washington8MR. MULLINS: This is Brad with AWEC and9State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I9I'll quickly comment. That those the benefits of the10think you added that it is not in conflict.10Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not11MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with11considered in the settlement. And given the sort of12they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under13available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.15they weren't included in the settlement.16And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time				
9State Department of Agriculture's rulemaking. And I9I'll quickly comment. That those the benefits of the10think you added that it is not in conflict.10Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not11MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with11considered in the settlement. And given the sort of12they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under13available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.1516And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time				-
10think you added that it is not in conflict.10Inflation Reduction Act were, due to its timing, not11MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with11considered in the settlement. And given the sort of12they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under12broad range of incentives and things that might be14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.16And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ohaead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time				
11MS. MCCLOY: It is not in conflict with11considered in the settlement. And given the sort of12they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under13available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.15they weren't included in the settlement.16And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ohaead.20Okay. I have no further questions on the2121EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time			1	
12they have not adopted the final rule. But it is not in12broad range of incentives and things that might be13conflict with the current rule that is under13available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding16And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time		•		
13conflict with the current rule that is under13available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt14consideration.13available, I think those would need to be sort of dealt15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding16And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20Honor.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time				•
14consideration.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.14with on a case-by-case basis. But just understanding16And I believe I don't have any more15they weren't included in the settlement.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20Honor.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time		• •		
15COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.15they weren't included in the settlement.16And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20Honor.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time				
16And I believe I don't have any more16COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20Honor.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time				
17questions on the EVSE topic, but any other settling17Nothing further on that line, Your Honor,18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20Honor.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time			1	-
18parties wishes to chime in and have comments, please go ahead.18unless Commissioners have questions. I have questions19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the 2120Honor.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time		•	1	
19ahead.19on other sections of the settlement if I might, Your20Okay. I have no further questions on the20Honor.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time				•
20Okay. I have no further questions on the20Honor.21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time				
21EVSE topic.21JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a22COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time			1	-
22 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Your Honor, I have a 22 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's on the time				
		-		-
23 guestion. A general guestion on the inflation reduction 23 variant rate to pilot settlement paragraph No. 41	23	question. A general question on the inflation reduction	23	variant rate to pilot settlement paragraph No. 41
24 act, if I might, please. 24 revenue requirement settlement paragraph 41.			1	
25 JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. 25 The settlement requires PSE to provide			1	
				· · ·

28 (Pages 349 to 352)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 353		Page 355
1	enabling methodology to half of low income participants	1	customer recruited for the DVR pilot?
2	in the time-bearing rate pilots that it also requires	2	MR. CEBULKO: I deferred to
3	PSE to provide bill protection to half of the low income	3	MR. PILIARIS: Commissioner Doumit, our
4	participants.	4	intention is that when we recruit customers, we will
5	First question, I guess, I have is in	5	specifically ask for their income levels. And based on
6	looking at Mr. Cebulko's initial testimony, BTC-IT at	6	their income levels, they will either be added to the
7	page 61, he had included four sort of observation	7	residential pilot or the low income pilot on a basis of
8	groups. And it looks like this pilot was, perhaps,	8	the varying levels of income that there may be.
9	developed from those from that testimony. Those	9	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And, again, thanks for
10	groups included low income customers who would have both	10	going into some detail on this.
11	the equipment and the bill protection and those who	11	I have another sort of detailed question.
12	would have none, neither.	12	Will the same low income customers receive
13	I just wondered why those last two	13	both enabling technology and bill protection?
14	categories fell out of the pilot.	14	It appears that that won't be the case, but
15	MR. CEBULKO: Did I hear PSE correctly that	15	half will receive technology and half will receive bill
16	they said Mr. Cebulko should take that?	16	protection, but maybe just a little more specificity on
17	MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.	17	that.
18	MR. CEBULKO: Hello, Commissioners. Brad	18	MR. PILIARIS: That's right. The intention
19	Cebulko from The Energy Project.	19	is to provide bill protection and technology to half
20	It was perhaps a I don't I'm not sure	20	half of the low income customers and that will be done
21	we actually discuss that specific piece of that. It was	21	on a randomized selection basis.
22	my understanding that's how Puget was going to structure	22	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And lastly, will the
23 24	this program. Consistent with that recommendation, it	23 24	company provide the results of how the TVR pilot
24 25	seems to make the most sense if you are trying to use this as a pilot.	24	impacted low income populations in their pilot results? MR. JHAVERI: Yes, we will.
	Page 354		Page 356
1	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I	1	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your
2	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with	2	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you.
2 3	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget.	2 3	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I
2 3 4	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe,	2 3 4	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions?
2 3 4 5	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the	2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon?	2 3 4 5 6	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad
2 3 4 5 6 7	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of	2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low income customers to the pilot that I saw; is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction. And so and you had proposed a way to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low income customers to the pilot that I saw; is that correct? MR. CEBULKO: Sorry, Commissioner. Is this question directed to me?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction. And so and you had proposed a way to to measure that in the evaluation of the results.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low income customers to the pilot that I saw; is that correct? MR. CEBULKO: Sorry, Commissioner. Is this question directed to me? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, please. I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction. And so and you had proposed a way to to measure that in the evaluation of the results. And so I think I understand your response to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low income customers to the pilot that I saw; is that correct? MR. CEBULKO: Sorry, Commissioner. Is this question directed to me? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, please. I'm sorry. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction. And so and you had proposed a way to to measure that in the evaluation of the results. And so I think I understand your response to Commissioner Doumit is that that did not that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low income customers to the pilot that I saw; is that correct? MR. CEBULKO: Sorry, Commissioner. Is this question directed to me? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, please. I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. CEBULKO: That's correct. It's an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction. And so and you had proposed a way to to measure that in the evaluation of the results. And so I think I understand your response to Commissioner Doumit is that that did not that evaluation didn't enter into the settlement; is that correct? MR. PILIARIS: That question is for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low income customers to the pilot that I saw; is that correct? MR. CEBULKO: Sorry, Commissioner. Is this question directed to me? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, please. I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. CEBULKO: That's correct. It's an opt-in program. So Puget is going to have to go out and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction. And so and you had proposed a way to to measure that in the evaluation of the results. And so I think I understand your response to Commissioner Doumit is that that did not that evaluation didn't enter into the settlement; is that correct? MR. PILIARIS: That question is for the company?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low income customers to the pilot that I saw; is that correct? MR. CEBULKO: Sorry, Commissioner. Is this question directed to me? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, please. I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. CEBULKO: That's correct. It's an opt-in program. So Puget is going to have to go out and solicit participation into this program.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction. And so and you had proposed a way to to measure that in the evaluation of the results. And so I think I understand your response to Commissioner Doumit is that that did not that evaluation didn't enter into the settlement; is that correct? MR. PILIARIS: That question is for the company? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That question was for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low income customers to the pilot that I saw; is that correct? MR. CEBULKO: Sorry, Commissioner. Is this question directed to me? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, please. I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. CEBULKO: That's correct. It's an opt-in program. So Puget is going to have to go out and solicit participation into this program. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And some another	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction. And so and you had proposed a way to to measure that in the evaluation of the results. And so I think I understand your response to Commissioner Doumit is that that did not that evaluation didn't enter into the settlement; is that correct? MR. PILIARIS: That question is for the company? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That question was for Mr. Cebulko first, and then I was going to follow up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	But I would say that wasn't I'm not I don't recall if that was an explicit conversation with Puget. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So do you believe, Mr. Cebulko, that this will be a robust pilot with the observation groups that are agreed upon? MR. CEBULKO: Depends on the number of participants that Puget can sign up, but yes, that would be my expectation. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I guess that was another question perhaps for you then as well. I think in your initial testimony you assumed it was 500 or a thousand customers. There's no mechanism to recruit low income customers to the pilot that I saw; is that correct? MR. CEBULKO: Sorry, Commissioner. Is this question directed to me? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, please. I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. CEBULKO: That's correct. It's an opt-in program. So Puget is going to have to go out and solicit participation into this program.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, may I follow up just slightly on that line of questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think Brad spoke I think you addressed this, but I would appreciate maybe PSE responding. So in your testimony, you had suggested a process for evaluating the various groups. You had proposed the half low income customers getting the tech enabling technology benefit and half including the bill reduction. And so and you had proposed a way to to measure that in the evaluation of the results. And so I think I understand your response to Commissioner Doumit is that that did not that evaluation didn't enter into the settlement; is that correct? MR. PILIARIS: That question is for the company? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That question was for

29 (Pages 353 to 356)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 357		Page 359
1	Rendahl, can you speak to the evaluation requirement you	1	excused.
2	are speaking of in my testimony?	2	I'm not sure who raised their hand first.
3	Do you have a reference?	3	Ms. Liotta.
4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: On page 62 of your	4	MS. LIOTTA: Yes, Your Honor. Rita Liotta
5	testimony you identified sort of the way you would	5	with FEA.
6	evaluate or you would have different ways of	6	I was hoping to have Mr. Al-Jabir excused.
7	evaluating the impacts on four different you know,	7	He is not on any other settlement panel.
8	looking at the groups in four different ways.	8	JUDGE HOWARD: I think that would be
9	And so that did not appear to be included in	9	perfectly fine.
10	the settlement. And so just inquiring whether this	10	MS. LIOTTA: Thank you, Your Honor.
11	method of evaluating and grouping different folks	11	MR. AL-JABIR: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	impacted by by this pilot, whether that was included	12	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Parekh.
13	in the settlement or it intended to be included in the	13	MS. PAREKH: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	settlement.	14	Same questions for Ms. McCloy and Ms. Smith.
15	MR. CEBULKO: Yes, it was my intention.	15	If they could please be excused as they're
16	Although, I now see that there might be some ambiguity	16	not on any other panel.
17	in the settlement.	17	JUDGE HOWARD: Was your witnesses McCloy and
18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And so now	18	what was the second one?
19	turning to PSE, was it PSE's understanding in developing	19	MS. PAREKH: Gloria Smith.
20	this pilot that it would follow the recommendations in	20	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Yes, I think I
21	Brad Cebulko's testimony on this evaluation technique?	21	think that is fine. All right.
22	MR. PILIARIS: So we would certainly be open	22	Counsel for Kroger.
23	to to various evaluation techniques. The company's	23	MR. BOEHM: Thank you, Your Honor.
24	intention is that when once we start the process of	24	Same question for our witness, Mr. Bieber.
25	assessing appropriate EMV measures and processees that	25	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Mr. Bieber may be
1	Page 358	1	Page 360
1 2	we would include stakeholders before we finalize the EMV	1 2	excused for the remainder of the hearing. MR. BOEHM: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	process. And so in through that method, we would certainly take into consideration any any proposals	3	THE COURT: So I see that we are approaching
	that that were provided to us, including the one in	1 3	
		4	
4		4	the lunch hour here.
5	Mr. Cebulko's testimony.	5	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have
5 6	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you,	5 6	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel.
5 6 7	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful.	5 6 7	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of
5 6 7 8	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you.	5 6 7 8	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel.
5 6 7 8 9	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further	5 6 7	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we
5 6 7 8	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench?	5 6 7 8 9	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel.
5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further	5 6 7 8 9 10	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank the witnesses on this panel for their testimony. You	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank the witnesses on this panel for their testimony. You may turn off your cameras.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions, Your
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank the witnesses on this panel for their testimony. You may turn off your cameras. And I understand that Irene Plenefisch,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions, Your Honor.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank the witnesses on this panel for their testimony. You may turn off your cameras. And I understand that Irene Plenefisch, Microsoft's witness, had limited availability today, so	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nor I do, Your Honor.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank the witnesses on this panel for their testimony. You may turn off your cameras. And I understand that Irene Plenefisch, Microsoft's witness, had limited availability today, so I was planning on excusing Irene Plenefisch from the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nor I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank the witnesses on this panel for their testimony. You may turn off your cameras. And I understand that Irene Plenefisch, Microsoft's witness, had limited availability today, so I was planning on excusing Irene Plenefisch from the remainder of the hearing, unless any of the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nor I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. The cost of capital panel, we will we
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank the witnesses on this panel for their testimony. You may turn off your cameras. And I understand that Irene Plenefisch, Microsoft's witness, had limited availability today, so I was planning on excusing Irene Plenefisch from the remainder of the hearing, unless any of the Commissioners had concerns with that.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nor I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. The cost of capital panel, we will we will skip over the cost of capital panel.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank the witnesses on this panel for their testimony. You may turn off your cameras. And I understand that Irene Plenefisch, Microsoft's witness, had limited availability today, so I was planning on excusing Irene Plenefisch from the remainder of the hearing, unless any of the Commissioners had concerns with that. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No concerns.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nor I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. The cost of capital panel, we will we will skip over the cost of capital panel. The witnesses on that panel, just to have a
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr. Cebulko's testimony. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. I have no other questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any further questions from the bench? CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No more questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank the witnesses on this panel for their testimony. You may turn off your cameras. And I understand that Irene Plenefisch, Microsoft's witness, had limited availability today, so I was planning on excusing Irene Plenefisch from the remainder of the hearing, unless any of the Commissioners had concerns with that. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No concerns. CHAIR DANNER: No concerns.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the lunch hour here. The next panel of witnesses we would have would be the cost of capital panel. And no party planned to cross the cost of capital panel. Do we before I swear in the panel, do we have any bench questions for this panel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Commissioner Rendahl. I spoke over you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. CHAIR DANNER: I have no questions, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nor I do, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. The cost of capital panel, we will we will skip over the cost of capital panel. The witnesses on that panel, just to have a bit of foresight here, I will say that those witnesses

30 (Pages 357 to 360)

Page 361 Page 361 1 With the exception of - of Betty Erdahl and Bradley Mullins who were on that panel, but we would like to remain available for the ramainder of the bearing. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 5 So the next panel after that would be the Energize Eastside panel. MR. NIGHTINGALE: This is Joel Nightingale on behalf of Commission Staff. 7 And, of course, we are coming up on the like to remain available for he transmission to part who indicated that they plan to cross with reases on the Energize Eastside panel. MR. NIGHTINGALE: This is Joel Nightingale and Course were are firm that the testimony you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 10 Invitues for Erdahl. MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes. 11 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes. 12 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes. 13 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes. 14 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes. 15 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 16 CENSE plans to cross-examinations before resume and pick woll be adverted with the theore cross-examinations theor fradminet works for the area with would be adverted with the mate sought the works for the area with would be adverted with theore for the staff to the area with would be adverted with theore soupout aspeciation for frads-				
2 Bradiey Mullins who were on that panel, but we would Image: Comparison of the remain available for the remainder of the hearing. 3 Bike to remain available for the remainder of the hearing. On behalf of Commission Staff. 4 hearing. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 5 So the next panel after that would be the 5 6 Energize Eastside panel. M.K. Echahl, I believe I swore you in earlier 7 And, of course, we are coming up on the M.K. Koch and Mr. Nightingale, would you 8 Jub of the truth, is of the truth is the the testimony pose server of affirm that the testimony 9 Jub of the funct hour or would you prefer to minutes for Fightingale The funct hear would you prefer to 10 minutes for Fightingale MR. HANSEN: Were not going to do Botty The first question we have is please turn to 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Page 362 Fage 364 11 Will take more than 10 minutes? Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit 22 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit 23 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you searor are relevant to minutes? 24 him. All think it would be nalward to		Page 361		Page 363
3 like to remain available for the remainder of the hearing. on behalf of Commission Staff. 5 So the next panel after that would be the Energize Eastside panel. on behalf of Commission Staff. 6 Energize Eastside panel. M. Koch and M. Nightingale, would you please raise your night hand and I will swear you in the sea you had - belaive it was 80 minutes to r PSE's witness Koch, 10 minutes for Staff. 10 witnesses on the Energize Eastside panel. Do you swear or affirm tha the the testimony witnesses conting up on the is a part who indicated that they plan to cross witnesses cont. 10 minutes for Fraff. 11 To minutes for Erdah. Do you swear or affirm that the thestimony witnesses conting up on the is a part who indicated that they plan do not you reminute cross-swaminations before 16 we break for the hunch hour or would you prefer to resume and pick up all these crosses after - after a 45-minute lunch break? M. Koch Kor 60 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 15 minutes. And they indicated that they wish to proceed with Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 16 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 17 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 18 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 19 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 19 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 10 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 10 minute what a fam. the set of the set of 10 minutes is the set of the set of 10 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 11 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. If is ay, approximately 12 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. I	1	With the exception of of Betty Erdahl and	1	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
4 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 5 So the next panel after that would be the 6 Energize Eastside panel. 7 And, of course, we are coming up on the 8 Lunch hour, so I would like to check in with CENSE who 9 is a party who indicated that they plan to cross 10 minutes for Figze Eastside panel. 11 Isseey ou had - I believe it was 60 minutes 16 for PSE withress Koch, 10 minutes for Nightingale, and 13 To minutes for Vightingale. 14 Mr. Hansen, would you be amenable to - to 15 doing one of your ter-minute cross-axaminable to - to 16 rescue and pick up al these crosses after - after 17 minute lunch break? 18 45-minute lunch break? 19 MR. HANSEN: Were not going to do Betty 11 The MR. HANSEN: Were not going to do betty 12 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 24 MR. HANSEN: Were not going to do Betty 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 26 MR. HANSEN: Were not going to do Betty 27 MR. HANSEN: Were not going to do Bett	2	Bradley Mullins who were on that panel, but we would	2	MR. NIGHTINGALE: This is Joel Nightingale
So the next panel after that would be the Frequize Eastide panel. So the next panel after that would be the Frequize Eastide panel. So the next panel after that would be the frequize Eastide panel. 1 And, of course, we are coming up on the is a party who indicated that the yel into cross MK. Koch and Mr. Nightingale, would you 10 Introducts for Erdah. MK. Koch and Mr. Nightingale, would you 11 Josey ou had - I believe it was 60 minutes Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 12 for PSE's witness Koch, 10 minutes for Fridh. MK. RANSEN: Weith the the formulate cross-examinations before 13 do minutes for Fridh. MK. Nightingale, and 14 MR. HANSEN: We're not going to do Betty Fridh. 15 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. To minutes and Mr. Nightingale first. 16 Except we have quite a few questions for C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 17 The time is 12:39 p.m. Judge HowARD: All right. D with weas going to resume calling winesses with 18 the Energize Eastide panel. MR. HANSEN: We with energize Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit 24 MR. HANSEN: We with energize for sume calling winesses with Mr. Lauckhart's testindifies the four factors	3	like to remain available for the remainder of the	3	on behalf of Commission Staff.
6 Energize Eastide panel. and consider yourseft under cath. 7 And, of course, we are coming up on the 8 lunch hour, so I would like to check in with CENSE who 9 is a party who indicated that they plan to cross 11 15 bit unch hour, so I would you please raise your right hand and I will swear you in 12 bit unch hour, so I would you please raise your right hand and I will swear you in 13 If will sees, no, to minutes for Nightingale, and 14 Mr. Hansen, would you be amenable to - to 15 doing one of your ten-minute cross-examinations before 16 With reservice and pick up all these crosses after - after a 17 minute lunch break? 18 45-minute lunch break? 19 MR. HANSEN: We're not going to do Betry 19 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 20 Erdahl. 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 22 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 23 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 24 BWR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 26 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 27 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 28 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 29 JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	4	hearing.	4	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
7 And, of course, we are coming up on the Introch hour, so I would like to check in with CENSE who 9 is a party who indicated that they plan to cross 10 introch hour, so I would like to check in with CENSE who 11 I see you had - I believe it was 0 minutes 12 for PSE's witness Koch, 10 minutes for Findh. 13 10 minutes for Findh. 14 minutes for Findh. 15 doing one dy our terminute cross-examinations before 16 we break for the lunch hour or would you prefer to 17 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. IT say, approximately 18 45-minute lunch break? 19 MR. HANSEN: We re not going to do Betty 12 Findah. 12 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 14 will take more than 10 minutes? 14 will take more than 10 minutes? 15 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 16 will take more than 10 minutes? 17 MR. HANSEN: Weile will will. 18 thore was a diff the resume at 12:35 p.m. 19 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 10 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 11 JUDGE HOWA	5	So the next panel after that would be the	5	Ms. Erdahl, I believe I swore you in earlier
a funch hour, so I would like to check in with CENSE who is a party who indicated that they plan to cross is a party who indicated that they plan to cross is a party who indicated that they plan to cross is a party who indicated that they plan to cross is a party who indicated that they plan to cross is a party who indicated that they plan to cross is a party who indicated that they plan to cross is a party who indicated that they plan to cross individual the truth, ? is a party who indicated that they plan to cross individual the truth, ? is a party who indicated that they plan to cross individual they they all these cross-examined the truth, ? is doing one of your ten-minute cross-examined the truth, ? individual they all these crosse stater - after a is doing one of your ten-minute cross-examined they plan to gotter. individual they they plan they proximately is mark tanSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. individual they they plan to cross examined they plan to gotter. is mark tanSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. individual they plan they plan to they plan they plan to they plan they plan they plan to the fort. is mark tanSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. judge. is mark tanSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. is mark tanSEN: judge thow ARD: All right. Do you think that	6	Energize Eastside panel.	6	and consider yourself under oath.
9 is a party who indicated that they plan to cross 9 together. 10 witnesses on the Energize Eastside panel. 10 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 11 Is ery out had - I believe it was 60 minutes 11 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony 11 It or minutes for FATAIL. MR. HANSEN: Work on the our or would you prefer to MR. NIGHTINACLE: Yes. 12 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. CENSE plans to cross-examine Mr. Koch for 60 17 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. I'll say, approximately 18 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. MR. HANSEN: We not going to do Beity 19 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. So. Mr. Hansen, please proceed. 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that Vill take more than 10 minutes? 10 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Think it would be awkward to stop halfway 11 through your examination. So let's leave off here for A Striniute lunch break. We will resume at 12.35 p.m. 11 All we raid the recry: JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. 12 Will take more than 10 minutes? Mr. Lauckhart's testimony on the four 13 Thoe time is 12.39 p.m. A limik these lactors are re	7	And, of course, we are coming up on the	7	Mr. Koch and Mr. Nightingale, would you
10 witnesses on the Energize Eastside panel. 10 11 Isee you had - I believe it was 60 minutes 10 12 for PSE's witness Koch, 10 minutes for Nightingale, and 11 13 10 minutes for Erdahl. 11 14 Mr. Hansen, would you be amenable to - to 13 15 doing one of your ten-minute cross-examinations before 15 16 web reak for the lunch bour or would you parfer to 16 17 resume and pick up all these crosses after after a 17 18 45-minute lunch break? UDGE HOWARD: All right. 20 Erdahl. 20 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 10 22 Except we have quite a few questions for 14 23 Except we have quite a few questions for 23 24 him. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 25 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Think in that 23 CR O S S - E X AM I N A T I O N 24 Will take more than 10 minutes? Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit 26 MR: HANSEN: Lebieve at will. 24 Orbar Mark you. 27	8	lunch hour, so I would like to check in with CENSE who	8	please raise your right hand and I will swear you in
11 Isee you had1 believe it was 60 minutes 11 you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 12 for PSE's witness Koch, 10 minutes for Nightingale, and 12 nothing but the truth? 14 Mr. Hansen, would you be amenable to - to 14 MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes. 15 doing one of your tren-minute cross-examinations before 14 MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes. 15 minutes and pick up all these crosses after after a 14 MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes. 16 doing one of your tren-minute cross-examinations before 16 UDEG HOWARD: All right. 19 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 17 minutes and Mr. Nightingale first. 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 20 So, Mr. Hansen, Please proceed. 24 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 21 Judge. 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think thatt 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to 26 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 24 Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit 26 Mr. Hauster's testimony on the four factors 4 31 Mr. Lauckhart's testimony on the four factors 6 3	9	is a party who indicated that they plan to cross	9	together.
12 for PSE's witness Koch, 10 minutes for Nightingale, and 12 nothing but the truth? 13 10 minutes for Erdahl. 13 MR. KOCH: 1 do. 14 Mr. Hansen, would you be amenable to - to 13 MR. KOCH: 1 do. 15 doing one of your ten-minute cross-examinations before 15 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 18 45-minute lunch break? minutes and Mr. Nightingale for, Ill say, approximately 16 T minutes. And they wish to proceed with Mr. Nightingale first. 21 JUDGE HOWARD: Might. 20 22 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 21 23 Except we have quite a few questions for 11 14 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 23 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 24 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 23 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Think that 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to 26 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 34 A. I metre. 34 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's leave off here for 4 A. I miters 34 4 Abreagize ant turb ready. <th>10</th> <td></td> <th>10</th> <td></td>	10		10	
10 minutes for Erdahl. 11 14 Mr. Hansen, would you be amenable to - to 11 15 doing one of your tern-minute cross-examinations before 11 16 minutes and pick up all these crosses after - after a 12 17 resume and pick up all these crosses after - after a 13 MR. KOCH: 1 do. 17 resume and pick up all these crosses after - after a 14 MR. HANSEN: We're not going to do Betty 18 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So. Mr. Hansen, Please proceed. 19 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. So. Mr. Hansen, Please proceed. 19 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 25 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 24 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Diff. I and to minutes? 24 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit 25 Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. Mr. Lauckhart's testimony on the four factors 26 A Seminute lunch break. We'll regrize Eashi Mith 27 Mr. Hansen, Please tha	11			
14 Mr. Hansen, would you be amenable to - to 14 MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes: 15 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 15 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 18 45-minute lunch brow or would you prefor to 16 17 Thinutes and Mr. Nightingale for, III say, approximately. 18 45-minute lunch broak? 18 15 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 20 MR. HANSEN: We're not going to do Betty 18 15 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. III say, approximately. 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 20 So, Mr. Hansen, please proceed. 23 Except we have quite a few questions for Judge. C R S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 24 MR. HANSEN: We're and Joel Nightingale. 23 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 24 MR. HANSEN: I believei twill. 30 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think that 25 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Might I think in that Case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway 5 Harms, u. 4 4 Cases, I think it would be awk atken from 5 Here Mr. Lauckhart's testimony or the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review. 7 A dwe are off the record. 4 11 A. I think these fac	12			•
15 doing one of your ten-minute cross-examinations before 15 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 16 we break for the lunch hour or would you prefer to 16 CENSE plans to cross-examine Mr. Koch for 60 17 minutes unch break? 16 CENSE plans to cross-examine Mr. Koch for 60 18 45-minute lunch break? 16 To minutes and Mr. Nightingale for, III say, approximately 18 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 17 15 minutes. and Mr. Nightingale for, III say, approximately 19 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 23 Except we have quite a few questions for 17 24 him. 23 Except we have quite a few questions for 23 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 24 MR. HANSEN: Ibeliewe it will. 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ibnik in that 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to 26 MR. HANSEN: Ibeliewe it will. 26 Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ibnik in that 26 Q. Kay, Thank you. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ibnik in that 27 A. I'm there. 4 <	13		13	
16 we break for the lunch hour or would you prefer to 16 CENSE plans to cross-examine Mr. Koch for 60 17 minutes and Mr. Nightingale for. 111 say, approximately 15 18 45-minute lunch break? 10 20 MR. HANSEN: We're not going to do Betty 10 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 20 22 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 23 23 Except we have quite a few questions for 23 4 him. 24 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 25 26 Page 362 Page 362 27 MR. HANSEN: believe it will. 25 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that 26 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that 26 4 case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway 5 5 through your examination. So let's leave off here for 26. Okay. Thank you. 6 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. 36 7 And we are off the record. 6 46. break was taken from 14 there fit berecord. 70. you disagree with his test	14		14	MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes.
17 resume and pick up all these crosses after after a 17 minutes and pick up all these crosses after after a 18 45-minute lunch break? 18 19 MR. HANSEN: Were not going to do Betty 18 20 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 18 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 20 23 Except we have quite a few questions for 17 24 him. 20 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 20 26 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 20 27 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 20 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Think in that 20 4 Gase, I think I would be awkward to stop halfway 3 5 through your examination. So let's leave off here cord. 45 6 (A break was taken from 3 7 And we are off the record. 46 8 (A break was taken from 3 9 1151 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) 3 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's back on the record. 41 11 The time is 12:39 p.m. 3				
13 45-minute lunch break? 18 15 minutes. And they indicated that they wish to proceed with <i>R</i> . Nightingale first. 14 50, Mr. Hansen, please proceed. 19 15 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 20 So, Mr. Hansen, please proceed. 16 MR. HANSEN: Ve can do Joel Nightingale. 20 So, Mr. Hansen, please proceed. 16 MR. HANSEN: Ve can do Joel Nightingale. 20 So, Mr. Hansen, please proceed. 17 MR. HANSEN: Ve can do Joel Nightingale. 20 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 16 Mr. HANSEN: Ibelieve it will. Judge. 20 17 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. To you think that 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to 18 Mr. HANSEN: Ibelieve it will. 3 A. I'm there. 2 MR. HANSEN: Ibelieve it will. 3 A. I'm there. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ithink in that 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. 3 A. I'm there. 3 A. I'm there. 3 A. I'm these factor requires a demonstration of 16 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Hall alloge 3 11 The t				
19 MR. HANSEN: We're not going to do Betty 19 proceed with Mr. Nightingale first. 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 20 So, Mr. Hansen, please proceed. 23 Except we have quite a few questions for MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 22 24 him. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 23 C R O S S · E X A M I N A T I O N 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to Page 362 Page 364 Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit Reg 362 Page 364 Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit Reg 362 Page 364 Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit Reg 364 10 Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit Reg 364 11 Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit Reg 364 1 Mr. Lauckhart deathies thor factors				
20 Erdahl. 20 So, Mr. Hansen, please proceed. 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 22 23 Except we have quite a few questions for MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 23 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 24 BY MR. HANSEN: C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 24 him. 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 26 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Think in that 26 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 26 Will take more than 10 minutes? Q. The first question we have is please turn to 27 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Think in that 27 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Think in that 28 RL-17, page 17. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Lat's bave off here for 6 46-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. 7 3 A d we are off the record. 7 And we are off the record. 7 3 A think these factors are relevant to prudency review. 7 4 Q. Chay. Thank you. 7 Factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review			1	
21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 21 MR. HANSEN: Ökay. Thank you very much, 23 Except we have quite a few questions for 23 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 24 him. 23 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 24 BY MR. HANSEN: 25 2 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to 2 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 25 Q. The first question yor CENSE. It's Exhibit 2 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 3 A. Im there. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that 3 A. Im there. 4 case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway A. Im there. 3 5 through your examination. So let's leave off here for 4 A. Im there. 6 that WITC looks for in a prudency review. 7 Do you disagree with his testimony on the four 6 that WITC looks for in a prudency review? 7 A. It in the staft to chart of prudency review? 11 The time is 12:39 p.m. 7 A. It in the staft to chart of prudency review? 12 We're going to resu			1	
22 MR. HANSEN: We can do Joel Nightingale. 22 Judge. 23 Except we have quite a few questions for 23 C R O S S - E X A MINATION 24 him. 23 C R O S S - E X A MINATION 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 24 BY MR. HANSEN: 25 26 Will take more than 10 minutes? 23 C R O S S - E X A MINATION 26 Will take more than 10 minutes? 24 BY MR. HANSEN: 2 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 300 C HOWARD: All right. I think in that 27 A. I'm there. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that 3 A. I'm there. 3 A. I'm there. 4 case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway 5 5 Here Mr. Lauckhart's testimony on the four 6 4 A break was taken from 9 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) 3 A. I'm there. 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. 4 A. I'm there. 3 A. I'm there. 11 The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with 5 Here for. faactors are relevant to prudency review? 9 A. I think thes				
23 Except we have quite a few questions for 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION 24 him. 24 BY MR. HANSEN: 25 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to Page 362 1 will take more than 10 minutes? 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to 2 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that 4 A. I'm there. 4 case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway 4 Q. Okay. Thank you. 5 through your examination. So let's leave off here for 6 Hat WUTC looks for in a prudency review. 6 that we are off the record. 7 And we are off the record. 7 9 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) 9 A. I'm these factors are relevant to prudency review? 9 11:51 setside panel. And these are the 7 Me're going to resume calling witnesses with 11 The time is 12:39 p.m. 12 Q. Thank you. 12 We're going to resume calling witnesses turn to fr. tauckhart's textinony on the four factors th				
24 him. 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 24 BY MR. HANSEN: 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to 24 will take more than 10 minutes? Q. The first question we have is please turn to 26 1 will take more than 10 minutes? MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. 26 Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit 4 case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway Him there. Q. Okay. Thank you. 5 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. 6 4. Im there. Q. Okay. Thank you. 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. Page 364 11 The time is 12:39 p.m. 9 12 We're going to resume calling witnesses with Him the Energize Eastide panel. And these are the 14 witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. 16 Let's have the witnesses identify themselves Ine is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately 17 and the party they are appearing for beginning with			1	-
25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that 25 Q. The first question we have is please turn to Page 362 1 will take more than 10 minutes? Page 364 1 will take more than 10 minutes? Page 364 1 will take more than 10 minutes? Page 364 2 MR. HANSEN: I believe it will. Page 364 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that A. I'm there. 4 case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway A. I'm there. 5 through your examination. So let's leave off here for A. I'm there. 6 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. A. I'm there. 7 And we are off the record. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four 8 (A break was taken from Factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? 9 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) Do you disagree with his testimony on the four 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency review? 11 The time is 12:39 p.m. C. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of 12 Mc Koch for PSE. And lety have the witnesses tithot if the party they ar				
Page 362Page 3641will take more than 10 minutes?MR. HANSEN: I believe it will.2MR. HANSEN: I believe it will.RL-1T, page 17.3JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in thatA. Im there.4case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfwayA. Im there.5through your examination. So let's leave off here forA. Im there.4And we are off the record.C. Okay. Thank you.7And we are off the record.Do you disagree with his testimony on the four8(A break was taken fromFactors that UTC looks for in a prudency review?911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)Do you disagree with his testimony on the four10JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.Staff took, which differs slightly.11The time is 12:39 p.m.Q. Thank you.12We're going to resume calling witnesses withImed.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are thewitnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and JoelThe first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and JoelImed.The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses identify themselvesImed.Imed.15Nightingale.Imed.Imed.16Let's have the witnesses for Staff?A. I understand that that's – that's how – how18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses for Staff?A. I am not. Credentials for the review have –24Mr. Koch to we have the witnesses for Staff?A. Iam not. Credentials for the review				
1will take more than 10 minutes?1Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit2MR. HANSEN: I believe it will.3JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that3A. I'm there.3JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that3A. I'm there.3A. I'm there.4case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway4G. Okay. Thank you.Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors5through your examination. So let's leave off here for6A. I'm there.Q. Okay. Thank you.7And we are off the record.7Do you disagree with his testimony on the four8(A break was taken from911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)9911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency review?10JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency11The time is 12:39 p.m.9A. I think these factors requires a demonstration of12We're going to resume calling witnesses with11Staff took, which differs slightly.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel16Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16Iine is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with18A. I understand that that's - that's how how<	25	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do you think that	25	Q. The first question we have is please turn to
1will take more than 10 minutes?1Mr. Lauckhart's testimony for CENSE. It's Exhibit2MR. HANSEN: I believe it will.3JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that3A. I'm there.3JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that3A. I'm there.94case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway4O. Okay. Thank you.5through your examination. So let's leave off here for645-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m.7And we are off the record.7And we are off the record.78(A break was taken from911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)910JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency review?11The time is 12:39 p.m.9A. I think these factors reare relevant to prudency12We're going to resume calling witnesses with11Staff took, which differs slightly.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16Ine is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.20Mext		Page 362		Dago 364
2MR. HANSEN: I believe it will.2RL-1T, page 17.3JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that3A. I'm there.4case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway4Q. Okay. Thank you.5through your examination. So let's leave off here for645-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m.7And we are off the record.7And we are off the record.8(A break was taken from8factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review.911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency10JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.10Staff took, which differs slightly.12We're going to resume calling witnesses with1113the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16Inderstand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.20M. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,21JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have19their cameras if they have the witnesses for Staff?24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckha				
3JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I think in that3A. I'm there.4case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway4Q. Okay. Thank you.5through your examination. So let's leave off here for5Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors645-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m.7And we are off the record.77And we are off the record.7Do you disagree with his testimony on the four8(A break was taken from8factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review?911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency10JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.10reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that11The time is 12:39 p.m.10Staff took, which differs slightly.12We're going to resume calling witnesses with12Q. Thank you.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses tidentify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately19their cameras if they have not already.18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,2020MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,<				
4case, I think it would be awkward to stop halfway4Q. Okay. Thank you.5through your examination. So let's leave off here for5Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors645-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m.6that WUTC looks for in a prudency review.7And we are off the record.7Do you disagree with his testimony on the four8(A break was taken from911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)99JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.10The time is 12:39 p.m.1112We're going to resume calling witnesses with12Q. Thank you.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.10Q. Next question.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23An				
5through your examination. So let's leave off here for5Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors645-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m.7Do you disagree with his testimony on the four7And we are off the record.7Do you disagree with his testimony on the four8(A break was taken from8factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review?911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency10JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.10reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that11The time is 12:39 p.m.11Staff took, which differs slightly.12We're going to resume calling witnesses with12Q. Thank you.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget So		-	3	A. I'm there.
645-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m.6that WUTC looks for in a prudency review.7And we are off the record.7Do you disagree with his testimony on the four8(A break was taken from8factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review?911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency10JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.10reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that11The time is 12:39 p.m.9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency12We're going to resume calling witnesses with11Staff took, which differs slightly.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.21A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	4			O Oliver Themeleurer
7And we are off the record.7Do you disagree with his testimony on the four8(A break was taken from8factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review?911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency10JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.10reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that11The time is 12:39 p.m.11Staff took, which differs slightly.12We're going to resume calling witnesses with12Q. Thank you.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16Iine is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit <th></th> <td></td> <th></th> <td></td>				
8(A break was taken from8factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review?911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency10JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.10reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that11The time is 12:39 p.m.11Staff took, which differs slightly.12We're going to resume calling witnesses with12Q. Thank you.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20 Q. Next question. 21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5	through your examination. So let's leave off here for	5	Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors
911:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)9A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that11The time is 12:39 p.m.10Staff took, which differs slightly.12We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel11The first factor requires a demonstration of need.14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14The first factor requires a demonstration of need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing for beginning with their cameras if they have not already.18A. I understand that that's that's how how that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch, 2120MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch, 2221Are you an expert in load flow studies?23And do we have the witnesses for Staff? 2423And do we have the witnesses for Staff?24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m.	5 6	Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review.
10JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.10reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that11The time is 12:39 p.m.11Staff took, which differs slightly.12We're going to resume calling witnesses with12Q. Thank you.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record.	5 6 7	Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four
11The time is 12:39 p.m.11Staff took, which differs slightly.12We're going to resume calling witnesses with12Q. Thank you.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from	5 6 7 8	Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review?
12We're going to resume calling witnesses with12Q. Thank you.13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)	5 6 7 8 9	Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency
13the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the13The first factor requires a demonstration of14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.	5 6 7 8 9 10	Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that
14witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel14need.15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly.
15Nightingale.15Are you aware that the need for a transmission16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you.
16Let's have the witnesses identify themselves16line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately17and the party they are appearing for beginning with17a power flow study?18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on18A. I understand that that's that's how how19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of
 and the party they are appearing for beginning with Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on their cameras if they have not already. MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch, Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And do we have the witnesses for Staff? MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need.
18Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on their cameras if they have not already.18A. I understand that that's that's how how that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch, 2120Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy. 2221Are you an expert in load flow studies?23And do we have the witnesses for Staff? 2423A. I am not. Credentials for the review have have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission
19their cameras if they have not already.19that can be done, yes.20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. Let's have the witnesses identify themselves	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately
20MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,20Q. Next question.21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. Let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing for beginning with	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately a power flow study?
21Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.21Are you an expert in load flow studies?22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. Let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing for beginning with Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately a power flow study? A. I understand that that's that's how how
22JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.22A. I am not. Credentials for the review have23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. Let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing for beginning with Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on their cameras if they have not already.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately a power flow study? A. I understand that that's that's how how that can be done, yes.
23And do we have the witnesses for Staff?23have been my testimony.24MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf24Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. Let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing for beginning with Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on their cameras if they have not already. MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately a power flow study? A. I understand that that's that's how how that can be done, yes. Q. Next question.
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. Let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing for beginning with Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on their cameras if they have not already. MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch, Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately a power flow study? A. I understand that that's that's how how that can be done, yes. Q. Next question. Are you an expert in load flow studies?
25 of Staff. 25 RL-4. Looking at pages 20 up to 37. Here Mr. Lauckhart	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. Let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing for beginning with Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on their cameras if they have not already. MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch, Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately a power flow study? A. I understand that that's that's how how that can be done, yes. Q. Next question. Are you an expert in load flow studies? A. I am not. Credentials for the review have
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. Let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing for beginning with Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on their cameras if they have not already. MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch, Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And do we have the witnesses for Staff?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately a power flow study? A. I understand that that's that's how how that can be done, yes. Q. Next question. Are you an expert in load flow studies? A. I am not. Credentials for the review have have been my testimony.
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	through your examination. So let's leave off here for 45-minute lunch break. We will resume at 12:35 p.m. And we are off the record. (A break was taken from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. The time is 12:39 p.m. We're going to resume calling witnesses with the Energize Eastside panel. And these are the witnesses: Dan Koch, Betty Erdahl, and Joel Nightingale. Let's have the witnesses identify themselves and the party they are appearing for beginning with Mr. Koch for PSE. And let's have the witnesses turn on their cameras if they have not already. MR. KOCH: Good afternoon. I'm Dan Koch, Vice President of Operations at Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And do we have the witnesses for Staff? MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl on behalf	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Here Mr. Lauckhart identifies the four factors that WUTC looks for in a prudency review. Do you disagree with his testimony on the four factors that UTC looks for in a prudency review? A. I think these factors are relevant to prudency reviews. I outline in my testimony the approach that Staff took, which differs slightly. Q. Thank you. The first factor requires a demonstration of need. Are you aware that the need for a transmission line is demonstrated through a load flow or alternately a power flow study? A. I understand that that's that's how how that can be done, yes. Q. Next question. Are you an expert in load flow studies? A. I am not. Credentials for the review have have been my testimony. Q. Okay. Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit

31 (Pages 361 to 364)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 365	Page 367
1	testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load	1 which is what he's being asked about.
2	flow studies.	2 JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I think I
3	Do you have any reason to disagree with	3 think the trouble here is that we're asking the witness
4	Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal	4 to give his opinion on several pages that he might not
5	flaws?	5 have seen before.
6	MR. ROBERSON: Objection. There's no	6 Could you consider re-wording your question
7	foundation laid for the witness to see this testimony.	7 so we're asking about about the underlying
8	Also, it's beyond the scope of his testimony. He	8 substantive issue and CENSE's position on that and what
9	doesn't testify about what Mr. Lauckhart testified to.	⁹ the witness thinks of that, perhaps?
10	He testifies about what he testified to.	10 MR. HANSEN: Okay. I'll take a moment here
11	JUDGE HOWARD: I am going to grant the	11 if you don't mind.
12	objection.	12 JUDGE HOWARD: That's perfectly fine.
13	Mr. Hansen, would you would you I	13 You may want to mute yourself.
14	think we need to back up.	14 MR. HANSEN: Okay. I'll mute it.
15	And I recognize you're not an attorney so	15 (Pause in the proceeding.)
16	that's why I'm explaining this a little differently.	16 MR. HANSEN: Okay. I'm back. We're
17	Would you ask the witness if he's familiar	17 we're trying to understand what Mr. Nightingale thinks
18	with this exhibit?	18 is prudency and how that relates to the seven fatal
19	MR. HANSEN: I will do that.	19 flaws.
20	BY MR. HANSEN:	20 MR. ROBERSON: Objection. I don't believe
21	Q. Are you familiar with the Exhibit RL-4?	21 Mr. Nightingale testifies about the seven flaws that
22	A. I believe I've taken a look at it, yeah.	22 CENSE is identifying. A sensible flaws.
23	Q. Specifically, pages 20 to 37?	23 He can ask him about prudency. He testifies
24	A. This is the PowerPoint; is that correct?	24 to that. But he doesn't testify to the matters that
25	Q. Yes.	25 Mr. Lauckhart testifies to.
	Page 366	Page 368
1	A. And the pages again?	1 JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the
2	A. And the pages again?Q. Pages 20 through 27.	1 JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the 2 objection.
2 3	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we
2 3 4	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on
2 3 4 5	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have
2 3 4 5 6	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Next 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.16Neither you nor anyone testifying through Staff
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Next JUDGE HOWARD: Wait. Wait, Wait, 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.16Neither you nor anyone testifying through Staff17have performed a load flow study to determine if there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Next JUDGE HOWARD: Wait. Wait. Wait, Mr. Hansen. 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.16Neither you nor anyone testifying through Staff17have performed a load flow study to determine if there18is a need for Energize Eastside.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Next JUDGE HOWARD: Wait. Wait, Wait, Mr. Hansen. Mr. Roberson, did did Mr. Nightingale 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.16Neither you nor anyone testifying through Staff17have performed a load flow study to determine if there18is a need for Energize Eastside.19Why has Staff not performed a load flow study?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Next JUDGE HOWARD: Wait. Wait, Wait, Mr. Hansen. Mr. Roberson, did did Mr. Nightingale I'm not recalling all his testimony at this moment. 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.16Neither you nor anyone testifying through Staff17have performed a load flow study to determine if there18is a need for Energize Eastside.19Why has Staff not performed a load flow study?20A. I don't believe we have the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Next JUDGE HOWARD: Wait. Wait, Mr. Hansen. Mr. Roberson, did did Mr. Nightingale I'm not recalling all his testimony at this moment. Did he discuss the Energize Eastside 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.16Neither you nor anyone testifying through Staff17have performed a load flow study to determine if there18is a need for Energize Eastside.19Why has Staff not performed a load flow study?20A. I don't believe we have the the the21correct software to perform something like that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Next JUDGE HOWARD: Wait. Wait, Mr. Hansen. Mr. Roberson, did did Mr. Nightingale I'm not recalling all his testimony at this moment. Did he discuss the Energize Eastside 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.16Neither you nor anyone testifying through Staff17have performed a load flow study to determine if there18is a need for Energize Eastside.19Why has Staff not performed a load flow study?20A. I don't believe we have the the the21correct software to perform something like that.22And I guess I would also say that the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Next JUDGE HOWARD: Wait. Wait, Wait, Mr. Hansen. Mr. Roberson, did did Mr. Nightingale I'm not recalling all his testimony at this moment. Did he discuss the Energize Eastside projects? MR. ROBERSON: He did, but he submitted 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.16Neither you nor anyone testifying through Staff17have performed a load flow study to determine if there18is a need for Energize Eastside.19Why has Staff not performed a load flow study?20A. I don't believe we have the the the21correct software to perform something like that.22And I guess I would also say that the the23testimony provided by the company, you know, in our eyes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. And the pages again? Q. Pages 20 through 27. MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-seven. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Thirty-seven. A. Twenty through 37? Q. Correct. A. Okay. And I'm sorry, what was the question again? Q. Okay. Here Mr. Lauckhart testifies to seven fatal flaws in the PSE/Quanta load flow studies, do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these seven fatal flaws? MR. ROBERSON: Again, I object. This is beyond the scope of Mr. Nightingale's testimony. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Next JUDGE HOWARD: Wait. Wait, Mr. Hansen. Mr. Roberson, did did Mr. Nightingale I'm not recalling all his testimony at this moment. Did he discuss the Energize Eastside 	1JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant the2objection.3And I'll explain, Mr. Hansen, that we4can't we can't have the witness be crossed on5something that he hasn't he doesn't already have6firsthand knowledge of. And this is not his testimony.7MR. HANSEN: I understand.8JUDGE HOWARD: So I would encourage you to9pose your questions in terms of in terms of his10testimony or establish that he's familiar with something11and then ask him12MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. I will do13that.14BY MR. HANSEN:15Q. Next question here.16Neither you nor anyone testifying through Staff17have performed a load flow study to determine if there18is a need for Energize Eastside.19Why has Staff not performed a load flow study?20A. I don't believe we have the the the21correct software to perform something like that.22And I guess I would also say that the the23testimony provided by the company, you know, in our eyes

32 (Pages 365 to 368)

,	Page 369		Page 371
1	Q. Next question here.	1	serious shortcomings in PSE's analysis.
2	When did you join the UTC staff?	2	Do we have any documentation that shows the
3	A. September of 2021.	3	MaxETA/Synapse Draft Report findings were incorrect?
4	Q. Okay. Is Energize Eastside your only project?	4	MR. ROBERSON: So I'm not sure that he's
5	MR. ROBERSON: Objection. I'm not sure	5	laid a foundation to ask this witness this question.
6	that's relevant.	6	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to allow the
7	JUDGE HOWARD: Well, I'll allow it. Let's	7	question.
8	see where it's going.	8	Mr. Nightingale, you may answer.
9	MR. NIGHTINGALE: No. I work on a wide	9	MR. NIGHTINGALE: I believe this study
10	variety of things at the Commission. This is the the	10	you're referring to is DRK-12; is that right?
11	Energize Eastside was the scope of my testimony that I	11	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Nightingale, Mr. Hansen
12	gave in this case.	12	can't agree with you and answer your questions.
13	BY MR. HANSEN:	13	MR. NIGHTINGALE: Oh, I'm sorry.
14	Q. Okay. Next question. Turning back to well,	14	JUDGE HOWARD: Just for the sake of clarity.
15	here again, we've got a question regarding our expert's	15	You can you could indicate that you are
16	testimony. So so I request a moment here also.	16	saying something "subject to check" and you can correct
17	JUDGE HOWARD: Please mute yourself. Thank	17	your statement if it is mistaken within five days of
18	you.	18	receiving the transcript.
19	BY MR. HANSEN:	19	MR. NIGHTINGALE: Okay. Thank you.
20	Q. Okay. I'm just going to ask the question.	20	Norm, could you repeat the question, please?
21	Turning back to page 17 of Exhibit RL-1, one of	21	BY MR. HANSEN:
22	the four factors for the prudency review deals with the	22	Q. Yes. The fourth alternative is Demand Side
23	need to identify and study alternatives to Energize	23	alternatives, the MaxETA/Synapse Draft Report showed
24	Eastside.	24	serious shortcomings in PSE's analysis.
25	At page 27 of the Exhibit RL-1, Mr. Lauckhart	25	Do you have any documentation that shows the
	Page 370		Page 372
1	identifies three alternatives to Energize Eastside that	1	MaxETA/Synapse Draft Report findings were incorrect?
2	were not studied by PSE.	2	A. I'm sorry. I was on mute.
3	Number one: A peaker plant at the load center;	3	I think the answer to that question is: No, I
4	number two, Seattle City Light alternative; and number	4	don't have documents that show that that study was
5	three, Lake Tradition alternative.	5	incorrect.
6	Do you have any documentation that PSE studied	6	Q. Okay. Next question.
7	any of these three alternatives?	7	Under the settlement agreement on the prudency
8	A. It might take me a minute to find the exact	8	of Energize Eastside that Staff signed, Staff accepts
9	citation, but I do recall that they explored the Seattle	9	and will not challenge that PSE has met its threshold
10	City Light option as well as generation closer to the	10	prudence requirement to demonstrate that the investment
11	load center, the Lake Tradition alternative. I would	11	should be provisionally included in the rate?
12	have to look back at at some of the exhibits from	12	Is this correct?
13	witness Koch.	13	MR. ROBERSON: Objection. Mr. Nightingale
14	Q. It would be helpful if you could take a minute	14	is not the settlement witness for Staff. He was a
15	to pull up that documentation.	15	litigation witness. This is the subject of a motion in
16	MS. CARSON: Your Honor, in the interest of	16	limine.
17	time, we're willing to point to an exhibit that may be	17	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the
18	relevant.	18	question. Mr. Nightingale testified regarding this
19	JUDGE HOWARD: Let's let's let's come	19	investment and his as I recall, his recommendations
20	back to that when when when we're cross-examining	20	and his testimony are very similar to what the
21	Koch.	21	settlement eventually adopted, so I will allow it.
22	BY MR. HANSEN:	22	Mr. Hansen, you may repeat the question, if
23	Q. Okay. Next question.	23	you may.
24	The fourth alternative is demand site	24	BY MR. HANSEN:
25	alternatives the MaxETA/Synapse Draft Report showed	25	Q. Okay. I'll under the settlement agreement on

33 (Pages 369 to 372)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

,	D		D 275
	Page 373		Page 375
1	the prudency of Energize Eastside that Staff signed,	1	I'm going to allow the question. He's
2	Staff accepts and will not challenge that PSE has made	2	simply asking about whether there is a rulemaking about
3	its threshold prudence requirement to demonstrate that	3	the issue.
4	the investment should be provisionally included in	4	MR. NIGHTINGALE: I don't know.
5	rates; correct?	5	MR. HANSEN: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that.
6	A. I guess that's my understanding without	6	MR. NIGHTINGALE: I don't know.
7	having without that being my testimony. I think	7	BY MR. HANSEN:
8	that's correct.	8	Q. Okay. Thank you.
9	Q. What information or data did PSE provide you to	9	Next question. The settlement agreement
10	prove they met threshold prudency?	10	recommends that the WUTC Staff agreed that Energize
11	A. Maybe to clarify, my testimony the	11	Eastside be put in rates starting now with the refund to
12	recommendation of my testimony left the prudence	12	be made if a future proper prudency hearing at the WUTC
13	determination for a later date. If if there's a	13	finds that some or all of Energize Eastside is not
14	difference between that and the settlement testimony, I	14	prudent and that a refund can then be made to customers
15	think I was not I did not testify in support of	15	to remedy the problem.
16	settlement, and I don't know if I'm able to answer that.	16	Is this correct?
17	Q. You've already stated that you aren't an expert	17	MR. ROBERSON: Objection. This is beyond
18	in transmission planning or load flow studies.	18	the scope of his testimony.
19	Are you qualified to evaluate the reports PSE	19	JUDGE HOWARD: I am going to grant the
20	provided?	20	objection. It does seem that Mr. Nightingale is is
21	A. I think so.	21	not closely familiar with the settlement details.
22	Q. Have you have you or anyone on staff defined	22	I think, Mr. Hansen, if we revisit whether
23	what is threshold prudence requirement?	23	CENSE wishes to cross Ms. Erdahl and pose some of these
24	A. The citations in my testimony call to to the	24	questions to Ms. Erdahl, that might be more clear.
25	use the Commission's "used and useful" policy	25	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Let me take a moment
	Page 374		Page 376
1		1	
1	statement, that's where we drew from for most of that		here, please.
2 3	language.	2	We can take questions, Your Honor, from Betty Erdahl. We do have some questions.
4	Q. What are the criteria for threshold prudency?A. I'll refer you to the "used and useful" policy	4	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Before we move on
5	statement which outlines it in more depth than I	5	from Mr. Nightingale before we move on from your
6	probably can right here.	6	questioning of Mr. Nightingale, I did want to ask, do we
7	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, it may be more	7	have CENSE's proposed cross exhibit JBN-9X, which is the
8	helpful if we pose the last two questions you were	8	same underlying exhibit as DRK-29X?
9	asking to Ms. Erdahl as I think that that would be a	9	Did you wish to move JBN-9X into evidence or
10	a topic properly within the scope of testimony she has	10	discuss this with Mr. Nightingale? Or shall I cross
11	offered on behalf of the Staff.	11	this off of Mr. Nightingale's portion of the list?
12	MR. HANSEN: Okay.	12	MR. HANSEN: Yes. We do have more questions
13	BY MR. HANSEN:	13	for Mr. Nightingale right now.
14	Q. I have one more question, I don't know if	14	And I'll have to take a moment here to
15	it's but I'll ask it anyway.	15	decide on the next questions. There's just a few more
16	Has there been rulemaking on the procedure	16	for Mr. Nightingale.
17	regarding threshold prudence?	17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
18	MR. ROBERSON: Objection. This seems like	18	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you.
19	it is beyond the scope of his testimony.	19	BY MR. HANSEN:
20	MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you.	20	Q. Next question.
21	Next question.	21	Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony,
22	JUDGE HOWARD: Wait.	22	Exhibit 35T starting at line 9.
23	MR. HANSEN: Sorry.	23	This testimony refers to data requests that
24	JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. I know it is not	24	CENSE made to you regarding PSE's annual transmission
25	something you do every day; this type of procedure.	25	assessments.

34 (Pages 373 to 376)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 377		Page 379
1	Your answer makes it clear that you did not get	1	Mr. Nightingale for a while. I would encourage you to
2	a full copy of any of the PSE annual transmission	2	wrap up.
3	assessments.	3	And if you do wish to move JBN-9X into
4	Is this correct?	4	evidence with this witness, that we do that before we
5	A. The TPL assessment that we that we got were	5	move on.
6	excerpts. That's true.	6	MR. HANSEN: Okay. I would like to take a
7	Q. Next question.	7	moment.
8	Do you have any do you have documentation	8	Judge Howard, in the interest of time, we
9	that PSE's NERC required annual transmission planning	9	won't ask more questions, but we would like to put
10	assessments examined the need for Energize Eastside?	10	his this into the record.
11	A. Could you repeat that?	11	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Because
12	Q. Yes.	12	because you're not an attorney, I will ask
13	Do you have any documentation that PSE's NERC	13	Mr. Nightingale.
14	required annual transmission planning assessments	14	Mr. Nightingale, do you have JBN-9X
15	examined the need for Energize Eastside?	15	available to you?
16	A. Those assessments, as I understand it, are	16	MR. NIGHTINGALE: I believe I have it saved
17	they do establish that their transmission infrastructure	17	under the "DRK" numbering system. Is that I think
18	concerns in that area, the Eastside area.	18	that's the same document. But what is the DRK number so
19	Q. Is this something beyond the experts excerpts	19	I can pull it up?
20	from the TPL that are included in your pre-filed	20	JUDGE HOWARD: It's DRK-29X, Staff responses
21	testimony?	21	to CENSE data requests. It's the same document.
22	A. Could you repeat that, sorry?	22	MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes, I have it.
23	Q. Sure.	23	Did you have a question on it or did you
24	Is this something beyond the excerpts from the	24	just want to verify?
25	TPL that are included in your pre-filed testimony?	25	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, because Mr. Hansen is
	Page 378		Page 380
1	A. I'm not sure I understand the question.	1	not an attorney, I'm just clarifying and and doing
2	Q. Okay. I'll re-address the question.	2	this in the interest of clarifying the record.
3	Do you have documentation that PSE's NERC	3	Are you familiar with this document?
4	required annual transmission planning assessments	4	MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes.
5	examine the need for Energize Eastside?	5	JUDGE HOWARD: What is it?
б	A. Yeah, I believe they they do speak to the	6	MR. NIGHTINGALE: It's UTC Staffs' response
7	need for or a deficiency of the transmission	7	to CENSE's data request.
	infrastructure in that area, yes.		-
8		8	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an
9	Q. Okay.	9	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with?
9 10	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you	9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so.
9 10 11	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents.	9 10 11	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from
9 10 11 12	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is	9 10 11 12	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X
9 10 11 12 13	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed.	9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence?
9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay.	9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an opportunity to to cross-examine.	9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It is admitted.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It is admitted. (Exhibit JBN-9X was admitted.)
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an opportunity to to cross-examine. MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It is admitted. (Exhibit JBN-9X was admitted.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Hansen, did
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an opportunity to to cross-examine. MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question. BY MR. HANSEN:	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It is admitted. (Exhibit JBN-9X was admitted.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Hansen, did that conclude your examination of Mr. Nightingale?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an opportunity to to cross-examine. MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Can you provide the documents? 	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It is admitted. (Exhibit JBN-9X was admitted.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Hansen, did
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an opportunity to to cross-examine. MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Can you provide the documents? JUDGE HOWARD: That is the same 	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It is admitted. (Exhibit JBN-9X was admitted.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Hansen, did that conclude your examination of Mr. Nightingale? MR. HANSEN: Yes. Thank you very much.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an opportunity to to cross-examine. MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question. BY MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Can you provide the documents? JUDGE HOWARD: That is the same MR. HANSEN: Same question. Okay. 	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It is admitted. (Exhibit JBN-9X was admitted.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Hansen, did that conclude your examination of Mr. Nightingale? MR. HANSEN: Yes. Thank you very much. That concludes our examination of
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an opportunity to to cross-examine. MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question. BY MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Can you provide the documents? JUDGE HOWARD: That is the same MR. HANSEN: Same question. Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: Same problem there. 	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It is admitted. (Exhibit JBN-9X was admitted.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Hansen, did that conclude your examination of Mr. Nightingale? MR. HANSEN: Yes. Thank you very much. That concludes our examination of Mr. Nightingale. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any redirect of Mr. Nightingale?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Okay. MR. HANSEN: We would like to have you provide those documents. JUDGE HOWARD: Well, Mr. Hansen, this is discovery has been closed. MR. HANSEN: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: And this is just just an opportunity to to cross-examine. MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question. BY MR. HANSEN: Let me rephrase that question. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Can you provide the documents? JUDGE HOWARD: That is the same MR. HANSEN: Same question. Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: Same problem there. MR. HANSEN: All right. 	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: Does this appear to be an accurate copy of what you're familiar with? MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yeah, I believe so. JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from the parties to CENSE's request to put Exhibit JBN-9X into evidence? MR. ROBERSON: None from staff. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. It is admitted. (Exhibit JBN-9X was admitted.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Hansen, did that conclude your examination of Mr. Nightingale? MR. HANSEN: Yes. Thank you very much. That concludes our examination of Mr. Nightingale. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any

35 (Pages 377 to 380)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

· · · ·	Page 381	Page 383
1	Howard.	1 closely, so.
2	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Hansen, do	2 Q. Okay. Thank you.
3	you wish to cross you do not have to cross	3 The settlement agreement recommends that the
4	Ms. Erdahl. But that was my suggestion to you for the	4 WUTC Staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates
5	sake of expediency and clarity that we pose those	5 starting now with the refund to be made if a future
6		 starting now with the related to be made if a future proper prudency hearing at the WUTC finds that some or
0 7	questions to Ms. Erdahl.	 all of Energize Eastside is not prudent and that a
	Would you rather cross her or Mr. Koch at	 refund can then be made to customers to remedy the
8	this point?	
9	MR. HANSEN: We would like to cross-examine	9 problem; correct?
10	her.	10 A. That is true. Similar to other projects. This
11	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Erdahl, would	11 is not unique to the settlement.
12	you turn on your camera, if you haven't already.	12 Q. This invented threshold prudency requirement has
13	All right. Mr. Hansen, you may proceed.	13 no plan or mechanism to remedy any safety environmental
14	MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Judge.	14 or other societal costs or impacts created by Energize
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION	15 Eastside; correct?
16	BY MR. HANSEN:	16 A. I don't I don't necessarily agree with that.
17	Q. Have you or anyone on staff defined what is a	17 I think once we at the end of the rate year,
18	threshold prudence requirement?	18 when we're determining whether the rates are reasonable
19	A. My understanding is that a threshold prudence	19 or not, costs will be looked at. And how those costs
20	to determine threshold prudence is when you consider	20 are determined or decided to be incurred, I believe that
21	allowing costs into rates provisionally subject to	21 that can be looked at at that point in time.
22	refund.	22 Q. Next question.
23	And it's when we're looking at the company's	23 It is your opinion that the Commissioners should
24	decision of whether to incur those costs or not. We're	24 not be concerned about these matters?
25	not actually looking at the cost yet. That happens	A. I disagree with that. I believe we will be
	Page 382	Page 384
1	later when we determine the full prudence.	1 looking at the prudence of the costs at the end of the
2	Q. Okay. What are the criteria?	2 first rate year and a determination will be made at that
3	What are the criteria for the threshold	³ time.
4	prudency?	4 Q. Our concern is if it's determined it's not
5	A. Demonstration of a need, cost benefit analysis,	5 prudent, will will they require removal of the
6	evaluation of alternatives, project risk uncertainty,	6 transmission line?
7	and the Board of Directors' knowledge and	A. I'm not sure if I should speak to that. I
8	decision-making.	8 don't I'm not sure the Commission can do that
9	However, I just want to put out there that Staff	9 regardless of what the decision is made.
10	didn't necessarily accept prudence, the threshold	10 Q. Next question.
10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	prudence determination based on that.	11 Please turn to Mr. Lauckhart's testimony,
11	prudence determination based on that. The settlement is taken as a whole. There's	
11 12	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's	12 Exhibit 35T starting on line 9.
11 12 13	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept	 Exhibit 35T starting on line 9. A. It's going take me a minute.
11 12 13 14	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for	 Exhibit 35T starting on line 9. A. It's going take me a minute. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that
11 12 13 14 15	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into	 12 Exhibit 35T starting on line 9. 13 A. It's going take me a minute. 14 JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that 15 page again?
11 12 13 14 15 16	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we	 Exhibit 35T starting on line 9. A. It's going take me a minute. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that page again? MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we would then determine the prudence of costs.	 12 Exhibit 35T starting on line 9. 13 A. It's going take me a minute. 14 JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that 15 page again? 16 MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T. 17 JUDGE HOWARD: Line 9 on which page?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we would then determine the prudence of costs. So we get another bite out of the apple. We're	 Exhibit 35T starting on line 9. A. It's going take me a minute. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that page again? MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T. JUDGE HOWARD: Line 9 on which page? MR. HANSEN: It doesn't say the page.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we would then determine the prudence of costs. So we get another bite out of the apple. We're not done.	 12 Exhibit 35T starting on line 9. 13 A. It's going take me a minute. 14 JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that 15 page again? 16 MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T. 17 JUDGE HOWARD: Line 9 on which page? 18 MR. HANSEN: It doesn't say the page. 19 One moment, I'll check that.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we would then determine the prudence of costs. So we get another bite out of the apple. We're not done. Q. Okay. Thank you.	12Exhibit 35T starting on line 9.13A. It's going take me a minute.14JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that15page again?16MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T.17JUDGE HOWARD: Line 9 on which page?18MR. HANSEN: It doesn't say the page.19One moment, I'll check that.20MS. ERDAHL: Could you start with the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we would then determine the prudence of costs. So we get another bite out of the apple. We're not done. Q. Okay. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure	12Exhibit 35T starting on line 9.13A. It's going take me a minute.14JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that15page again?16MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T.17JUDGE HOWARD: Line 9 on which page?18MR. HANSEN: It doesn't say the page.19One moment, I'll check that.20MS. ERDAHL: Could you start with the21exhibit number one more time?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we would then determine the prudence of costs. So we get another bite out of the apple. We're not done. Q. Okay. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence?	12Exhibit 35T starting on line 9.13A. It's going take me a minute.14JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that15page again?16MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T.17JUDGE HOWARD: Line 9 on which page?18MR. HANSEN: It doesn't say the page.19One moment, I'll check that.20MR. HANSEN: I could you start with the21MR. HANSEN: I'm sorry. I had it on mute.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we would then determine the prudence of costs. So we get another bite out of the apple. We're not done. Q. Okay. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence? A. This is coming from "used and useful" policy	12Exhibit 35T starting on line 9.13A. It's going take me a minute.14JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that15page again?16MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T.17JUDGE HOWARD: Line 9 on which page?18MR. HANSEN: It doesn't say the page.19One moment, I'll check that.20MS. ERDAHL: Could you start with the21exhibit number one more time?22MR. HANSEN: I'm sorry. I had it on mute.23Could you please repeat?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we would then determine the prudence of costs. So we get another bite out of the apple. We're not done. Q. Okay. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence? A. This is coming from "used and useful" policy statement. And that was a process that occurred I	12Exhibit 35T starting on line 9.13A. It's going take me a minute.14JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that15page again?16MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T.17JUDGE HOWARD: Line 9 on which page?18MR. HANSEN: It doesn't say the page.19One moment, I'll check that.20MS. ERDAHL: Could you start with the21exhibit number one more time?22MR. HANSEN: I'm sorry. I had it on mute.23Could you please repeat?24MS. ERDAHL: Could you just give the full
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The settlement is taken as a whole. There's give and take. And so staff was willing to accept prudence on threshold prudence on the decision for Energize Eastside knowing that the cost would go into rates provisionally and at the end of the rate year we would then determine the prudence of costs. So we get another bite out of the apple. We're not done. Q. Okay. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence? A. This is coming from "used and useful" policy	12Exhibit 35T starting on line 9.13A. It's going take me a minute.14JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, can I get that15page again?16MR. HANSEN: It's line 9 of Exhibit 35T.17JUDGE HOWARD: Line 9 on which page?18MR. HANSEN: It doesn't say the page.19One moment, I'll check that.20MS. ERDAHL: Could you start with the21exhibit number one more time?22MR. HANSEN: I'm sorry. I had it on mute.23Could you please repeat?

36 (Pages 381 to 384)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 385	Page 387
1	MR. HANSEN: Yes, Exhibit 35T. And we're	1 testimony. I think it's those are some of the
2	looking for the page number, but it starts at line 9.	2 factors that are used to determine prudence under a
3	And so we should have that shortly.	3 multiyear rate plan design. There are other factors
4	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. That's RL I	4 such as "used and useful" policy that are used to
5	understand that to be RL-35T.	5 determine prudence.
6	MR. HANSEN: Correct. I'm sorry. We	6 Q. The first factor requires a demonstration of
7	don't we can't find it.	7 need.
8	Well, that completes our questioning then,	8 The need for a transmission line is demonstrated
9	Judge Howard. Thank you very much.	⁹ through a load flow, also known as Power Flow Study;
10	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any redirect for	10 correct?
11	Ms. Erdahl?	11 A. It's one of the tools that is used to determine
12	MR. ROBERSON: Just one kind of brief topic.	12 whether or not a transmission line upgrade is needed.
13	REDIRECTEXAMINATION	13 Q. Okay. The next question references Exhibit
14	BY MR. ROBERSON:	14 RL-4, pages 20 through 37.
15	Q. So, Ms. Erdahl, does the Commission issue land	15 Do you have that available?
16	use permits that would look at the type of environmental	16 A. Yes, I have RL-4. It does not have page numbers
17	safety concerns that CENSE is asking you about?	17 on it, so could you direct me to the page?
18	A. No, it does not.	18 Q. Well, this is where yeah. This is where
19	MR. ROBERSON: Thank you.	19 Mr. Lauckhart identifies seven fatal flaws in the
20	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Hansen, I	20 PSE/Quanta load flow studies.
21	believe your next witness would be Dan Koch for PSE.	21 The first
22	I'm going to note here, before we begin, PSE	A. What page would that be?
23	objected to a majority of CENSE's cross-exhibits for	23 Q. It's slide number 20.
24	Koch with the exception of what was filed DRK-29X and is now marked as DRK 30X related to Lauckhart's CEII	A. Go ahead. Do you have a question regarding
25	now marked as DRK 30X related to Lauckhart's CEI	25 this?
	Page 386	Page 388
1		Page 388
1	requests.	1 Q. We have some more information. The first fatal
2	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire
2 3	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.
2 3 4	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different	 Q. We have some more information. The first fatal flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire generators. The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed
2 3	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That
2 3 4 5	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.
2 3 4 5 6	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer
2 3 4 5 6 7	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions.	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that.	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed.	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you.	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN:	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The four factors that WUTC will look for in a prudency review of Energize Eastside are: Number one, the demonstration of need; two, the identification and	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans16raised by CENSE's own witness that this is not a17question; this is testifying into the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The four factors that WUTC will look for in a prudency review of Energize Eastside are: Number one, the demonstration of need; two, the identification and analysis of alternatives; number three, adequate	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans16raised by CENSE's own witness that this is not a17question; this is testifying into the record.18MR. HANSEN: That is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The four factors that WUTC will look for in a prudency review of Energize Eastside are: Number one, the demonstration of need; two, the identification and analysis of alternatives; number three, adequate communication with the Board of Directors; four,	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans16raised by CENSE's own witness that this is not a17Question; this is testifying into the record.18MR. HANSEN: That is.19One moment, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The four factors that WUTC will look for in a prudency review of Energize Eastside are: Number one, the demonstration of need; two, the identification and analysis of alternatives; number three, adequate communication with the Board of Directors; four, adequate documentation of decisions.	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans16raised by CENSE's own witness that this is not a17Question; this is testifying into the record.18MR. HANSEN: That is.19One moment, please.20I'll just rephrase that as a question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The four factors that WUTC will look for in a prudency review of Energize Eastside are: Number one, the demonstration of need; two, the identification and analysis of alternatives; number three, adequate communication with the Board of Directors; four, adequate documentation of decisions. Correct?	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans16raised by CENSE's own witness that this is not a17question; this is testifying into the record.18MR. HANSEN: That is.19One moment, please.20I'll just rephrase that as a question.21BY MR. HANSEN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The four factors that WUTC will look for in a prudency review of Energize Eastside are: Number one, the demonstration of need; two, the identification and analysis of alternatives; number three, adequate communication with the Board of Directors; four, adequate documentation of decisions. Correct? A. Is that a question for me?	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans16raised by CENSE's own witness that this is not a17question; this is testifying into the record.18MR. HANSEN: That is.19One moment, please.20I'll just rephrase that as a question.21BY MR. HANSEN:22Q. Do you have any documents that that shows the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The four factors that WUTC will look for in a prudency review of Energize Eastside are: Number one, the demonstration of need; two, the identification and analysis of alternatives; number three, adequate communication with the Board of Directors; four, adequate documentation of decisions. Correct? A. Is that a question for me? Q. Yes. Thank you.	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans16raised by CENSE's own witness that this is not a17Question; this is testifying into the record.18MR. HANSEN: That is.19One moment, please.20I'll just rephrase that as a question.21BY MR. HANSEN:22Q. Do you have any documents that that shows the23results from these fatal flaws?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MR. HANSEN: A. The four factors that WUTC will look for in a prudency review of Energize Eastside are: Number one, the demonstration of need; two, the identification and analysis of alternatives; number three, adequate communication with the Board of Directors; four, adequate documentation of decisions. Correct? A. Is that a question for me? Q. Yes. Thank you. A. Well, I think Staff witnessed Erdahl and 	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans16raised by CENSE's own witness that this is not a17Question; this is testifying into the record.18MR. HANSEN: That is.19One moment, please.20I'll just rephrase that as a question.21BY MR. HANSEN:22Q. Do you have any documents that that shows the23results from these fatal flaws?24MS. CARSON: I'm going to object to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	requests. So, Mr. Hansen, I would we've already touched on this issue in your earlier witness examinations. But as we come to these different exhibits that have been disputed, I would ask that you see if the witness is familiar with the exhibit and has some knowledge of it and then move into evidence and then ask your questions. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I will do that. JUDGE HOWARD: So with that, you may proceed. MR. HANSEN: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HANSEN: Q. The four factors that WUTC will look for in a prudency review of Energize Eastside are: Number one, the demonstration of need; two, the identification and analysis of alternatives; number three, adequate communication with the Board of Directors; four, adequate documentation of decisions. Correct? A. Is that a question for me? Q. Yes. Thank you.	1Q. We have some more information. The first fatal2flaw is the shutting down of six natural gas fire3generators.4The second fatal flaw was assuming BPA proposed5I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would be built. That6project was canceled in 2017.7Not allowing nearby 230/115 transformer8MS. CARSON: Objection, Your Honor. This9sounds like testimony10JUDGE HOWARD: I'm I'm going to grant11that objection.12Mr. Hansen, I understand sometimes we have13to preface what we're saying with with some14orientation for the witness, but but I am concerned15that if we're reading this list of different plans16raised by CENSE's own witness that this is not a17Question; this is testifying into the record.18MR. HANSEN: That is.19One moment, please.20I'll just rephrase that as a question.21BY MR. HANSEN:22Q. Do you have any documents that that shows the23results from these fatal flaws?

37 (Pages 385 to 388)

	Page 389		Page 391
1	JUDGE HOWARD: I think, Mr. Hansen, would it	1	MR. HANSEN: We're going to pull up the
2	be possible to focus the question?	2	date. One moment, please.
3	Because in the studies, as far as I'm aware,	3	I think the initial report was probably in
4	the present state of the record, we're talking about	4	2016. But perhaps it wasn't published until 2017.
5	hundreds and hundreds of pages related to some of these	5	We're checking.
6	topics of evidence. Perhaps we can narrow	6	(Off-record discussion.)
7	MR. HANSEN: One moment, please.	7	MR. HANSEN: Do you have do you have the
8	(Reporter noted microphone disruption)	8	report there, perhaps you can confirm the date.
9	JUDGE HOWARD: I do notice that as well.	9	MR. KOCH: I have a report marked RL-5,
10	MR. HANSEN: It's not what I'm doing.	10	which is dated February 18, 2016.
11	Anyway.	11	JUDGE HOWARD: And, Mr. Hansen, I would be
12	BY MR. HANSEN:	12	careful that when you do confer with your colleague,
13	Q. I guess the question is, Mr. Koch, is that do	13	that you do mute yourself, because otherwise the court
14	you have any documentation do you have any reason to	14	reporter may have to try to listen to that and add it
15	disagree with Mr. Lauckhart's identification of these	15	into the record.
16	seven fatal flaws?	16	MR. HANSEN: All right. Okay.
17	A. Yes, I do. I I've seen these presented	17	So that's what the report said, whether it
18	previously during a CUP hearing for the City of	18	is 2016 or '17.
19	Newcastle, and they were they were rejected by the	19	BY MR. HANSEN:
20	hearing examiner in that case.	20	Q. At any time since 2017, did PSE run a load flow
21	Furthermore, PSE has provided ample studies and	21	study correcting these fatal flaws?
22	reports demonstrating how the need was determined for	22	A. Okay. PSE runs studies annually. And as I
23	Energize Eastside. And those are contained in my	23	stated earlier, I don't agree with the fatal flaws that
24	pre-filed testimony 1T.	24	have been referenced.
25	So I absolutely take issue with with these	25	But if he has run load flow studies and
	Page 390		Page 392
1	purported fatal flaws.	1	submitted through our annual transmission planning
2	Q. So this is your documentation; correct?		
	-	2	process with NERC, those those studies.
3	A. I'm not understanding that question.	3	Q. Next question.
4	Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing	3 4	Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to
4 5	Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner.	3 4 5	Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct?
4 5 6	Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So	3 4 5 6	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again,
4 5 6 7	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents 	3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony
4 5 7 8	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing 	3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside.
4 5 7 8 9	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant
4 5 7 8 9 10	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? This was the Lauckhart-Schiffman study 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct? MS. CARSON: Object to the form of the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? This was the Lauckhart-Schiffman study correcting these fatal flaws or incorrect assumptions 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct? MS. CARSON: Object to the form of the question. Compound. Ambiguous.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? This was the Lauckhart-Schiffman study correcting these fatal flaws or incorrect assumptions and found there was no need for Energize Eastside? 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct? MS. CARSON: Object to the form of the question. Compound. Ambiguous. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? This was the Lauckhart-Schiffman study correcting these fatal flaws or incorrect assumptions and found there was no need for Energize Eastside? A. Are you referring to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct? MS. CARSON: Object to the form of the question. Compound. Ambiguous. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that. Maybe, Mr. Hansen, could you you had two
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? This was the Lauckhart-Schiffman study correcting these fatal flaws or incorrect assumptions and found there was no need for Energize Eastside? A. Are you referring to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-5? 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct? MS. CARSON: Object to the form of the question. Compound. Ambiguous. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that. Maybe, Mr. Hansen, could you you had two questions there, essentially. Could you maybe pose the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? This was the Lauckhart-Schiffman study correcting these fatal flaws or incorrect assumptions and found there was no need for Energize Eastside? A. Are you referring to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-5? Q. Yes. Correct. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct? MS. CARSON: Object to the form of the question. Compound. Ambiguous. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that. Maybe, Mr. Hansen, could you you had two questions there, essentially. Could you maybe pose the first one and then we'll see what the witness says and
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? This was the Lauckhart-Schiffman study correcting these fatal flaws or incorrect assumptions and found there was no need for Energize Eastside? A. Are you referring to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-5? Q. Yes. Correct. A. Just for the record, you stated that was 2017. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct? MS. CARSON: Object to the form of the question. Compound. Ambiguous. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that. Maybe, Mr. Hansen, could you you had two questions there, essentially. Could you maybe pose the first one and then we'll see what the witness says and then pose the second question?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? This was the Lauckhart-Schiffman study correcting these fatal flaws or incorrect assumptions and found there was no need for Energize Eastside? A. Are you referring to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-5? Q. Yes. Correct. A. Just for the record, you stated that was 2017. I show that as being reported in 2016. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct? MS. CARSON: Object to the form of the question. Compound. Ambiguous. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that. Maybe, Mr. Hansen, could you you had two questions there, essentially. Could you maybe pose the first one and then we'll see what the witness says and then pose the second question? MR. HANSEN: Okay. I will do that, Judge.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Well, you referenced the Newcastle hearing examiner. So MS. CARSON: Objection. That misrepresents Mr. Koch's response. It was not just Newcastle Hearing Examiner's decision. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant it. I did not understand that to be the entirety of of what Mr. Koch may have been referring to. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. One moment, please. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lauckhart ran load flow studies in 2017? This was the Lauckhart-Schiffman study correcting these fatal flaws or incorrect assumptions and found there was no need for Energize Eastside? A. Are you referring to Mr. Lauckhart's Exhibit RL-5? Q. Yes. Correct. A. Just for the record, you stated that was 2017. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Next question. You relied on the studies done by use to establish need for Energize Eastside; correct? A. No, that's incorrect. PSE relied upon, again, all of the exhibits that are in my pre-filed testimony to establish the need for Energize Eastside. The use report that was produced by a consultant hired by the City of Bellevue is included as an exhibit to to confirm the analysis and the work that was done by PSE. Q. Next question. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part and Stantec didn't run a load flow study; correct? MS. CARSON: Object to the form of the question. Compound. Ambiguous. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant that. Maybe, Mr. Hansen, could you you had two questions there, essentially. Could you maybe pose the first one and then we'll see what the witness says and then pose the second question?

38 (Pages 389 to 392)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 393		Page 395
1	Q. Did you rely on the Stantec report to establish	1	starting in 2008; correct?
2	the need for Energize Eastside in full or in part?		A. Could you repeat that question?
3	A. No. PSE relied on the work that PSE performed	3	And what testimony are you referring to?
4	itself and/or contracted personally.	4	Q. I will.
5	The Stantec analysis and memo provided to the	5	It's true that the MaxETA/Synapse report stated
6	partner cities as part of the EIS was contracted for by	6	that PSE found a summer bulk electric system
7	the partner cities involved in the Environmental Impact	7	vulnerability in King County starting in 2008; correct?
8	Statement.	8	A. I can't speak to how they characterized that.
9	Q. Next question.	9	What I can speak to is that and it's in my
10	MR. HANSEN: Okay. One moment.	10	pre-filed testimony is that PSE began to identify a
11	(Off-record discussion.)	11	transmission deficiency as early as 2008 and confirmed
12	BY MR. HANSEN:	12	that during our transmission planning assessment
13	Q. Did Stantec run a load flow study?	13	beginning in 2009. And that has been confirmed for both
14	A. I don't believe that Stantec ran a load flow	14	summer and winter each of the following years, up until
15	study.	15	most recently.
16	Q. Thank you. Next question.	16	Furthermore, and what's most important, is that
17	Did you rely on the MaxETA/Synapse report to	17	the need for Energize Eastside has been exceeded five
18	establish need for Energize Eastside in full or in part?	18	out of the six past summers.
19	A. No. My answer is the same as before. The	19	So this is not a question of whether or not the
20	MaxETA/Synapse analysis was contracted for by the City	20	project was planned appropriately. We we're at that
21	of Newcastle to have an independent analysis of the need	21	point now.
22	for Energize Eastside. And in that process, the City of	22	Q. Next question.
23	Newcastle's Hearing Examiner determined that there	23	PSE has not reported the summer bulk electrical
24	was that PSE had established a need under their code	24	system vulnerability in King County to NERC; correct?
25	requirements and issued a permit for the project.	25	A. All of our transmission planning assessments
25			
	Page 394		Page 396
1	Q. MaxETA/Synapse didn't run a load flow study that	1	have been submitted to to NERC through through
2	corrected Mr. Lauckhart's seven fatal flaws; correct?	2	the through WECC.
3	A. I can't speak to what MaxETA/Synapse did in	3	Q. Do you have any evidence that this documentation
4	their load flow studies.	4	is available?
5	They used the WECC Base Case, as any expert	5	A. Could you clarify the question? Available to
6	transmission planner would utilize to evaluate the need	6	whom?
7	and incorporated reasonable assumptions and reasonable	7	Q. Available to WECC?
8	scenarios and contingencies to come up with their own	8	A. As I've stated, PSE has submitted our
9	conclusions.	9	transmission planning assessments annually to WECC.
10	And, again, their conclusion was there was a	10	We've also provided excerpts of those
11	need for the Energize Eastside Project.	11	transmission planning assessments to a data request by
12	Q. Okay. Is it true that the MaxETA/Synapse report	12	UTC Staff, and they are included in Staff witness Joel
13	found no winter load need for Energize Eastside;	13	Nightingale's testimony as an exhibit.
14	correct?	14	Q. Next question.
15	A. While it's true that they, in their analysis,	15	PSE has not reported the summer bulk electric
16	could not determine a specific need within the planning	16	system vulnerability in King County to FERC; correct?
17	horizon based on the the load forecast that they were	17	A. Not directly to FERC. We submitted our
18	utilizing at that time, they did find that the summer	18	transmission planning assessments. We produce those and
19	need was present and, in fact, that the forecast for	19	submit those to WECC. And in those, they include any
20	summer had been exceeded in the prior years.	20	corrective action plans that are necessary to maintain
21	At that time, it would have been four out of	21	the system integrity.
22	five years during the summer.	22	MR. HANSEN: One moment.
23	Q. Okay. Thank you. It's true that the	23	BY MR. HANSEN:
24	MaxETA/Synapse report stated that PSE found a summer	24	Q. Next question. PSE has not reported the summer
25	bulk electrical system vulnerability in King County	25	bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to

39 (Pages 393 to 396)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 397	Page 399
1	NorthernGrid; correct?	1 number of the exhibit.
2	A. Not that I'm aware of.	2 JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, is this the email
3	Q. Next question.	3 from someone named "Paul White"?
4	PSE has not reported the summer bulk electric	4 MR. HANSEN: We found it. It's DRK-35X.
5	system vulnerability in King County to RC West; correct?	5 MS. CARSON: Your Honor, this is one of the
6	A. I'm not aware.	6 exhibits that PSE objected to.
7	Q. Next question.	7 JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, I suggest we
8	A. We do we do share our annual transmission	8 ask we start by asking the witness if he's familiar
9	assessments with neighboring and regional planning	9 with this and if he knows what this exhibit is.
10	authorities. But I can't speak specifically to whether	10 BY MR. HANSEN:
11	those have been provided to those entities.	11 Q. So, Mr. Koch, are you familiar with this? With
12	Q. Next question.	12 the exhibit?
13	PSE has not reported the summer bulk electric	13A. I'm familiar of that it is an exhibit. I
14	system vulnerability in King County to Bonneville Power	14 received the exhibit list on Friday. So I've seen that
15	Administration; correct?	15 it is an exhibit. But I'm not personally familiar with
16	A. I believe as as a neighboring utility, we do	16 the communications between Mr. White and Mr. Lauckhart.
17	share our transmission planning assessments with BPA,	17JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, if the witness is
18	with Seattle City Light, with Snohomish PUD, and other	18 not familiar with these communications and it's between
19	neighboring entities, because all of the transmission	19 two other individuals, I'm I'm hesitant to allow
20	planning assessments that each entity does affects one	20 further cross on this exhibit because it is outside his
21	another, so I believe we do.	21 personal knowledge.
22	Q. Page 5.	22 MR. HANSEN: Okay. I understand that.
23	One moment, please.	23 JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to grant PSE's
24	Okay. Next question.	24 objection to DRK-35X and this particular exhibit is
25	PSE has not reported or discussed the summer	25 rejected.
	Page 398	Page 400
1	Page 398 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to	Page 400 1 BY MR. HANSEN:
1 2		
	bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to	1 BY MR. HANSEN:
2	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. 	1 BY MR. HANSEN: 2 Q. Next question.
2 3	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct?
2 3 4 5 6	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files
2 3 4 5 6 7	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEII team, describing several problems he found with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEII team, describing several problems he found with the PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEII team, describing several problems he found with the PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received a response; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEII team, describing several problems he found with the PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received a response; correct? A. I'm not familiar with any communication received
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEII team, describing several problems he found with the PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received a response; correct? A. I'm not familiar with any communication received by or from Mr. Lauckhart.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEll team, describing several problems he found with the PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received a response; correct? A. I'm not familiar with any communication received by or from Mr. Lauckhart. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of Newcastle the week before last that OPL has the final 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEll team, describing several problems he found with the PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received a response; correct? A. I'm not familiar with any communication received by or from Mr. Lauckhart. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. BY MR. HANSEN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of Newcastle the week before last that OPL has the final design for Energize Eastside. 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEll team, describing several problems he found with the PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received a response; correct? A. I'm not familiar with any communication received by or from Mr. Lauckhart. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Next question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of Newcastle the week before last that OPL has the final design for Energize Eastside. Q. Thank you. 	 BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Next question. You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; correct? A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEII team, describing several problems he found with the PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received a response; correct? A. I'm not familiar with any communication received by or from Mr. Lauckhart. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. BY MR. HANSEN: Q. Okay. Next question. You are aware that the parties to the settlement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of Newcastle the week before last that OPL has the final design for Energize Eastside. Q. Thank you. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. 	1 BY MR. HANSEN: 2 Q. Next question. 3 You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the 4 load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; 5 correct? 6 A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files 7 were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. 8 Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these 9 files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEII 10 team, describing several problems he found with the 11 PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received 12 a response; correct? 13 A. I'm not familiar with any communication received 14 by or from Mr. Lauckhart. 15 MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. 16 BY MR. HANSEN: 17 Q. Okay. Next question. 18 You are aware that the parties to the settlement 19 agreement on the prudency of Energize Eastside agreed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of Newcastle the week before last that OPL has the final design for Energize Eastside. Q. Thank you. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. We're trying to pull up the exhibit from 	1 BY MR. HANSEN: 2 Q. Next question. 3 You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the 4 load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; 5 correct? 6 A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files 7 were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. 8 Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these 9 files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEII 10 team, describing several problems he found with the 11 PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received 12 a response; correct? 13 A. I'm not familiar with any communication received 14 by or from Mr. Lauckhart. 15 MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. 16 BY MR. HANSEN: 17 Q. Okay. Next question. 18 You are aware that the parties to the settlement 19 agreement on the prudency of Energize Eastside agreed 20 that PSE has met its threshold prudence requirement to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of Newcastle the week before last that OPL has the final design for Energize Eastside. Q. Thank you. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. We're trying to pull up the exhibit from Paul White, who was the Newcastle contact. 	1 BY MR. HANSEN: 2 Q. Next question. 3 You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the 4 load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; 5 correct? 6 A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files 7 were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. 8 Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these 9 files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEII 10 team, describing several problems he found with the 11 PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received 12 a response; correct? 13 A. I'm not familiar with any communication received 14 by or from Mr. Lauckhart. 15 MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. 16 BY MR. HANSEN: 17 Q. Okay. Next question. 18 You are aware that the parties to the settlement 19 agreement on the prudency of Energize Eastside agreed 20 that PSE has met its threshold prudence requirement to 21 demonstrate that the investment should be provisionally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of Newcastle the week before last that OPL has the final design for Energize Eastside. Q. Thank you. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. We're trying to pull up the exhibit from 	1 BY MR. HANSEN: 2 Q. Next question. 3 You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the 4 load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; 5 correct? 6 A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files 7 were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. 8 Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these 9 files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEll 10 team, describing several problems he found with the 11 PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received 12 a response; correct? 13 A. I'm not familiar with any communication received 14 by or from Mr. Lauckhart. 15 MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. 16 BY MR. HANSEN: 17 Q. Okay. Next question. 18 You are aware that the parties to the settlement 19 agreement on the prudency of Energize Eastside agreed 20 that PSE has met its threshold prudence requirement to 21 demonstrate that the investment should be provisionally 22 included in rates; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of Newcastle the week before last that OPL has the final design for Energize Eastside. Q. Thank you. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. We're trying to pull up the exhibit from Paul White, who was the Newcastle contact. JUDGE HOWARD: Do you know the exhibit 	1 BY MR. HANSEN: 2 Q. Next question. 3 You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the 4 load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; 5 correct? 6 A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files 7 were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. 8 Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these 9 files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEll 10 team, describing several problems he found with the 11 PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received 12 a response; correct? 13 A. I'm not familiar with any communication received 14 by or from Mr. Lauckhart. 15 MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. 16 BY MR. HANSEN: 17 Q. Okay. Next question. 18 You are aware that the parties to the settlement 19 agreement on the prudency of Energize Eastside agreed 20 that PSE has met its threshold prudence requirement to 21 demonstrate that the investment should be provisionally 22 included in rates; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 bulk electric system vulnerability in King County to Seattle City Light; correct? A. I believe I just answered that question. Q. I believe you did. Question. Next question. Condition three and the Newcastle Conditional Use Permit requires PSE to certify to the City of Newcastle that Olympic Pipeline has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That is a condition under the Conditional Use Permit. Q. PSE has not yet certified to the City of Newcastle that OPL has received the final system design for Energize Eastside; correct? A. That's not correct. We certified to the City of Newcastle the week before last that OPL has the final design for Energize Eastside. Q. Thank you. MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. We're trying to pull up the exhibit from Paul White, who was the Newcastle contact. JUDGE HOWARD: Do you know the exhibit number? 	1 BY MR. HANSEN: 2 Q. Next question. 3 You're aware that PSE provided Mr. Lauckhart the 4 load flow files he requested on Monday, September 26th; 5 correct? 6 A. Yeah, I am generally aware that that files 7 were provided to Mr. Lauckhart. 8 Q. You are aware that Mr. Lauckhart reviewed these 9 files per his email of September 27th to the PSE CEll 10 team, describing several problems he found with the 11 PSE/Quanta load flow input data and has not yet received 12 a response; correct? 13 A. I'm not familiar with any communication received 14 by or from Mr. Lauckhart. 15 MR. HANSEN: One moment, please. 16 BY MR. HANSEN: 17 Q. Okay. Next question. 18 You are aware that the parties to the settlement 19 agreement on the prudency of Energize Eastside agreed 10 that PSE has met its threshold prudence requirement to 10 demonstrate that the investment should be provisionally 11 included in rates; correct? 12 A. Th

40 (Pages 397 to 400)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

,	Page 401		Page 403
1	MS. CARSON: Objection. Calls for a legal	1	included in rates now. It is included in rates such
2	conclusion.	2	
3	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow this one,	3	that portions of the project are complete and providing benefits to customers.
4	again, under the reason that policy questions in our	4	Q. This invented threshold prudency requirement has
5	particular area of practice do tend to verge on legal	5	no plan or mechanism to remedy any safety environmental
6	questions at times. And this does not appear to be a	6	or other societal costs or impacts created by Energize
7	purely legal question.	7	Eastside; correct?
8	MR. KOCH: I think it's repetitive with a	8	A. That's not that's not the scope of a
9	prior question in which I described the four or I	9	multiyear rate plan or a GRC. The environmental review
10	answered the question around the four prudency tests	10	of this project has been extensive. A two-phased EIS
11	that Mr. Lauckhart claimed. And I added to that that	11	that took nearly three years to identify not only the
12	Staff witness Nightingale and Staff witness Ball used a	12	need for the project, the alternative for the project;
13	criteria based on the "used and useful" policy and	13	and then the second phase evaluated the impacts from the
14	concluded that the final cost of the project or the only	14	project.
15	remaining prudency test that had not yet been satisfied.	15	These have been subjects of multiple Conditional
16	BY MR. HANSEN:	16	Use Permit hearings. So it's not the scope of the UTC
17	Q. Next question.	17	to determine the environmental impacts of a project of
18	Are these criteria documented anywhere?	18	this nature.
19	A. I'm going to refer back to the "used and useful"	19	MR. HANSEN: That completes our questions,
20	policy as the basis for the determination of that	20	Your Honor. Thank you very much.
21	criteria.	21	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any
22	Q. Okay. Thank you.	22	redirect for this witness?
23	Are these criteria part of the record in this	23	MS. CARSON: Yes, just a couple questions.
24	rate case?	24	REDIRECTEXAMINATION
25	A. It appears so.	25	BY MS. CARSON:
	Page 402		Page 404
1	Page 402	1	Page 404
1	Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit?	1	Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the
2	Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit?A. It's not a part of my direct testimony.	2	Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's
	Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit?A. It's not a part of my direct testimony.Q. Thank you.		Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need?
2 3	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure 	2 3	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are
2 3 4	Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit?A. It's not a part of my direct testimony.Q. Thank you.	2 3 4	Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need?
2 3 4 5	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? 	2 3 4 5	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system.
2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not 	2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers - settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers - settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers - settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. The settlement agreement recommends and the WUTC staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers. Can you just elaborate on what what's been going on these past few summers?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. The settlement agreement recommends and the WUTC staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates starting now with the refund to be made if the future 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers. Can you just elaborate on what what's been going on these past few summers? A. So the needs assessment originally assumed that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. The settlement agreement recommends and the WUTC staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates starting now with the refund to be made if the future proper prudency hearing that the WUTC finds that some or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers. Can you just elaborate on what what's been going on these past few summers? A. So the needs assessment originally assumed that a deficiency would occur in the summer of 2018.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. The settlement agreement recommends and the WUTC staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates starting now with the refund to be made if the future proper prudency hearing that the WUTC finds that some or all of the Energize Eastside is not prudent and that a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers. Can you just elaborate on what what's been going on these past few summers? A. So the needs assessment originally assumed that a deficiency would occur in the summer of 2018. In the 2017 summer, that load level was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. The settlement agreement recommends and the WUTC staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates starting now with the refund to be made if the future proper prudency hearing that the WUTC finds that some or all of the Energize Eastside is not prudent and that a refund can then be made to customers to remedy the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers. Can you just elaborate on what what's been going on these past few summers? A. So the needs assessment originally assumed that a deficiency would occur in the summer of 2018. In the 2017 summer, that load level was exceeded.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. The settlement agreement recommends and the WUTC staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates starting now with the refund to be made if the future proper prudency hearing that the WUTC finds that some or all of the Energize Eastside is not prudent and that a refund can then be made to customers to remedy the problem; correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers. Can you just elaborate on what what's been going on these past few summers? A. So the needs assessment originally assumed that a deficiency would occur in the summer of 2018. In the 2017 summer, that load level was exceeded. So the deficiency was no longer an issue of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. The settlement agreement recommends and the WUTC staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates starting now with the refund to be made if the future proper prudency hearing that the WUTC finds that some or all of the Energize Eastside is not prudent and that a refund can then be made to customers to remedy the problem; correct? A. Not entirely correct. I would clarify that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers. Can you just elaborate on what what's been going on these past few summers? A. So the needs assessment originally assumed that a deficiency would occur in the summer of 2018. In the 2017 summer, that load level was exceeded. So the deficiency was no longer an issue of planning, it was an issue of actual loads.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers - settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends and the WUTC staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates starting now with the refund to be made if the future proper prudency hearing that the WUTC finds that some or all of the Energize Eastside is not prudent and that a refund can then be made to customers to remedy the problem; correct? A. Not entirely correct. I would clarify that the provisional inclusion in rates is based on the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers? A. So the needs assessment originally assumed that a deficiency would occur in the summer of 2018. In the 2017 summer, that load level was exceeded. So the deficiency was no longer an issue of planning, it was an issue of actual loads. 2018, the same thing occurred. The load was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Do you have any reference to the exhibit? A. It's not a part of my direct testimony. Q. Thank you. Has there been rulemaking on the procedure regarding threshold prudence requirement? A. Again, outside of my direct testimony. I'm not aware of any. Q. What information or data did PSE provide to the settlement agreement signers settlement agreement signers to prove they met threshold prudency? A. Could you clarify the question? Do you have a reference to something in my testimony regarding that? Q. We do not. Next question. The settlement agreement recommends next question. The settlement agreement recommends and the WUTC staff agreed that Energize Eastside be put in rates starting now with the refund to be made if the future proper prudency hearing that the WUTC finds that some or all of the Energize Eastside is not prudent and that a refund can then be made to customers to remedy the problem; correct? A. Not entirely correct. I would clarify that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Mr. Koch, can you explain how the TPLs, the transmission planning studies, factor into PSE's determination of need? A. Well, as I stated earlier, they are they are done annually and they are done for the entire system. It is not just the Energize Eastside Project, but they include the eastside area and include those deficiencies that were identified within the specific needs assessment provided in my testimony. They are continually assessed annually and continue to show that the results of of the load flow analysis produces deficiencies on the eastside area. Q. Earlier you testified about four out of five summers, the need has been present. And then I think you said five out of six summers. Can you just elaborate on what what's been going on these past few summers? A. So the needs assessment originally assumed that a deficiency would occur in the summer of 2018. In the 2017 summer, that load level was exceeded. So the deficiency was no longer an issue of planning, it was an issue of actual loads.

41 (Pages 401 to 404)

	Page 405		Page 407
1	years, including the very hot summer in 2020, the load	1	early on about revenue requirement and getting
1 2	level has been exceeded by a substantial amount of	2	workpapers for the settlement?
3	megawatts.	3	MS. ERDAHL: Yes.
4		4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And so would this be
4 5	And in 2020, PSE was one event away from needing	5	
6	to load shed as a result of that deficiency. Q. Can you clarify what you mean by "load shed"?	6	identified in those workpapers as well? MS. ERDAHL: Yes. That should be reflected
7	A. Yeah. Load shed is intentionally turning off	7	
8	, ,	8	in the workpapers.
8 9	the power to customers.	9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.
10	Q. There was a question about the CEII application that Mr. Lauckhart had had provided to PSE.	10	And so I was going to ask about whether all the estimated costs of the project in their entirety are
11	•	11	
12	Can you just give a little bit of background about the CEII applications PSE filed?	12	included in rate year one and rate year two, but maybe
		13	that will can you answer that? Or is that going to
13	A. Yes. This is an independent process. It's not	14	be in the workpapers?
14	in my area of responsibility. So I'm only familiar with	14	MS. ERDAHL: It will be in the workpapers.
15	Mr. Lauckhart's request, which was received in July,	16	And, Joel, correct me if I'm wrong, but my
16 17	which I think is roughly six months after PSE filed this	17	understanding is there will be less cost in rate year
	case. And PSE processed that that request.	18	one than what was originally filed.
18	We had some follow-up questions for	19	And the same is true of rate year two, there
19	Mr. Lauckhart. There was some follow-up meetings that		will be less costs than originally filed.
20	occurred scheduling on both sides that were necessary to	20	And I believe there's costs that will be in
21	achieve that. And the requested data, which also needed	21	rate year three which is no longer part of the multiyear
22	to be narrowed, the scope of the request was was	22 23	rate plan. So those costs won't be in rates until
23	quite broad.		another rate case is filed.
24	And so my understanding is that the the scope	24 25	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. But those will
25	of the request was was confirmed and that data was	25	be clarified in the in the bench request with the
	Page 406		Page 408
1	provided to Mr. Lauckhart.	1	workpapers.
2	MS. CARSON: I have no further questions.	2	MS. ERDAHL: Yes.
3	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any	3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, thank
4	questions from the bench for the Energize Eastside	4	you.
5	panel?	5	I have no further questions, unless
6	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. This is	6	Ms. Free, you had something you wanted to say on this.
7	Commissioner Rendahl. I just have a few questions.	7	MS. FREE: Thank you, Commissioner Rendahl.
8	JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead.	8	I missed part of Betty's question.
9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So the revenue	9	Sounds to me like she handled it well and we
10	requirement settlement and that's at page 9	10	will be sure that is included in the bench press
11	specifies that the delayed service dates for Energize	11	response, that it's clear.
12	Eastside are assumed to be incorporated into the	12	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you very much.
13	agreed-upon revenue requirement.	13	That's all I have.
14	Can the settling parties explain what they	14	JUDGE HOWARD: Did we have any further
15	mean by "assumed to be incorporated."	15	questions for the bench for this panel?
16	MS. ERDAHL: Do you want to go ahead?	16	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: None here, Your Honor.
17	MR. KOCH: No. Go ahead.	17	CHAIR DANNER: No, Your Honor.
18	MS. ERDAHL: Okay. The start dates for	18	JUDGE HOWARD: I would like to thank the
19	Energize Eastside "used and useful" is further out in	19	witnesses for their testimony. You may turn off your
20	the first rate year than was filed by PSE. And so in	20	cameras.
21	the settlement we included revenue requirement that	21	Our next panel is the Tacoma LNG settlement
22	reflected a later state start date and less revenue	22	panel. I think before we jump to that panel, let's take
23	requirement in that first year.	23	a brief break and we will return at 2:10 p.m.
24	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And were you	24	That's 2:10 p.m.
25	listening into the hearing when I asked some questions	25	Mr. Thomas?

42 (Pages 405 to 408)

×	Page 409		Page 411
1	MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.	1	Dr. Libicki, who is the person who's testimony is in
2	Just very briefly. Had a quick housekeeping	2	RJR-31.
3	matter to put on the record. Probably makes the most	3	In the interest of keeping post-hearing
4	sense to do it without the Commissioners on the line,	4	submissions clean and to a minimum, I looked at what the
5	but it should be quickly addressed and it can	5	Tribe would be interested in counter-designating. And
6	wait until later if you want to take it up at an	6	the Tribe would request it have the ability it would
7	appropriate time.	7	probably be only five to ten pages of counter-designated
8	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Hansen, you should mute	8	testimony.
9	your line so we don't hear your conversation.	9	And so the Tribe just wanted to offer to
10	Sorry, Mr. Thomas.	10	keep the Commission from receiving a bunch of additional
11	Are you fine with when we come back on after	11	testimony, that the Tribe just be given the opportunity
12	the break and we'll address your logistical issue?	12	to counter-designate those portions of Dr. Libicki's
13	MR. THOMAS: Yes. And it needn't be when we	13	testimony just to address the basis of its objection.
14	come back from the break, just before the end of the	14	JUDGE HOWARD: So the the PSE has
15	day. I just wanted to raise it with Your Honor now and	15	offered and agreed to file the the entirety of this
16	leave it to Your Honor to determine what would be the	16	particular proceedings testimony for this expert.
17	most appropriate time would be to take it up. But it	17	Are you is your counter-designation
18	need not occur before the Tacoma LNG panel.	18	within what they are going to file?
19	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. We'll address it then.	19	MR. THOMAS: It is. It would be within but
20	Ms. Carson?	20	also in lieu of that, because submitting everything from
21	MS. CARSON: Yes, I just wanted to before	21	this witness would raise some pretty serious ER 403
22	Mr. Koch leaves, there were other cross-exam exhibits	22	concerns. A lot of it's not going to be relevant to
23	that were not used, and I just want to confirm that none	23	these proceedings. And so PSE has already submitted
24	of those will be admitted into the record.	24	what it views as being relevant. The Tribe has
25	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I have it as for the	25	identified about five to ten pages of counter-designated
	Page 410		Page 412
1	CENSE cross exhibits, JBN-9X was admitted and then	1	testimony that it thinks would be relevant, and that
2	DRK-29X through DRK-35X were either explicitly rejected	2	would save the Commission from the potential for
3	by me, as in the case of DRK-35X, or they were not	3	confusion and the need to wade through a lot of extra
4	offered into evidence as in the case of the other ones.	4	testimony that doesn't relate to these issues.
5	MS. CARSON: Thank you.	5	JUDGE HOWARD: Well, in the and just to
6	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So let's	6	be clear, you're we're talking about the the same
7	actually, since we had a bit of conversation there, we	7	testimony from the same expert in this proceeding that
8	will return at 2:12 p.m. We are off the record.	8	PSE wishes to submit the entirety of.
9	(A break was taken from	9	I am inclined at this time to stick with
10	2:02 p.m. to 2:12 p.m.)	10	our my original ruling of asking the company to file
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.	11	the entirety of that witness' testimony in, I believe it
12	The time is 2:13 p.m.	12	was a seven-day period of time.
13	We are about to start the Tacoma LNG panel.	13	The Tribe I would suggest that the Tribe,
14	Before we do, Mr. Thomas, you referred to an	14	within seven days, if the Tribe wishes, can submit a
15	administrative matter. I know you said that it does not	15	letter identifying and explaining those portions in the
16	have to be addressed right now, but I would prefer to	16	testimony. I would ask that the letter be under 30
17	just address it now.	17	pages in length, because it shouldn't have to quote
18	MR. THOMAS: Okay. Yes, Your Honor. Just	18	everything.
19	very briefly it it relates to the Tribe's objection	19	Hopefully that addresses the Tribe's
20	earlier this morning. We understand that Exhibit RJR-31	20	concern. I'm not especially troubled in terms of a 403
21	is in.	21	issue or things along those lines. We don't have a
22	Typically, in this circumstance, what	22	jury. We sort through large amounts of information
	what would happen is that the the Tribe given that	23	already. And and the Tribe's pre-filed testimony
23			
23 24	this involves testimony, the Tribe would be given the	24	does include testimony in other form.
23		24 25	

43 (Pages 409 to 412)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 413		Page 415
1	witnesses on the Tacoma LNG settlement panel.	1	waive my cross at this time and concede my time to the
2	As before, let's have the witnesses identify	2	Tribe.
3	themselves and the party that they are appearing for,	3	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Thank you.
4	beginning with the witnesses for PSE.	4	Well, who will be conducting the cross for
5	Let's also have witnesses turn on their	5	the Puyallup Tribe of PSE's witness Roberts?
б	cameras, if they have not already. I will swear you in	6	MR. FULLER: Andrew Fuller. Myself, Your
7	as a panel. Actually, for this panel, all the witnesses	7	Honor, and I don't anticipate that we will be using our
8	are repeat appearances from earlier today, with the	8	entire 30 minutes, so we should be getting through this
9	exception of Ronald Roberts. So I will only be swearing	9	relatively quickly.
10	in Mr. Roberts.	10	CROSS-EXAMINATION
11	Could the company witnesses identify	11	BY MR. FULLER:
12	themselves for the record?	12	Q. Hello, Mr. Roberts. I'll start with just a few
13	MS. FREE: This is Susan Free for PSE.	13	questions about your background.
14	MR. ROBERTS: Ron Roberts, Vice President of	14	The documents you submitted with your testimony
15	Energy Supply for PSE.	15	indicate that you graduated from the Colorado School of
16	MR. PILIARIS: And Jon Piliaris again for	16	Mines with a Bachelor of Science in mining engineer and
17	PSE.	17	a minor in economics; is that correct?
18	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	18	A. That is correct.
19	Can we hear from Staff's witnesses?	19	Q. Okay. I took a look at the website for the
20	MS. ERDAHL: This is Betty Erdahl from	20	undergraduate mining engineering program at the
21	Staff.	21	Colorado School of Mines, and that website stated that
22	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	22	the mining engineering students study the principles and
23	And Nucor?	23	techniques of mineral exploration and underground and
24	MR. HIGGINS: Kevin Higgins, witness for	24	surface mining operations as well as mineral processing
25	Nucor Steel.	25	technologies.
	Page 414		Page 416
1	JUDGE HOWARD: And Walmart.	1	Is that a fair description of the program that
2	MR. KRONAUER: This is Alex Kronauer for	2	you completed there?
3	Walmart.	3	A. It's fair but not complete.
4	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And AWEC.	4	
		1	Q. I understand.
5	MR. MULLINS: Brad Mullins with AWEC.	5	Can you describe what specialized education or
5 6	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	6	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling?
6 7	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please	6 7	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for
6 7 8	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand?	6 7 8	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was
6 7 8 9	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony	6 7 8 9	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine
6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth,	6 7 8 9 10	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm
6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?	6 7 8 9 10 11	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what
6 7 9 10 11 12	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes. Have the parties discussed who would proceed	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions. Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes. Have the parties discussed who would proceed first?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions. Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. And do you hold any advanced degrees?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes. Have the parties discussed who would proceed first? MS. GAFKEN: Your Honor, we have not	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions. Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. And do you hold any advanced degrees? A. No.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes. Have the parties discussed who would proceed first? MS. GAFKEN: Your Honor, we have not discussed that but I think I can shortcut this pretty	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions. Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. And do you hold any advanced degrees? A. No. Q. Based on your education and your expertise, if I
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes. Have the parties discussed who would proceed first? MS. GAFKEN: Your Honor, we have not discussed that but I think I can shortcut this pretty pretty quickly.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions. Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. And do you hold any advanced degrees? A. No. Q. Based on your education and your expertise, if I was to ask you whether a molecule of benzene emitted
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes. Have the parties discussed who would proceed first? MS. GAFKEN: Your Honor, we have not discussed that but I think I can shortcut this pretty pretty quickly. So Public Counsel had three cross exhibits	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions. Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. And do you hold any advanced degrees? A. No. Q. Based on your education and your expertise, if I was to ask you whether a molecule of benzene emitted from Tacoma LNG would remain in the air or whether it
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes. Have the parties discussed who would proceed first? MS. GAFKEN: Your Honor, we have not discussed that but I think I can shortcut this pretty pretty quickly. So Public Counsel had three cross exhibits directed to Mr. Bieber for Kroger and Mr. Higgins for	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions. Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. And do you hold any advanced degrees? A. No. Q. Based on your education and your expertise, if I was to ask you whether a molecule of benzene emitted from Tacoma LNG would remain in the air or whether it would be deposited on the ground, would you be able to
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes. Have the parties discussed who would proceed first? MS. GAFKEN: Your Honor, we have not discussed that but I think I can shortcut this pretty pretty quickly. So Public Counsel had three cross exhibits directed to Mr. Bieber for Kroger and Mr. Higgins for Nucor and Mr. Kronauer for Walmart. And those three	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions. Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. And do you hold any advanced degrees? A. No. Q. Based on your education and your expertise, if I was to ask you whether a molecule of benzene emitted from Tacoma LNG would remain in the air or whether it would be deposited on the ground, would you be able to answer that question?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. All right. Mr. Roberts, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you'll give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Public Counsel indicated that it had 15 minutes of cross-examination time. The Puyallup Tribe indicated 30 minutes. Have the parties discussed who would proceed first? MS. GAFKEN: Your Honor, we have not discussed that but I think I can shortcut this pretty pretty quickly. So Public Counsel had three cross exhibits directed to Mr. Bieber for Kroger and Mr. Higgins for	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Can you describe what specialized education or expertise you have regarding air dispersion modeling? A. Yes. Early in my career, when I worked for Mobil Oil, I was an environmental engineer and I was responsible for air compliance at a large surface mine that had a lot of emissions with it. Therefore, I'm fairly familiar with air dispersion modeling and what goes into it. Later in my career, I was the Associate Vice President of Environmental Health & Safety for a chemical company in Houston which also dealt with a lot of air toxics, air emissions. Q. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. And do you hold any advanced degrees? A. No. Q. Based on your education and your expertise, if I was to ask you whether a molecule of benzene emitted from Tacoma LNG would remain in the air or whether it would be deposited on the ground, would you be able to

44 (Pages 413 to 416)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

1	Page 417	Page 419
1	Q. Okay. And if I asked you the same question	1 PSE Vice President of Energy Supply at PSE, I
2	regarding a molecule of formaldehyde released from	2 recognize that you're responsible for oversight of Puget
3	Tacoma LNG, would you be able to answer that question?	3 LNG.
4	A. No.	4 I'm just wondering, do you generally, as part of
5	Q. Okay. So is it correct to say that if I asked	5 your role at PSE, stay aware of and abreast of
б	the same question about any of the carcinogens that are	6 information regarding incidents and accidents that are
7	known to be emitted from Tacoma LNG you would be unable	7 related to natural gas facilities and LNG facilities?
8	to answer that question?	8 A. Yes, it is part of my responsibility.
9	MS. CARSON: Object to the question.	9 Q. And you're aware of the LNG leak in the
10	Assumes facts not in evidence.	10 subsequent explosion that occurred in 2014 at the
11	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the	11 Plymouth LNG peak shaving plant that was located in
12	question.	12 Kennewick, Washington?
13	MR. ROBERTS: Can you repeat the question	13 A. I'm aware of the incident but not of the details
14	one more time for me, please?	14 surrounding what the actual cause was.
15	BY MR. FULLER:	15 Q. Okay. Are you aware that the explosion that
16	Q. Yeah, no problem.	16 occurred in that incident threw 250 pound pieces of
17	I'm just wondering if I ask that same question	17 steel up to 300 yards?
18	about any of the carcinogens that are known to be	18 A. I did read that.
19	emitted from Tacoma LNG, would you be able to based	19 Q. Okay. Thank you.
20	on your education and expertise, be able to tell me	20 And beyond the Plymouth LNG peak shaving plant
21	whether that molecule would remain in the air or be	21 here in Washington, there have been significant
22	deposited on the ground?	22 accidents that have occurred at other LNG facilities
23	A. Personally, I would not be able to.	around the U.S. as well as outside of the U.S.; correct?
24	Q. Okay. Thank you.	A. I don't have knowledge of any of the significant
25	You didn't participate in the PCH proceedings	25 ones beyond Plymouth.
	Page 418	Page 420
1	under Docket P-19087 that were related to the challenge	1 Q. Did you review the testimony in this matter that
2	of the air permit for Tacoma LNG?	2 was submitted by Dr. Ranajit Sahu on July 28th, 2022?
3	A. I was not an active participant in that, but I	3 That was Exhibit RXS-1T.
4	was engaged and involved in it.	4 A. Yes.
5	Q. Thank you.	5 Q. Okay. And you also reviewed Dr. Sahu's
6	In your role as Vice President of Energy Supply	6 September 9th, 2020, testimony which was designated
7	at PSE, where you were responsible for oversight of	7 RXS-30T?
8	Puget LNG, do you as part of the role of your job to	8 A. Yes.
9	generally be aware of and stay abreast of information	9 Q. Okay. Thank you.
10	regarding incidents and accidents related to natural gas	10 Are you aware that recently, just in June 2022,
11	and LNG facilities?	11 an accident occurred at the Freeport LNG facility in
12	(Off-record discussion.)	12 Texas that caused a large explosion?
13	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Mr. Fuller, would you	13 A. I'm not aware of the circumstances around that.
14	mind repeating your question?	14 Q. Okay. Are you aware that an accident occurred
15	MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.	15 in June 2022 at that facility, Freeport LNG?
16	I think Stephanie had to step away from	16 A. Yes.
17	her desk for a few minutes, so if maybe Mr. Smith could	17Q. Okay. In your August 26th, 2022 testimony, you
18	mute her for her on your end, that would be great.	18 testified that, quote: "There is no significant
19	JUDGE HOWARD: He can. I know we have a	19 difference between the gas quality needed for TOTE's
20	number of people listening.	20 engines and the gas quality needed for use by PSE's
21	Mr. Fuller, you may proceed. You may need	21 retail gas customers"; is that correct?
22	to repeat your question.	A. That is a true statement. Both of our customers
23	BY MR. FULLER:	23 rely on the same quality of gas.
24 25	Q. No problem. Mr. Poberts, in your role as vice president at	24Q. Okay. And the LNG fuel supply agreement between25PSE and TOTE contains specifications regarding the
25	Mr. Roberts, in your role as vice president at	

45 (Pages 417 to 420)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 421	Page 423
1	quality of the LNG that PSE sells to TOTE; is that	1 Tacoma LNG that were required to removal of those heavy
2	correct?	2 hydrocarbons from the feed gas prior to the
3	A. It does have a quality requirement, yes.	3 liquefaction, that removal of those heavy hydrocarbons
4	Q. And the LNG specifications that are set forth in	4 is done to meet the TOTE methane fuel requirement; is
5	that PSE/TOTE contract require that the LNG that PSE	5 that correct?
6	provides to TOTE must have a minimum methane number of	6 A. No. It is partially to satisfy the liquefaction
7	80; correct?	7 phase in the fact those particles will freeze before
8	A. That is correct.	8 methane will.
9	Q. Okay. And also in your August 26th, 2022	9 Second of all, that does apply to all of our
10	testimony you testified that, quote: "If left	10 customers. High levels of ethane or propane in our
11	untreated, CO2 and H2O in the feed gas would freeze	11 natural gas supply are not good for our customers
12	during the liquefaction process. Therefore,	12 either, not just TOTE.
13	pretreatment is necessary to remove these molecules to	13 Q. Mr Mr. Roberts, if the Tacoma LNG facility
14	avoid riming" if I pronounced that wrong, I'm	14 produced LNG with a methane number of 78 that LNG would
15	sorry "of the platefin heat exchangers. After	15 be of suitable quality to be vaporized and injected
16	pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural	16 into PSE's distribution system for rate payer use;
17	gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic	17 correct?
18	temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by	18 A. It could be. But we start ending up on problems
19	partial refrigeration."	19 on the lower end of methane quantity as well in our
20	Is that a correct representation of your	20 system. It's a balanced system that needs to be there.
21	testimony?	21 Gas quality from Canada has changed over the 22 last couple of years. It has more heavies in it. The
22 23	 A. That is a correct representation and that actually impacts all of PSE's customers. It's just not 	
23 24	a liquefaction issue at the LNG site; that's something	
24	that's being worked on in Canada. It has to do with the	 originally, so there was some modifications done to it to change that.
25		
	Page 422	Page 424
1		Page 424
1	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming	1 Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding
2	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada.	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for
2 3	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you.	 Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding that there's no minimum methane number requirement for LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility
2 3 4	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for
2 3 4 5	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.
2 3 4 5 6	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane
2 3 4 5	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?
2 3 4 5 6 7	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration."	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process?	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct?	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas14prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the15heating energy from the feed gas?16A. Too much heat is also a problem.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct? A. I would consider it part of the pretreatment	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas14prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the15heating energy from the feed gas?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct? A. I would consider it part of the pretreatment because to me pretreatment is treating the gas before	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas14prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the15heating energy from the feed gas?16A. Too much heat is also a problem.17Q. Sorry. You broke up for a second for me.18Did you say "yes"?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct? A. I would consider it part of the pretreatment because to me pretreatment is treating the gas before liquefaction.	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas14prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the15heating energy from the feed gas?16A. Too much heat is also a problem.17Q. Sorry. You broke up for a second for me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct? A. I would consider it part of the pretreatment because to me pretreatment is treating the gas before liquefaction. So there's actually two stages of pretreatment.	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas14prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the15heating energy from the feed gas?16A. Too much heat is also a problem.17Q. Sorry. You broke up for a second for me.18Did you say "yes"?19A. Yes. Too much heat is also an issue in the gas20system.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct? A. I would consider it part of the pretreatment because to me pretreatment is treating the gas before liquefaction. So there's actually two stages of pretreatment. There's the removal of water in the initial phase and	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas14prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the15heating energy from the feed gas?16A. Too much heat is also a problem.17Q. Sorry. You broke up for a second for me.18Did you say "yes"?19A. Yes. Too much heat is also an issue in the gas20system.21Q. Okay. But but the feed gas that is received
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct? A. I would consider it part of the pretreatment because to me pretreatment is treating the gas before liquefaction. So there's actually two stages of pretreatment. There's the removal of the heavies before it hits the 	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas14prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the15heating energy from the feed gas?16A. Too much heat is also a problem.17Q. Sorry. You broke up for a second for me.18Did you say "yes"?19A. Yes. Too much heat is also an issue in the gas20system.21Q. Okay. But but the feed gas that is received22from at Tacoma LNG, if it was not to be turned into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct? A. I would consider it part of the pretreatment because to me pretreatment is treating the gas before liquefaction. So there's actually two stages of pretreatment. There's the removal of water in the initial phase and then the removal of the heavies before it hits the liquefaction. 	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas14prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the15heating energy from the feed gas?16A. Too much heat is also a problem.17Q. Sorry. You broke up for a second for me.18Did you say "yes"?19A. Yes. Too much heat is also an issue in the gas20system.21Q. Okay. But but the feed gas that is received22from at Tacoma LNG, if it was not to be turned into23LNG, if it was to remain gas, it would be suitable to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct? A. I would consider it part of the pretreatment because to me pretreatment is treating the gas before liquefaction. So there's actually two stages of pretreatment. There's the removal of water in the initial phase and then the removal of the heavies before it hits the liquefaction. Q. Okay. So that that second piece of what 	1 Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding 2 that there's no minimum methane number requirement for 3 LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility 4 before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for 5 rate payer use during peak shaving. 6 Am I correct that there is no minimum methane 7 number requirement for PSE ratepayers? 8 A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum 9 quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does 10 impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load 11 out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other 12 equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment. 13 Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas 14 prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the 15 heating energy from the feed gas? 16 A. Too much heat is also a problem. 17 Q. Sorry. You broke up for a second for me. 18 Did you say "yes"? 19 A. Yes. Too much heat is also an issue in the gas 20 system. 21 Q. Okay. But but the feed gas that is received
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 elevated levels of ethane and methane in the gas coming from Canada. Q. Thank you. So I'll just repeat the last sentence of that testimony, which was a quote. You stated that "After pretreatment, but prior to liquefaction of the natural gas, heavy hydrocarbons that may freeze at the cryogenic temperatures encountered downstream would be removed by partial refrigeration." So based on that testimony, the removal of heavy hydrocarbons prior to liquefaction that follows pretreatment; therefore, that removal of heavy hydrocarbons is not part of the pretreatment process? Is that properly – is that correct? A. I would consider it part of the pretreatment because to me pretreatment is treating the gas before liquefaction. So there's actually two stages of pretreatment. There's the removal of the heavies before it hits the liquefaction. Q. Okay. So that that second piece of what you've described as pretreatment, the removal of the 	1Q. Okay. And there is it is my understanding2that there's no minimum methane number requirement for3LNG that is to be vaporized at the Tacoma LNG facility4before it is returned to the PSE distribution system for5rate payer use during peak shaving.6Am I correct that there is no minimum methane7number requirement for PSE ratepayers?8A. There's no standard that says it's a minimum9quantity. However, diminished methane certainly does10impact our customers. They don't get the same heat load11out of it. Some cases would be very harmful to other12equipment that's in the system, end users' equipment.13Q. And when heavies are removed from the feed gas14prior to liquefaction, does that remove any of the15heating energy from the feed gas?16A. Too much heat is also a problem.17Q. Sorry. You broke up for a second for me.18Did you say "yes"?19A. Yes. Too much heat is also an issue in the gas20system.21Q. Okay. But but the feed gas that is received22from at Tacoma LNG, if it was not to be turned into23LNG, if it was to remain gas, it would be suitable to

46 (Pages 421 to 424)

	Page 425		Page 427
1		1	
1	value; correct?		Can you clarify for the record, Mr. Roberts,
2 3	 A. That is true. Q. And TOTE is the only Tacoma LNG customer that 	2	whether the Tacoma LNG facility is fully commissioned at
4	has a methane number requirement for the LNG that's	4	this time, used and useful to regulating gas customers?
4 5	purchased from Tacoma LNG; is that correct?	5	MR. ROBERTS: Yes, sir, it is. We did test
6	-	6	the vaporizer. All of the rest of the systems are up,
7	A. They are our only customer at this point.Q. And because the TOTE methane number requirement	7	functional. We've been producing LNG. We've transported LNG to the Gig Harbor satellite facility.
8	in the contract between TOTE and PSE requires that PSE	8	So yes, the facility is up and available.
9	provide LNG with a methane number of 80 and above, PSE	9	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.
10	would not have constructed the Tacoma LNG facility if	10	Can you please clarify for the record
11	the facility was was not able to produce LNG with a	11	whether PSE has, to date, used the Tacoma LNG as a peak
12	minimum methane number of 80; correct?	12	shaving resource for core gas customers?
13	A. Can you rephrase that? I'm not quite sure what	13	MR. ROBERTS: No, Commissioner, we have not.
14	you're asking.	14	Because it has not been cold enough yet to warrant that.
15	Q. Sorry. That was a little clumsy.	15	However, we are building inventory in a tank for
16	PSE would not have constructed the LNG facility	16	that hopefully not too severe event, but you never know.
17	if the facility was unable to produce LNG with a methane	17	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And on the tank, you
18	number of 80 or above; correct?	18	testified and this is your testimony RJR-30T at page
19	A. When the facility was originally designed, it	19	35, lines 15 through 19, testified that the LNG
20	met 80 easily. Changes in the gas system from Canada	20	facility's vaporizer may only be operated for 240 hours
21	over the last couple of years have changed that, so	21	a year. That's your limit. But that limit does not
22	there were some modifications done to the pretreatment.	22	compromise the ability to use the full 6.3 million
23	Q. Mr. Roberts, I don't think you are answering my	23	gallons of LNG storage that doesn't allocated to the
24	question.	24	PSE as regulating core gas customers.
25	My question is would PSE PSE would not have	25	Can you please explain how the full
	Page 426		Page 428
1	constructed the Tacoma LNG facility if it was unable to	1	6.3 million gallons of LNG stored storage allocated
2	produce LNG with a methane number of 80 to meet TOTE's	2	PSE's prudent investment for PSE core gas customers,
3	needs; is that correct?	3	particularly when any LNG must be first vaporized before
4	A. If we were absolutely unable to meet that	4	it is injected into the distribution system.
5	number, I would say this is correct. But we are able to	5	MR. ROBERTS: Can you phrase that one more
6	meet that number.	6	time?
7	Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. I have no	7	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yeah.
8	further questions.	8	MR. ROBERTS: So I can answer your question.
9	JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect for	9	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Sorry. That was a
10	Mr. Roberts?	10	mouth full.
11	MS. CARSON: No. No redirect.	11	Is the tank larger than it needs to be in
12	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I believe that's	12	terms of prudence?
13	all the cross we had indicated for this panel.	13	MR. ROBERTS: No. The tank is designed
14	Do we have any questions from the bench for	14	around two to three days of vaporization two times per
15	the Tacoma LNG panel?	15	year. And in that period of time, we would utilize all
16	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. If I	16	of that capacity in the tank. It's easy to sit back and
17	might, please.	17	look at, well, you could just refill it as soon as you
18	JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead.	18	vaporized off your share, but with us having gas
19	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: In Mr. Roberts's	19	constraints originally coming in, it would take us up to
20	direct testimony and that's at RJR-1CT at page 69,	20	120 days to refill that capacity. So we would be out of
21	lines 10 through 14. He testified that the construction	21	the heating season by the time we would refill it.
22	of the Tacoma LNG facility is complete but that the	22	So I think that when I look at it, you know,
23	plant equipment at that time, such as the vaporizer, may	23 24	two events, two to three days long of significant cold
24 25	not be commissioned until January subsequent to his	24	temperatures, size of the tank is adequate and warranted.
20	testimony.	[∠] ⊃	wanancu.
		<u> </u>	

47 (Pages 425 to 428)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	5 400		5 421
	Page 429		Page 431
1	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And did you evaluate	1	through their schedule 87 T rates that they will pay for
2	whether a smaller LNG facility would have been would	2	the for the delivery of the gas to the to the
3	have served the ratepayers peak shaving needs?	3	project.
4	MR. ROBERTS: We looked at a variety of	4	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Let me follow-up,
5	design options, and that's really the optimal that we	5	Mr. Piliaris, if I might.
6	could come to that provided enough for the peak shaving.	6	Does that does that benefit the PSE
7	For our customers, as you said, 6 million	7	customers, then? And can you explain how that is?
8	out of 8 is designated for the customers. The other two	8	MR. PILIARIS: As with any other large
9	is left for the Puget LNG side on the transportation	9	customer that hooks up to the system, when you bring on
10	fuel.	10	a large new load, it tends to you have more volume
11	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. And this is for	11	volumetric revenue covering fixed cost.
12	the settling parties. Maybe you, Mr. Roberts. Maybe	12	So by and large, yes, customers non-Puget
13	you, Mr. Piliaris.	13	LNG customers benefit by the presence of the Puget LNG
14	The LNG settlement this is at paragraph	14	load because it is contributing revenue towards the
15	18(A)(4), provides that PSE may recover distribution	15	fixed costs used to serve them.
16	costs and base rates. The settlement doesn't allocate	16	And I would also note that it goes beyond
17	any percentage of distribution costs to Puget LNG.	17	just the distribution upgrades. They are paying for a
18	Can the settling parties please explain how	18	share of the entire distribution system in addition to
19	allocating 100 percent of these distribution costs to	19	the upgrades. So it's all socialized as with any
20	core gas customers is consistent with the principle of	20	other any other large distribution customer load.
21	cost causation?	21	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Switch gears
22	And I say that in the context of the	22	for a minute.
23	distribution lines, for example. Gas flows both ways.	23	Do the settling parties believe that the
24 25	It appears from the record that the vast bulk of the	24 25	Tacoma LNG settlement appropriately considers and
25	liquefaction will be for the Puget LNG facility.	25	addresses equity?
	Page 430		Page 432
1	Page 430	1	Page 432
1	So can you answer the question, please?	1	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This
2	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon	2	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC.
2 3	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris.	2 3	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the
2 3 4	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget	2 3 4	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of
2 3	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that	2 3	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were
2 3 4 5	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility.	2 3 4 5	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily
2 3 4 5 6	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any	2 3 4 5 6	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the
2 3 4 5 6 7	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would say, all right, these are the revenues that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would say, all right, these are the revenues that we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with the the Tacoma LNG facility to be able to contest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would say, all right, these are the revenues that we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from this customer and these are the costs associated with upgrading the system to meet that load. And this is exactly what we did in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with the the Tacoma LNG facility to be able to contest that, while still agreeing or staying neutral on other parts of on the other stipulations. So I think looking at them holistically is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would say, all right, these are the revenues that we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from this customer and these are the costs associated with upgrading the system to meet that load. And this is exactly what we did in the analysis for Puget LNG. And so long as the revenues	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with the the Tacoma LNG facility to be able to contest that, while still agreeing or staying neutral on other parts of on the other stipulations. So I think looking at them holistically is the you know, sort of proper way to do it, at least
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would say, all right, these are the revenues that we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from this customer and these are the costs associated with upgrading the system to meet that load. And this is exactly what we did in the analysis for Puget LNG. And so long as the revenues cover the costs, the customer doesn't have to pay. To	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with the the Tacoma LNG facility to be able to contest that, while still agreeing or staying neutral on other parts of on the other stipulations. So I think looking at them holistically is the you know, sort of proper way to do it, at least from our perspective.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would say, all right, these are the revenues that we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from this customer and these are the costs associated with upgrading the system to meet that load. And this is exactly what we did in the analysis for Puget LNG. And so long as the revenues cover the costs, the customer doesn't have to pay. To the extent that that it doesn't, they have to front a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with the the Tacoma LNG facility to be able to contest that, while still agreeing or staying neutral on other parts of on the other stipulations. So I think looking at them holistically is the you know, sort of proper way to do it, at least from our perspective. MR. PILIARIS: I'll start for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from this customer and these are the revenues that we upgrading the system to meet that load. And this is exactly what we did in the analysis for Puget LNG. And so long as the revenues cover the costs, the customer doesn't have to pay. To the extent that that it doesn't, they have to front a contribution to pay for the delta, to pay for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with the the Tacoma LNG facility to be able to contest that, while still agreeing or staying neutral on other parts of on the other stipulations. So I think looking at them holistically is the you know, sort of proper way to do it, at least from our perspective. MR. PILIARIS: I'll start for the company and I've asked my colleague Mr. Roberts, to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from this customer and these are the revenues that we upgrading the system to meet that load. And this is exactly what we did in the analysis for Puget LNG. And so long as the revenues cover the costs, the customer doesn't have to pay. To the extent that that it doesn't, they have to front a contribution to pay for the delta, to pay for the difference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with the the Tacoma LNG facility to be able to contest that, while still agreeing or staying neutral on other parts of on the other stipulations. So I think looking at them holistically is the you know, sort of proper way to do it, at least from our perspective. MR. PILIARIS: I'll start for the company and I've asked my colleague Mr. Roberts, to weigh in. But, of course, you know, from the standpoint
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from this customer and these are the revenues that we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from this is exactly what we did in the analysis for Puget LNG. And so long as the revenues cover the costs, the customer doesn't have to pay. To the extent that that it doesn't, they have to front a contribution to pay for the delta, to pay for the difference. So the short response to that is the the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with the the Tacoma LNG facility to be able to contest that, while still agreeing or staying neutral on other parts of on the other stipulations. So I think looking at them holistically is the you know, sort of proper way to do it, at least from our perspective. MR. PILIARIS: I'll start for the company and I've asked my colleague Mr. Roberts, to weigh in. But, of course, you know, from the standpoint of prudence, clearly the Commission's long-standing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So can you answer the question, please? MR. PILIARIS: Yes, I can take this. Jon Piliaris. The so I want to start, first, that Puget LNG will be contributing towards distribution costs that were incurred to support the LNG facility. I think of Puget LNG no different than any other large industrial load on our system. When we have a new large let's just assume that Puget LNG was BP LNG and they hooked up onto our system and we needed to do distribution upgrades. What we would normally go through in that case is essentially a line extension analysis. And we would collect through our tariff distribution rates from this customer and these are the revenues that we upgrading the system to meet that load. And this is exactly what we did in the analysis for Puget LNG. And so long as the revenues cover the costs, the customer doesn't have to pay. To the extent that that it doesn't, they have to front a contribution to pay for the delta, to pay for the difference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. MULLINS: I guess I can jump in. This is Brad with AWEC. And, you know, our thinking of the settlement agreements is, you know, looking at all of them together in whole and so we weren't when we were looking at the Tacoma settlement, we weren't necessarily focusing on equity within that settlement, because the equity provisions were contained in the more in the you know, revenue requirement part of the settlement or the revenue requirement settlement agreement. And, you know, I guess splitting splitting up the settlement agreements, I think, was a convenient way for parties to that did disagree with the the Tacoma LNG facility to be able to contest that, while still agreeing or staying neutral on other parts of on the other stipulations. So I think looking at them holistically is the you know, sort of proper way to do it, at least from our perspective. MR. PILIARIS: I'll start for the company and I've asked my colleague Mr. Roberts, to weigh in. But, of course, you know, from the standpoint

48 (Pages 429 to 432)

	Page 433		Page 435
1	was made to go forward with the project, which was back	1	And then I would go back to the earlier
2	in the 2016 to 2018 time time frame. And at that	2	colloquy between ourselves around the spreading of of
3	point, while equity was beginning to be discussed in	3	additional revenue across fixed costs. It has a
4	various places, it certainly wasn't to the extent it is	4	beneficial rate impact to all customers, including those
5	now in statute through CETA and more recently through	5	who are less economically advantaged.
6	Senate Bill 5295.	6	MR. ROBERTS: I would add one more component
7	And so I think it would be technically	7	onto that, if I may. Ron Roberts.
8	improper to apply current standard legal standard to	8	I would add in reliability. This project on
9	the decisions that were made at that time.	9	the regulated side, it's been in our integrated resource
10	Now, that being said, the project does have	10	plans for many years that this was the the least
11	benefits to customers in the area, many of whom are	11	cost lowest reasonable cost alternative to meet a
12	disadvantaged and highly impacted, particularly with the	12	design day requirement, which is for a very, very cold
13	reduction of the constituents to the air toxins in the	13	day.
14	region. And I invite Mr. Roberts to elaborate on that.	14	We had this obligation to serve our
15	MR. ROBERTS: Yeah. Thanks, John. Ron	15	customers both gas and electric. And I look at it as
16	Roberts.	16	one of my prime responsibilities to make sure we can do
17	I think one of the things that we point out	17	that.
18	about this project is it was really designed to go after	18	Because on a very cold day, I don't want to
19	certainly criteria pollutants, which are SOCs/NOX	19	have anybody's gas go off. Because that immediately
20	particulates, all of those things have a dramatic health	20	presents all kinds of safety issues, as well as as
21	impact on the immediate residents and the Port of	21	impacts to communities far and wide of all sizes.
22	Tacoma's workers who actually work there by removing	22	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Thank you.
23	diesel as a fuel source.	23	This may be to counsel settling party's
24	In addition, it does have the side benefit	24	counsel.
25	of decreasing greenhouse gases. So when you look at	25	The settlement provides that the settling
	- 424		
	Page 434		Page 436
1		1	
1 2	this project, although that wasn't part of the	1 2	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to
	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project		parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph
2	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of	2	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover
2 3	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it.	2 3	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph
2 3 4	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's	2 3 4	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review.
2 3 4 5	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this	2 3 4 5	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject
2 3 4 5 6	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the	2 3 4 5 6	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through	2 3 4 5 6 7	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to pose that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So okay. And in the timeline sort of continuing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to pose that. Does that sound good to you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So okay. And in the timeline sort of continuing when equity was introduced into the equation, if we say	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to pose that. Does that sound good to you? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's perfectly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So okay. And in the timeline sort of continuing when equity was introduced into the equation, if we say that it's, you know, now on a multiyear rate plan case,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to pose that. Does that sound good to you? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's perfectly reasonably. Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So okay. And in the timeline sort of continuing when equity was introduced into the equation, if we say that it's, you know, now on a multiyear rate plan case, looking at equities sort of going forward, what does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to pose that. Does that sound good to you? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's perfectly reasonably. Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So okay. And in the timeline sort of continuing when equity was introduced into the equation, if we say that it's, you know, now on a multiyear rate plan case, looking at equities sort of going forward, what does that look like to you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to pose that. Does that sound good to you? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's perfectly reasonably. Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. CARSON: Can I take a stab at addressing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So okay. And in the timeline sort of continuing when equity was introduced into the equation, if we say that it's, you know, now on a multiyear rate plan case, looking at equities sort of going forward, what does that look like to you? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I would lead with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to pose that. Does that sound good to you? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's perfectly reasonably. Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. CARSON: Can I take a stab at addressing it, that question? Not from a legal standpoint.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So okay. And in the timeline sort of continuing when equity was introduced into the equation, if we say that it's, you know, now on a multiyear rate plan case, looking at equities sort of going forward, what does that look like to you? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I would lead with what Mr. Roberts just concluded with, which was the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to pose that. Does that sound good to you? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's perfectly reasonably. Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. CARSON: Can I take a stab at addressing it, that question? Not from a legal standpoint. Basically, Tacoma LNG costs will go into a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this project, although that wasn't part of the decision-making in 2016 to 2018 when this project was moved forward, it certainly has the components of equity into it. I think every environmental agency that's been involved in the permitting has recognized that this facility has environmental benefits. The EIS that the City of Tacoma did is a great example. It runs through many components that would be found in an equity kind of a look. Air quality, water quality, fish habitat, water issues, cleanup of an existing Brownfield site, you can go through most of what's in an EIS, including socioeconomic impacts. A lot of the information contained in the EIS that the City of Tacoma did would back that up as well as being a very solid project on that front. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So okay. And in the timeline sort of continuing when equity was introduced into the equation, if we say that it's, you know, now on a multiyear rate plan case, looking at equities sort of going forward, what does that look like to you? MR. PILIARIS: I guess I would lead with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	parties accept a determination that PSE's decision to build the facility was prudent, and that's at paragraph 18(B). The settling parties agree that PSE may recover the cost of the facility on a provisional basis subject to later review. If the Commission accepts this settlement, do the settling parties object to the Commission delaying a prudency determination until a later proceeding, such as the company's 2023 purchased gas adjustment filing when the plant is in service for core gas customers? JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Doumit, I hate to jump in. But I might suggest we save those questions for after we conclude with calling witnesses. And we and time permitting, we have closing arguments from counsel. And that would be, I think, the ideal time to pose that. Does that sound good to you? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's perfectly reasonably. Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. MS. CARSON: Can I take a stab at addressing it, that question? Not from a legal standpoint.

49 (Pages 433 to 436)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

Page 437Page1filing, as you mentioned, which would be effective1the revenue requirement settlement. So that is2November 1, 2023. The prudence review wouldn't be until1the revenue requirement settlement. So that is3the end of that year when the true-up is happening for3Is that something that the company can4the following year.3Is that something that the company can5So at that point the opportunity is there to5MS. FREE: Yes, that is something we can6challenge costs by any of the parties and the prudence6include.7of the costs.7I will just clarify you covered it, but8COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8I'll just clarify, the distribution plant is in the main9No further questions at this time. I'll9settlement. The LNG facility costs are in the will10wait until we have a chance to address counsel.11for each of those.11Thanks, Your Honor.11of these.
 November 1, 2023. The prudence review wouldn't be until the end of that year when the true-up is happening for the following year. So at that point the opportunity is there to challenge costs by any of the parties and the prudence of the costs. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you. No further questions at this time. I'll wait until we have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. So would have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor.
3the end of that year when the true-up is happening for the following year.3Is that something that the company can include in the workpapers and the bench request?5So at that point the opportunity is there to challenge costs by any of the parties and the prudence of the costs.5MS. FREE: Yes, that is something we can include.7of the costs.7I will just clarify you covered it, but8COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8I'll just clarify, the distribution plant is in the main settlement. The LNG facility costs are in the will10wait until we have a chance to address counsel.10be in the tracker. And we will provide FERC accounts 1111Thanks, Your Honor.11for each of those.
4the following year.4include in the workpapers and the bench request?5So at that point the opportunity is there to5MS. FREE: Yes, that is something we can6challenge costs by any of the parties and the prudence6include.7of the costs.7I will just clarify you covered it, but8COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8I'll just clarify, the distribution plant is in the main9No further questions at this time. I'll9settlement. The LNG facility costs are in the will10wait until we have a chance to address counsel.10be in the tracker. And we will provide FERC accounts11Thanks, Your Honor.11for each of those.
5So at that point the opportunity is there to challenge costs by any of the parties and the prudence of the costs.5MS. FREE: Yes, that is something we can include.7of the costs.7I will just clarify you covered it, but8COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8I'll just clarify, the distribution plant is in the main9No further questions at this time. I'll9settlement. The LNG facility costs are in the will10wait until we have a chance to address counsel.10be in the tracker. And we will provide FERC accounts11Thanks, Your Honor.11for each of those.
 challenge costs by any of the parties and the prudence of the costs. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you. No further questions at this time. I'll wait until we have a chance to address counsel. Thanks, Your Honor. include. include. I will just clarify you covered it, but I'll just clarify, the distribution plant is in the main settlement. The LNG facility costs are in the will be in the tracker. And we will provide FERC accounts for each of those.
7of the costs.7I will just clarify you covered it, but8COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.8I'll just clarify, the distribution plant is in the main9No further questions at this time. I'll9settlement. The LNG facility costs are in the will10wait until we have a chance to address counsel.10be in the tracker. And we will provide FERC accounts11Thanks, Your Honor.11for each of those.
8 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you. 8 I'll just clarify, the distribution plant is in the main 9 No further questions at this time. I'll 9 settlement. The LNG facility costs are in the will 10 wait until we have a chance to address counsel. 10 be in the tracker. And we will provide FERC accounts 11 Thanks, Your Honor. 11 for each of those.
9No further questions at this time. I'll9settlement. The LNG facility costs are in the will10wait until we have a chance to address counsel.10be in the tracker. And we will provide FERC accounts11Thanks, Your Honor.11for each of those.
10wait until we have a chance to address counsel.10be in the tracker. And we will provide FERC accounts11Thanks, Your Honor.11for each of those.
11Thanks, Your Honor.11for each of those.
12 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. Okay. Tha
13 Do we have any further questions from the 13 you.
14 bench? 14 So we will provide this in in the written
15 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: This is Commissioner 15 request, but I just wanted to let you know what we would
16 Rendahl and I had deferred some questions about the 16 be requesting.
17 calculations of what is in what is included in the 17 MS. FREE: I appreciate that additional
18 revenue requirement for LNG. And I think I was 18 clarity. Thank you.
19 discussing this with witness Susan Free. 19 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you
20 And the question has to do with what is in 20 much. That's all I have, Your Honor.
21 the revenue requirement for the LNG plant as opposed to 21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
22 what is in the tracker? 22 Any further bench questions for this panel?
23 And so I guess maybe the question is 23 CHAIR DANNER: I have none. Thank you.
 is this something that would be included in the response 24 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor.
25 to the bench request, the workpapers, or is this 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. I
Page 438 Page
1 something that I should be asking separately? 1 would like to thank the witnesses for their testimony
2 MS. FREE: So this is Susan Free for PSE. 2 You may turn off your cameras.
³ Page 6 of the LNG settlement provides a table of the ³ If you have not I assume PSE will keep
4 amount of revenue requirement that was removed from the 4 their camera on because they are in one room.
5 main settlement, as well as an estimate of what will be 5 We'll now turn to the individual witnesses.
6 put into the tracker in November of 2023. 6 No party indicated any cross for Public
7 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And are the 7 Counsel witnesses Shay Bauman and Stephanie C
8 mechanics of this beyond what's in this table, will that 8 Andrea Crane, Robert Earle, David Garrett, Glenn
9 be included in the workpapers? 9 Watkins, or J. Randall Woolridge.
10 MS. FREE: The workpapers have support 10 Do we have any question from the bench for
11 there are supporting workpapers that support this table. 11 Public Counsel's witnesses?
12 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And will the 12 Hearing none.
13 supporting workpapers identify which FERC accounts in 13 No party indicated cross for the Puyallup
14 which the company would classify the plants, 14 Tribe's witnesses, Dr. Ranajit Sahu and I apologi
15 different aspects of the plants? 15 if I'm not saying that correctly or Gary Saleba.
16 MS. FREE: Yes. I do believe they do as 16 Do we have any questions from the bench f
17 they are currently put together. If not, we will ensure 17 these witnesses?
18that we do. By the time we file the bench request.18COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No.
19 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Then I would this 19 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none
20 may be a supplemental bench request, and I will 20 Lastly, no party indicated cross for CENSE
21 obviously include this in writing. But I would like to 21 witnesses, Norm Hansen and Richard Lauckhart.
22 have PSE, when it provides the workpapers, identify by 22 Do we have any questions from the bench f
23 FERC account all plant that will be included in the 23 these witnesses?
tracker, all distribution plants that is included in the 24 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Hone
25 tracker, and all distribution plants that is included in 25 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, Your Ho

50 (Pages 437 to 440)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	D 441		D 442
	Page 441		Page 443
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. It appears we do not	1	In terms of offering these statements about
2	have any further questions.	2	the settlements, are we talking about each one
3	So now we would turn to closing arguments.	3	separately; so 10 minutes for the Green Direct
4	It is 2:55 p.m. As I explained, we are	4	settlement, 10 minutes for the LNG settlement, and ten
5	going to allow the parties an opportunity to provide	5	minutes for the revenue requirement settlement?
6	oral closing arguments today. It does appear that we	6	I'm asking because Public Counsel is a party
7	have time for this.	7	to the Green Direct settlement but not the other two.
8	I ask the settling parties to limit	8	And then we have different positions on each one of
9	themselves to one joint closing argument for each of the	9	those. And so I'm wondering what's is the universe of
10	three settlements and to limit each closing to ten	10	the ten minutes.
11	minutes this.	11	JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. That's a fair
12	This means we would have the settling	12	question. I think if we if we were to do all this
13	parties at their option, could provide an oral	13	very precisely, I'd have to make a chart.
14	closing in support of each of the three multi-party	14	I'm I'm picturing there would be three
15	settlements and they would be 10 minutes total.	15	joint oral closing arguments in one in support of
16	Before I go further, Mr. Thomas, I see you	16	each of the three settlements. I recognize that Public
17	have your hand back up.	17	Counsel has joined one of them.
18	MR. THOMAS: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.	18	And then any party that has opposed any
19	Just very briefly, I was wondering if it would be okay	19	aspect of the settlement can provide an oral closing
20	with Your Honor if Dr. Sahu and Mr. Saleba were excuse	20	that I would request be limited to ten minutes, and they
21	at this time?	21	can address any topics within their purview during their
22	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.	22	ten minutes. Whether it's multiple settlements or what.
23	MR. THOMAS: Thank you.	23	MS. GAFKEN: Okay. That's what I was
24	CHAIR DANNER: And, Your Honor, if I may.	24	envisioning coming into the hearing. So thank you for
25	Would it be possible for us to take a	25	that clarification.
	Page 442		Page 444
1	five-minute break and come back here at three o'clock?	1	MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I can provide
2	JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Let's take a	2	my understanding and others can correct me if I'm
3	five-minute break and return at three. We are off the	3	wrong about how we were going to do the joint
4	record. And we'll resume with closings after the break.	4	statements.
5	(A break was taken from	5	I believe for the main revenue requirement
6	2:57 p.m. To 3:01 p.m.)	6	settlement there were four parties who were going to
7	JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.	7	speak. PSE on certain issues, revenue requirement and
8	The time is 3:02 p.m.	8	Energize Eastside staff on equity, The Energy Project on
9	As I was saying, we will allow the	9	low income, and the joint environmental advocates on
10	parties the settling parties, we join each of the	10	decarbonization-related issues. And I'll stop. If I'm
11	three settlements to provide a joint closing statement.	11	wrong, others can correct me, but that was my
12	That could mean we have up to three closing oral	12	understanding.
13	closing arguments in support of each of the three	13	JUDGE HOWARD: It does sound like that may
14	settlements. And then I will allow each of the parties	14	be the parties' understanding. I'm not hearing any
15	in opposition to the settlements, which will be Public	15	responses to that and would the total time for the
16	Counsel, the Puyallup Tribe, CENSE, and The Energy	16	revenue requirement settlement be roughly ten minutes or
17	Project on certain issues, to provide any oral closing	17	under under 15 or 20.
18	argument they would like. Also also requesting that	18	We could be here, theoretically, the entire
19	those are limited to ten minutes each.	19	rest of the afternoon. And
20	So would have the settling parties	20	MS. CARSON: Yeah. It might exceed ten by a
21	discussed who would go first or how they would like to	21	little bit. So it might be 15 or so. I'm also happy to
22	present?	22	say my understanding of Green Direct I know Public
	Ms. Gafken?	23	Counsel wanted to speak on that. PSE can also speak to
23			
	MS. GAFKEN: I have a question more than	24	that, and I'm not sure who else wants to speak to that.
23		24 25	that, and I'm not sure who else wants to speak to that. Perhaps Ben, King County.

51 (Pages 441 to 444)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

,	Page 445	Page	447
1	MR. MAYER: Yes, that's correct. King	1 PSE serves a wide swath of customers who	
2	County will speak briefly to the Green Direct settlement	2 have varying interests and concerns. But PSE recog	nizes
3	as well.	3 that a segment of its customers live on fixed incomes	
4	MS. CARSON: And then my understanding on	4 and face difficult financial times coming out of the	
5	Tacoma LNG settlement was that AWEC, Sommer Moser would	5 pandemic.	
6	speak, I would speak, and I believe Staff is going to.	6 At the same time, studies show that	
7	Although, I'm not sure about that.	7 approximately 86 percent of PSE's customers are not	
8	MR. ROBERSON: Staff intends to offer some	8 energy burdened and many of these customers want	PSE to
9	argument.	9 move faster into clean energy, decarbonization, and	
10	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Why don't we	10 improved reliability.	
11	begin with the revenue requirement settlement. It	11 PSE constantly works to balance these	
12	sounds like the company would present first is what I'm	12 competing interests. But one thing is for sure, PSE	
13	implying inferring.	13 will continue to work to provide for the energy security	,
14	So why don't we begin with that. We'll go	14 for its low income and vulnerable populations. The	
15	through the statements in support of the revenue	15 settlement will expand bill assistance channels and	
16	requirement summary, and we'll just try to do it in	16 increase funding amounts for these customers in	
17	relatively short order.	17 financial need.	
18	MS. CARSON: Great. Shall I proceed?	18 PSE has invested more than 2 billion in	
19	JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed.	19 plant that already today is providing safe and reliable	
20	CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. CARSON FOR PSE	20 service to PSE customers, although PSE is not yet	
21	MS. CARSON: All right. Thank you.	recovering end rates for this significant investment.	
22	Thank you, Your Honor; thank you,	And PSE will invest another 2 billion by the end of the	
23	Commissioners, for the opportunity to present our	23 rate plan.	
24	settlements here and these closing statements as well.	²⁴ The settlement allows PSE to recover	
25	As I said, we've divided up the issues,	²⁵ investments made and to be made over the rate plan	
	Page 446	Page	448
1	Page 446 revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will	Page 1 including technology investments to enhance	448
1 2			448
	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will	1 including technology investments to enhance	448
2	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, 	
2 3	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline 	
2 3 4	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure 	
2 3 4 5	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE.	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructur just to name a few. 	e,
2 3 4 5 6	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation,	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructur just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and 	e, nd
2 3 4 5 6 7	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructur just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a 	e, nd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructur just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and extended 	e, nd energy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructur just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely 	e, nd mergy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago.	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructur just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructur just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely updates to power cost rates helps to ensure that PSE has	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity level from 48.5 percent to 49 percent, which is less than PSE had requested. Along with other parts of the settlement, 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely updates to power cost rates helps to ensure that PSE has the financial health to provide safe and reliable	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity level from 48.5 percent to 49 percent, which is less than PSE had requested. 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely updates to power cost rates helps to ensure that PSE has the financial health to provide safe and reliable service as we move deeper into the clean energy	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity level from 48.5 percent to 49 percent, which is less than PSE had requested. Along with other parts of the settlement, 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely updates to power cost rates helps to ensure that PSE has the financial health to provide safe and reliable service as we move deeper into the clean energy transformation.	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity level from 48.5 percent to 49 percent, which is less than PSE had requested. Along with other parts of the settlement, these costs to capital provisions will allow PSE to 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely updates to power cost rates helps to ensure that PSE has the financial health to provide safe and reliable service as we move deeper into the clean energy transformation. It is important to realize there are several	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructur just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity level from 48.5 percent to 49 percent, which is less than PSE had requested. Along with other parts of the settlement, these costs to capital provisions will allow PSE to improve its cash flow and strengthen its financial 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely updates to power cost rates helps to ensure that PSE has the financial health to provide safe and reliable service as we move deeper into the clean energy transformation. It is important to realize there are several customer safeguards built into the settlement and	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructur just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity level from 48.5 percent to 49 percent, which is less than PSE had requested. Along with other parts of the settlement, these costs to capital provisions will allow PSE to improve its cash flow and strengthen its financial health and credit profile. 	e, nd energy E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely updates to power cost rates helps to ensure that PSE has the financial health to provide safe and reliable service as we move deeper into the clean energy transformation. It is important to realize there are several customer safeguards built into the settlement and multiyear rate plan that PSE filed.	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity level from 48.5 percent to 49 percent, which is less than PSE had requested. Along with other parts of the settlement, these costs to capital provisions will allow PSE to improve its cash flow and strengthen its financial health and credit profile. 	e, nd energy E. S And /
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely updates to power cost rates helps to ensure that PSE has the financial health to provide safe and reliable service as we move deeper into the clean energy transformation. It is important to realize there are several customer safeguards built into the settlement and multiyear rate plan that PSE filed. First of all, there are enhanced financial	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity level from 48.5 percent to 49 percent, which is less than PSE had requested. Along with other parts of the settlement, these costs to capital provisions will allow PSE to improve its cash flow and strengthen its financial health and credit profile. And significantly, PSE's weighted average cost of capital resulting from the settlement will be 	e, nd energy E. S And /
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	revenue requirement and Energize Eastside I will address, staff on equity, The Energy Project on low income issues, and Joint Environmental Advocates on decarbonization issues. But I want to make clear that all of these topics are important to PSE. The clean energy transformation, decarbonization, and incorporation of equitable principles into the public interest standard, these all make the landscape of the utility industry quite different than it was even a decade ago. If the State of Washington is to deliver on the aggressive clean energy policies, utilities like PSE that play a key role must be financially healthy. The agreed-upon revenue requirement and provision for timely updates to power cost rates helps to ensure that PSE has the financial health to provide safe and reliable service as we move deeper into the clean energy transformation. It is important to realize there are several customer safeguards built into the settlement and multiyear rate plan that PSE filed. First of all, there are enhanced financial assistance programs, there is the earning share	 including technology investments to enhance cybersecurity, several major infrastructure projects, and investments in grid modernization, pipeline modernization, and advanced metering infrastructure just to name a few. The settlement provides for recovery and rates of new and extended hydroelectric contracts a PPAs for wind energy and firm hydro capacity and e during summer peak hours and it allows for timely updates to power costs. These are important to PS It's important to note that PSE compromised significantly on its requested return on equity. It has agreed to maintain its current ROE of 9.4 percent. the parties agree to a slight increase in PSE's equity level from 48.5 percent to 49 percent, which is less than PSE had requested. Along with other parts of the settlement, these costs to capital provisions will allow PSE to improve its cash flow and strengthen its financial health and credit profile. And significantly, PSE's weighted average cost of capital resulting from the settlement will be lower than it has been for more than a decade, which 	e, nd energy E. S And /

52 (Pages 445 to 448)

,	Page 449	Page 45	1
1	requirement in 2023 and 2024 is the Energize Eastside	1 the equity terms in the settlement.	
2	transmission project that addresses a transmission	2 The legislature has, in recent years,	
3	deficiency on the east side of Lake Washington by	3 repeatedly emphasized as Mr. Piliaris noted not that	
4	upgrading an existing 115 kV transmission line to	4 long ago equity into terms of utility operations.	
5	230 kV.	5 There are four terms in this settlement	
6	The settling parties agree to a threshold	6 that in the Commission's words "apply an equity	
7	prudence determination; in other words, agree that a	7 lens," end quote, to PSE's operations.	
8	showing of need and consideration of alternatives has	8 The first of these is the corporate capital	
9	been met sufficient to allow the project into rates	9 planning term. That term does two things.	
10	subject to refund in 2023 and 2024.	10 The first is that it requires PSE to make a	
11	Parties will be able to review the prudence	11 compliance compliance filing showing that it has	
12	of Energize Eastside cost and subsequent compliance	12 processes and methods for its board and senior	
13	filing. The only party that opposes this important and	13 management to considerable equitable outcomes across th	е
14	necessary project is CENSE which is comprised of	14 enterprise-wide planning process.	
15	affluent neighborhood groups, many of which built homes	15 The second thing is that it requires PSE to	
16	around an existing transmission line and now oppose its	16 develop corporate spending authorizations that require	
17	upgrade.	17 project and program sponsors to consider the equitable	
18	The record demonstrates that today there is	18 distribution of burdens and benefits in programs.	
19	currently a transmission deficiency that justifies the	19The second important term is the delivering	
20	need for the project.	20 distribution planning provision. That also requires two	
21	In addition to PSE's own transmission	21 things.	
22	planning studies and third-party studies of need and	22 The first is that it requires PSE to solicit	
23	alternatives, that need has been shown through the	23 feedback from interested persons in order to perform	
24	environmental impact the EIS process, conditional use	24 distributions in planning and coordination with its	
25	permits for the City of Bellevue and Newcastle, as well	25 clean energy implementation plan process. And the goal	
	Page 450	Page 45	2
1	as other studies.	1 of that distribution planning distribution system	
2	PSE witness Mr. Koch has testified to the	2 plan is identifying ways of customer cited that	
3	problems with analysis by Mr. Lauckhart. That's in his	3 customer cited resources can be used to generate value	;
4	testimony. There are several fails to stress the	4 for other PSE customers and ways to equitably distribute	Э
5	electric system as required by federal standards. He	5 benefits and burdens to vulnerable populations and to	
6	studied only one contingency versus the thousands that	6 highly impacted communities.	
7	are required to be studied and he uses incorrect load	7 The second thing that PSE must do is it must	
8	growth for the eastside area.	8 create equity-related benefits for its investment	
9	CENSE's study and testimony have been	9 optimization software. Currently uses something called	
10	reviewed in permitting proceedings and have been found	10 "iDot," but it's moving to something else. Whatever it	
11	to be not credible. The Energize Eastside Project will	11 is using, it must create these equity-related benefits	
12 13	improve liability for customers and communities on the	 12 and then incorporate those benefits and costs or its 13 benefits and costs into the planning process. 	
	and aide of Lake Weehington increase consein as		
1/	east side of Lake Washington, increase capacity as		
14 15	growth and development continue, including increased	14 Again, it has to consult with groups before	
15	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency	14Again, it has to consult with groups before15creating these benefits and costs and the settlement	
15 16	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency that has been present for five of the last six summers.	14Again, it has to consult with groups before15creating these benefits and costs and the settlement16specifically identifies its equity group, its equity	
15 16 17	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency that has been present for five of the last six summers. For these reasons, PSE respectfully requests	 Again, it has to consult with groups before creating these benefits and costs and the settlement specifically identifies its equity group, its equity advisor group and then members of highly impacted 	
15 16	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency that has been present for five of the last six summers.	 Again, it has to consult with groups before creating these benefits and costs and the settlement specifically identifies its equity group, its equity advisor group and then members of highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations. 	
15 16 17 18 19	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency that has been present for five of the last six summers. For these reasons, PSE respectfully requests that the Commission approve the revenue requirement settlement without conditions.	 Again, it has to consult with groups before creating these benefits and costs and the settlement specifically identifies its equity group, its equity advisor group and then members of highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations. The third term is the distributional equity 	
15 16 17 18	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency that has been present for five of the last six summers. For these reasons, PSE respectfully requests that the Commission approve the revenue requirement settlement without conditions. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	 Again, it has to consult with groups before creating these benefits and costs and the settlement specifically identifies its equity group, its equity advisor group and then members of highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations. The third term is the distributional equity analysis. This term requires PSE to come up with 	
15 16 17 18 19 20	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency that has been present for five of the last six summers. For these reasons, PSE respectfully requests that the Commission approve the revenue requirement settlement without conditions.	 Again, it has to consult with groups before creating these benefits and costs and the settlement specifically identifies its equity group, its equity advisor group and then members of highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations. The third term is the distributional equity analysis. This term requires PSE to come up with methods and processes for distribution equity 	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency that has been present for five of the last six summers. For these reasons, PSE respectfully requests that the Commission approve the revenue requirement settlement without conditions. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from staff in support of the	 Again, it has to consult with groups before creating these benefits and costs and the settlement specifically identifies its equity group, its equity advisor group and then members of highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations. The third term is the distributional equity analysis. This term requires PSE to come up with methods and processes for distribution equity 	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency that has been present for five of the last six summers. For these reasons, PSE respectfully requests that the Commission approve the revenue requirement settlement without conditions. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from staff in support of the settlement?	14Again, it has to consult with groups before15creating these benefits and costs and the settlement16specifically identifies its equity group, its equity17advisor group and then members of highly impacted18communities and vulnerable populations.19The third term is the distributional equity20analysis. This term requires PSE to come up with21methods and processes for distribution equity22analysis distributional equity analysis. It then has	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	growth and development continue, including increased electrification and address a transmission deficiency that has been present for five of the last six summers. For these reasons, PSE respectfully requests that the Commission approve the revenue requirement settlement without conditions. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from staff in support of the settlement? CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MR. ROBERSON	 Again, it has to consult with groups before creating these benefits and costs and the settlement specifically identifies its equity group, its equity advisor group and then members of highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations. The third term is the distributional equity analysis. This term requires PSE to come up with methods and processes for distribution equity analysis distributional equity analysis. It then has to apply those methods and processes to, I believe it is 	

53 (Pages 449 to 452)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

~	Page 453		Page 455
1	that DER.	1	about one minute, if I may.
2	Once it does that, it will participate in	2	JUDGE HOWARD: That sounds great.
3	what's in the settlement described as a staff-led	3	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MR. ZAKAI
4	process, I understand from Commissioner Doumit, that	4	MR. ZAKAI: Thank you.
5	perhaps the Commission will impose a condition. But as	5	Judge Howard, Commissioners, there are
6	currently written, it is a staff-led process to refine	6	multiple provisions in the revenue requirement
7	those methods.	7	settlement specifically designed to assist low income
8	At the end of that process, it would present	8	customers and vulnerable populations and otherwise
9	the methods and processes to the Commission for	9	promote equity. I would like to highlight three of
10	approval. Once the Commission does that, it would apply	10	these now.
11	those methods and processes to the corporate capital	11	First, the settlement paves the way for PSE
12	planning and delivery and distribution system planning	12	and its low income advisory group to develop and
13	that it does.	13	implement a five-tier bill discount and to establish
14	And then the final term at which is not like	14	arrearage management programs. The combination of these
15	a process, but the the settlement requires PSE to	15	shows promise as a cornerstone strategy to reduce
16	report a number of metrics related to equity. Things	16	household energy insecurity and retain access to
17	that impact highly impacted communities or vulnerable	17	essential utility service for low income customers in
18	populations, like the use of AMI in those communities or	18	Washington.
19	how many members of those communities participate in DR,	19	Second, the settlement will increase
20	DER, renewable programs, things like that.	20	weatherization measure incentive amounts, which will
21	The settlement was drafted before the	21	allow low income weatherization programs to provide more
22	Commission issued guidance on equity in the 2021 Cascade	22	customer benefits and serve more customers. The
23	GRC order that it entered not that long ago. But these	23	settlement also affirms PSE's commitments to baseline
24	terms in the settlement are fully consistent with the	24	low income weatherization funding.
25	Commission's description of energy justice and its four	25	Finally, the time varying rates pilot and
	- 454	1	
	Page 454		Page 456
1	Page 454 core tenets. Many of those terms focus on	1	Page 456 targeted electrification program include low income
1 2		1 2	
	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on		targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy
2	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to	2	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low
2 3	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of	2 3	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy
2 3 4	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they	2 3 4 5 6	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2 3 4 5	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable	2 3 4 5	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in
2 3 4 5 6	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their	2 3 4 5 6	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public interest in that they center equity in PSE's operations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners. And the joint environmental advocates urge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public interest in that they center equity in PSE's operations. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners. And the joint environmental advocates urge you to approve the revenue requirement stipulation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public interest in that they center equity in PSE's operations. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners. And the joint environmental advocates urge you to approve the revenue requirement stipulation. This settlement would put into effect innovative changes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public interest in that they center equity in PSE's operations. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Roberson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners. And the joint environmental advocates urge you to approve the revenue requirement stipulation. This settlement would put into effect innovative changes to encourage decarbonization of PSE's utility service in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public interest in that they center equity in PSE's operations. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Did another settling party wish to speak in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners. And the joint environmental advocates urge you to approve the revenue requirement stipulation. This settlement would put into effect innovative changes to encourage decarbonization of PSE's utility service in a manner that centers equity and prioritizes cost
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public interest in that they center equity in PSE's operations. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Did another settling party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners. And the joint environmental advocates urge you to approve the revenue requirement stipulation. This settlement would put into effect innovative changes to encourage decarbonization of PSE's utility service in a manner that centers equity and prioritizes cost efficacy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public interest in that they center equity in PSE's operations. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Did another settling party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement? MR. ZAKAI: Yes, Your Honor, this is Yochi	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners. And the joint environmental advocates urge you to approve the revenue requirement stipulation. This settlement would put into effect innovative changes to encourage decarbonization of PSE's utility service in a manner that centers equity and prioritizes cost efficacy. This agreement phases out costly subsidies
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public interest in that they center equity in PSE's operations. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Did another settling party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement? MR. ZAKAI: Yes, Your Honor, this is Yochi Zakai with The Energy Project.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners. And the joint environmental advocates urge you to approve the revenue requirement stipulation. This settlement would put into effect innovative changes to encourage decarbonization of PSE's utility service in a manner that centers equity and prioritizes cost efficacy. This agreement phases out costly subsidies to promote fossil gas customer growth through the line
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	core tenets. Many of those terms focus on distributional justice and that they require PSE to consider how to distribute the benefits and burdens of its operations equitably. The terms are also consistent with procedural and recognitional justice in that they require PSE to work with members of vulnerable populations or highly impacted communities or their representatives in various processes which kind of implicitly recognizes the exclusion of those groups from these processes. So in summary, the Commission should approve the settlement because one of the one of the key criteria for approving a settlement under Senate Bill 5295 is equity that's used to determine the public interest and these terms are very much in the public interest in that they center equity in PSE's operations. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Did another settling party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement? MR. ZAKAI: Yes, Your Honor, this is Yochi	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	targeted electrification program include low income customer protections and will prioritize serving low income customers and named communities. The Energy Project urges the Commission to accept the revenue requirement settlement in full. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Did we have any other party wish to speak in support of the revenue requirement settlement before we move to either Tacoma LNG or Green Direct? MS. PAREKH: Yes, Your Honor. The joint environmental advocates would like to address the commission this afternoon. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. PAREKH MS. PAREKH: Thank you for this opportunity, Commissioners. And the joint environmental advocates urge you to approve the revenue requirement stipulation. This settlement would put into effect innovative changes to encourage decarbonization of PSE's utility service in a manner that centers equity and prioritizes cost efficacy. This agreement phases out costly subsidies

54 (Pages 453 to 456)

	Page 457	Page 459
1	encourage cost effective electrification for homes and	1 Who would like to speak first in support of
2	businesses.	2 the Green Direct settlement?
3	This agreement would also develop an	3 MS. CARSON: I'm happy to or if Public
4	electrification pilot that will roll out to 10,000	4 Counsel wants to speak first, that's fine, too. Or
5	existing residential and small commercial gas utility	5 Staff. Either is fine.
6	customers. That pilot will help those customers to	6 JUDGE HOWARD: Feel free to start when you
7	transition away from gas utility service. And findings	7 are ready.
8	from this pilot alone, with a revised decarbonization	8 CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. CARSON
9	study that corrects that includes revised findings	9 MS. CARSON: All right. PSE respectfully
10	regarding cold climate heat pumps and the benefits of	10 requests that the Commission approve the Green Direct
11	those heat pumps for decarbonization will be used to	11 settlement stipulation without conditions.
12	develop a comprehensive long-term electrification	12 This settlement stipulation is in the public
13	strategy for gas customers and PSE in PSE's service	13 interest because it resolves issues that have been
14	territory.	14 percolating in PSE cases for the past few years
15	The this settlement would also adopt	15 regarding PSE's voluntary long-term renewable energy
16	incentives and rebates that would encourage customers to	16 purchase writer under schedule 139 of PSE's tariff which
17	electrify. And it would integrate electrification into	17 is also known as "Green Direct."
18	the biennial conservation planning process and energy	18 The settlement in this case was reached by
19	efficiency programming.	19 parties with diverse perspectives, Commission Staff,
20	These changes collectively will	20 Public Counsel, who represents non-Green Direct
21	significantly reduce GHG emissions from residential and	21 customers, and then Walmart and King County, who
22	small commercial energy use within PSE service	22 represent who are Green Direct customers, as well as
23	territory. And we believe that this settlement could be	23 PSE. And no party objects to this settlement.
24	seen as as an innovative policy in across the	24 The need to reach a durable method
25	nation.	25 methodology for calculating the energy credit for Green
	Page 458	Page 460
1	Throughout this process, additionally, PSE	1 Direct customers was an issue in PSE's 2020 PCORC. The
2	must prioritize low-income customers highly impacted in	2 parties to that case reached a settlement that addressed
3	vulnerable communities and communities experiencing	 several issues relating to PSE's Green Direct including
4	energy burden. In this way, it it centers	4 establishing a methodology for calculating the energy
5	equity through this electrification process.	 credit for Green Direct customers. But there was also
6	This will also enable PSE to meet its	 recognition of the need to pursue a path forward on a
7	commitment under the Climate Commitment Act in a	7 durable method for calculating this.
8	cost-effective manner by reducing the demand for fossil	8 Some customers who were not parties to the
9	gas.	 2020 PCORC had concerns about the methodology that was
10	And the last thing I'll note is that we	10 approved in the 2020 PCORC and they spoke out at the
11	in addition to these changes and benefits in the	11 public comment hearing. And in the 2020 order approving
12	decarbonization program, we also agree to more than	12 the PCORC settlement, the Commission set an expectation
13	double the company's target for acquiring demand	13 that PSE would encourage its Green Direct customers to
14	response resources and the settlement makes clear that	14 participate in future discussions on the Green Direct
15	life-extending costs for the Colstrip facility are not	15 credit.
16	recoverable from ratepayers.	16 So the parties to the 2020 PCORC did
17	Thank you for your consideration.	17 engage in collaborative discussions and Green Direct
18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	18 customers who had not participated in the PCORC case did
19	Were there any other statements in support	19 join these discussions. Good progress was made, but no
20	of the revenue requirement settlement?	 20 resolution was reached by the time PSE filed this case.
21	All right. Hearing none. Let's turn	21 And so the procedural schedule in this case
22	next I don't have strong opinions about whether we	22 noted that there would be early Green Direct settlement
23	turn to the Tacoma LNG or the Green Direct settlement	23 conference, which was held. And ultimately, we reached
24	next.	24 this settlement.
25	Why don't we go to Green Direct.	25 From PSE's perspective, the settlement is in

55 (Pages 457 to 460)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

,	Page 461		Page 463
1		1	
1	the public interest because it does provide a durable	1	Commission Staff. Although the collaborative did not
2	method for calculating the energy credit for Green	2	result in an agreement before PSE filed its rate case,
3	Direct customers, thus avoiding the inefficiency of	3	it did provide a solid foundation for rate case parties
4	re-litigating this issue in future cases or at least for	4	to complete the task of developing a durable, fair
5	a while.	5	methodology to calculate the credit received by Green
6	It also represents a balancing of interests	6	Direct customers.
7	on the issue of the energy credit for Green Direct	7	RCW 19.29A.090 subsection 5 Mr. Roberson
8	customers. It's the methodology is agreed to by	8	had the right citation there is very clear that all
9	Green Direct customers, residential customers,	9	costs and benefits be borne by Green Direct subscribers
10	Commission staff, and PSE. And the settlement continues	10	and not be borne by non-subscribers. Not properly
11	to take all steps to make sure that there is no improper	11	allocating costs and benefits can result in
12	subsidizing of the Green Direct program by non-Green	12	non-subscribers subsidizing the Green Direct program,
13	Direct customers.	13	which is not only expressly prohibited by statute but
14	And for these reasons, PSE asks the	14	also unfair to the non-subscriber.
15	Commission to approve the Green Direct settlement	15	During the 2020 PCORC, the issue of
16	without conditions. Thank you.	16	subsidization came up and the issue was resolved through
17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	17	settlement. The settling parties were cognizant that
18	Mr. Roberson?	18	further work was needed to create a durable solution
19	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MR. ROBERSON	19	which brings us to the settlement.
20	MR. ROBERSON: I'll be very brief.	20	The Green Direct settlement presents an
21	Staff largely concurs with everything	21	elegant solution that is easy to calculate and
22	Ms. Carson said. This issue has been around for a	22 23	administer and that is also based on an economic
23 24	while. From staff's perspective, the methodology agreed	23	justification. Non-subscribers should be indifferent to the
24	to amongst the diverse interest here is a better way of ensuring that there is not cross-subsidization between	24	operation of the Green Direct program due to the
23		23	operation of the Green Direct program due to the
	Page 462		Page 464
1	PSE's Green Direct customers and its general ratepayers	1	statute's requirement that all costs and benefits of the
2	as required by RCW 19.29A.0905, I think.	2	program be allocated to Green Direct customers.
3	But there are two other benefits.	3	As Dr. Earle testified in his pre-filed
4	The first is that it provides certainty	4	testimony supporting a settlement, the settlement,
5	for PSE's ratepayers, which is important. The law	5	quote: "Provides a good approximation of the
6	should be stable and predictable. It also avoids the	6	indifference principle mandated by statute," end quote.
7	need for updates. There shouldn't be any need to update	7	The credit should equal the value that the
8	any tariff pages. There should be no approximately	8	Green Direct PPAs provide to the system. There is no
9	upcoming cases about this. And that should reduce the	9	one right answer to how to calculate this value, as
10	administrative burden on staff and the Commission. So	10	Dr. Earle explains in his testimony.
11	the Commission should adopt the settlement as in the	11	In this case, approximation of the value
12	public interest.	12	provided by the Green Direct PPAs is fairly
13	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	13	straightforward, or at least it can be. The Green
14	Did Public Counsel wish to speak in favor of	14	Direct PPAs are solar and wind PPAs. It is likely that
15	this?	15	PSE would have entered into similar PPAs if the Green
16	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MS. GAFKEN	16	Direct program did not exist. Therefore, it is
17	MS. GAFKEN: Yes, Your Honor.	17	reasonable to assess the credit at a level approximately
18	Public Counsel asks that the Commission	18	equal to the cost of the Green Direct PPA.
19	approve the Green Direct settlement without condition.	19	I also want to highlight how diligently
20	The settlement is not only the product of negotiations during this rate case, but also several	20	stakeholders address the issues during the collaborative
0.1		21	and that the rate case parties continue discussions in
21		20	
22	collaborative meetings between the time or during the	22	the same vein.
22 23	collaborative meetings between the time or during the time between PSE's 2020 PCORC and this rate case.	23	As a group, as Ms. Carson pointed out, we
22 23 24	collaborative meetings between the time or during the time between PSE's 2020 PCORC and this rate case. Several of PSE's Green Direct customers participated in	23 24	As a group, as Ms. Carson pointed out, we bring different perspectives to the tables. But I do
22 23	collaborative meetings between the time or during the time between PSE's 2020 PCORC and this rate case.	23	As a group, as Ms. Carson pointed out, we

56 (Pages 461 to 464)

	Page 465		Page 467
1	that complies with the law and that fairly calculates	1	settlement.
2	the Green Direct credit. Everyone worked hard to listen	2	Which party would like to speak in favor of
3	to each other and to bring thoughtful ideas forward for	3	that settlement first?
4	discussion. Public Counsel supports the Green Direct	4	MS. MOSER: I'm sorry. Can you hear me?
- 5	settlement and believes it offers a durable solution	5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	that complies with the statute and resolves the issue of	6	MS. MOSER: Okay. I am happy to go in
7	non-subscriber subsidization and also provides Green	7	whatever order, but this is Sommer Moser with AWEC and
8	Direct subscribers with some certainty.	8	I'm also just prepared to speak.
9	In short, I believe that we achieved the	9	JUDGE HOWARD: Right. Now I remember,
10	goal. Thank you.	10	Ms. Carson referring to AWEC speaking in support of this
11	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you,	11	particular settlement.
12	Ms. Gafken.	12	Should Ms. Moser proceed? Does another
13	Did another party wish to speak in support	13	party wish to jump in before or after or should
14	of the Green Direct settlement?	14	Ms. Moser lead here? Go first?
15	MR. MAYER: I do, yes. It is Ben Mayer on	15	MR. THOMAS: Judge Howard, Ms. Carson was
16	behalf of King County. I would like to make a brief	16	just booted off the Zoom call so she's trying to
17	statement.	17	reconnect.
18	JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead.	18	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Was that could you
19	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MR. MAYER	19	give me your name just for the record?
20	MR. MAYER: Thank you, Judge Howard and	20	MR. THOMAS: I'm sorry. It's Ryan Thomas
20	Commissioners.	20	from Perkins Coie.
22	King County supports the Green Direct	22	JUDGE HOWARD: Let's wait a moment, because
23	settlement as a reasonable compromise on	23	Ms. Carson has been delivering the closing arguments for
24	various positions on the Green Direct energy charge	24	PSE so far, let's just wait a moment.
25	credit; a compromise that resulted from a process and	25	Ms. Carson, are you back on the call?
23	cical, a compromise that resulted norm a process and	15	
	Page 466		Page 468
1	discussions, that per the Commission's directive in	1	MS. CARSON: Yes, I got booted off somehow,
2	order five in Docket UE-200980, the PCORC, involved		
2		2	but I believe I'm back. Get my video. Yes. Sorry
3	Green Direct customers, two of whom the County and	2	but I believe I'm back. Get my video. Yes. Sorry about that.
3 4	Green Direct customers, two of whom the County and Walmart have signed on to and directly support the	1	
		3	about that.
4	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the	3 4	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay.
4 5	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here.	3 4 5	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was
4 5 6	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green	3 4 5 6	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or
4 5 6 7	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct	3 4 5 6 7	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement.
4 5 7 8	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also	3 4 5 6 7 8	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way.
4 5 7 8 9	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings. For these reasons for these reasons, the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties. CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. MOSER
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings. For these reasons for these reasons, the County respectfully asks the Commissioners to approve	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties. CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. MOSER MS. MOSER: Great. Good afternoon, Judge
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings. For these reasons for these reasons, the County respectfully asks the Commissioners to approve and adopt the Green Direct settlement in this case.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties. CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. MOSER MS. MOSER: Great. Good afternoon, Judge Howard and Commissioners.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings. For these reasons for these reasons, the County respectfully asks the Commissioners to approve and adopt the Green Direct settlement in this case. Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties. CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. MOSER MS. MOSER: Great. Good afternoon, Judge Howard and Commissioners. My name is Sommer Moser and on behalf of
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings. For these reasons for these reasons, the County respectfully asks the Commissioners to approve and adopt the Green Direct settlement in this case. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties. CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. MOSER MS. MOSER: Great. Good afternoon, Judge Howard and Commissioners. My name is Sommer Moser and on behalf of AWEC, I have just a few brief comments regarding the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings. For these reasons for these reasons, the County respectfully asks the Commissioners to approve and adopt the Green Direct settlement in this case. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would any other party like to speak in favor	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties. CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. MOSER MS. MOSER: Great. Good afternoon, Judge Howard and Commissioners. My name is Sommer Moser and on behalf of AWEC, I have just a few brief comments regarding the settlement stipulation and agreement on Tacoma LNG.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings. For these reasons for these reasons, the County respectfully asks the Commissioners to approve and adopt the Green Direct settlement in this case. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would any other party like to speak in favor of the Green Direct settlement?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties. CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. MOSER MS. MOSER: Great. Good afternoon, Judge Howard and Commissioners. My name is Sommer Moser and on behalf of AWEC, I have just a few brief comments regarding the settlement stipulation and agreement on Tacoma LNG. AWEC's testimony on Tacoma LNG in this case
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings. For these reasons for these reasons, the County respectfully asks the Commissioners to approve and adopt the Green Direct settlement in this case. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would any other party like to speak in favor of the Green Direct settlement? I believe that may have been all.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties. CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. MOSER MS. MOSER: Great. Good afternoon, Judge Howard and Commissioners. My name is Sommer Moser and on behalf of AWEC, I have just a few brief comments regarding the settlement stipulation and agreement on Tacoma LNG. AWEC's testimony on Tacoma LNG in this case was focused on this rate-making treatment for the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Walmart have signed on to and directly support the settlement here. The agreed-upon energy charge credit appropriately recognizes the value of the Green Direct PPAs and ensures that the cost and benefits of the Green Direct program are allocated to Green Direct customers. Importantly, this settlement also establishes predictable and durable approach for calculating the energy charge credit. It will provide the County when budgeting for such things as essential services certainty and eliminate the need for the County to intervene in future rate cases and other Commission proceedings. For these reasons for these reasons, the County respectfully asks the Commissioners to approve and adopt the Green Direct settlement in this case. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would any other party like to speak in favor of the Green Direct settlement?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about that. JUDGE HOWARD: It's okay. Ms. Moser was just indicating that she was prepared to speak in support of the Tacoma LNG settlement. Did PSE prefer to go first on that one or after AWEC? MS. CARSON: I can go either way. Do you prefer to go first, Ms. Moser? I'm happy to go first if you want. MS. MOSER: I have no preference, so that's totally fine. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Moser, why don't you proceed and then we'll hear from the other parties. CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. MOSER MS. MOSER: Great. Good afternoon, Judge Howard and Commissioners. My name is Sommer Moser and on behalf of AWEC, I have just a few brief comments regarding the settlement stipulation and agreement on Tacoma LNG. AWEC's testimony on Tacoma LNG in this case

57 (Pages 465 to 468)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 469		Page 471
1	comments this afternoon.	1	of the settlement?
2	The record in this case demonstrates that	2	CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. CARSON
3	the Tacoma LNG settlement is lawful, supported by an	3	MS. CARSON: Sure. I would be happy to.
4	appropriate record, and consistent with the public	4	Before I get to the LNG settlement, I guess
5	interests in light of all of the information available	5	I want to just look at the bigger picture. I think it
6	to the Commission.	6	is important to recognize that the settlements presented
7	The proposed rate-making treatment of the	7	to the Commission today represent a carefully balanced
8	Tacoma LNG project will also result in rates that are	8	and delicately crafted resolution of complex issues.
9	fair, just, and reasonable and as to the benefit of	9	These were negotiated together; the revenue requirement
10	customers.	10	settlement and the LNG settlement.
11	Cost recovery through a tracker	11	For purposes of making progress, we
12	preserves traditional rate making and that only costs	12	ultimately broke them apart, but there are gives and
13	that are deemed prudent and used and useful as permitted	13	takes between the settlements that I think it's
14	for cost recovery, but also ensures that cost recovery	14	important for the Commission to recognize.
15	is more transparent and follows the principle of cost	15	It's also important to recognize just the
16	causation.	16	background of this case. PSE filed a complex case back
17	Importantly, the settlement explicitly	17	in January 2022. One of the first multiyear rate plans
18	provides that no party waives its right to challenge	18	filed under the new statute.
19	future LNG costs at the point that cost recovery is	19	PSE filed testimony from 37 witnesses, more
20	sought, and that includes PSE's initial filing that will	20	than a dozen parties intervened, and more than 30
21	be concurrent with its 2023 PGA.	21	witnesses ultimately filed intervener testimony.
22	Investments included on a provisional basis	22	The parties had the opportunity to fully
23	will be subject to review and potential refund. This	23	investigate the case and they did.
24	ensures transparency by affording parties ample	24	The exhibits show that PSE responded to over
25	opportunity to review costs and also creates a process	25	1100 data requests over the course of the case.
	Page 470		Page 472
1	through which challenges can be raised resulting in a	1	
1 2	through which challenges can be raised resulting in a tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs	1	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement
1 2 3	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs	1 2 3	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission
2	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered.	2	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a
2 3	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement	2 3	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission
2 3 4	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered.	2 3 4	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony;
2 3 4 5	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales	2 3 4 5	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony.
2 3 4 5 6	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of	2 3 4 5 6	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The
2 3 4 5 6 7	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent	2 3 4 5 6 7	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore the benefits of Tacoma LNG cost-recovery mechanism as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions. In the settlement, the parties accept the determination
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore the benefits of Tacoma LNG cost-recovery mechanism as proposed in the stipulation pursuant to a separate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions. In the settlement, the parties accept the determination that the decision to build the regulated portion of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore the benefits of Tacoma LNG cost-recovery mechanism as proposed in the stipulation pursuant to a separate tracker.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions. In the settlement, the parties accept the determination that the decision to build the regulated portion of the Tacoma LNG facility was prudent and PSE may include its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore the benefits of Tacoma LNG cost-recovery mechanism as proposed in the stipulation pursuant to a separate tracker. So for these reasons, AWEC continues to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions. In the settlement, the parties accept the determination that the decision to build the regulated portion of the Tacoma LNG facility was prudent and PSE may include its investment in rates through a tracker with costs subject
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore the benefits of Tacoma LNG cost-recovery mechanism as proposed in the stipulation pursuant to a separate tracker. So for these reasons, AWEC continues to recommend that the Commission adopt the Tacoma LNG	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions. In the settlement, the parties accept the determination that the decision to build the regulated portion of the Tacoma LNG facility was prudent and PSE may include its investment in rates through a tracker with costs subject to refund and challenge if not prudently incurred.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore the benefits of Tacoma LNG cost-recovery mechanism as proposed in the stipulation pursuant to a separate tracker. So for these reasons, AWEC continues to recommend that the Commission adopt the Tacoma LNG settlement stipulation and agreement as filed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions. In the settlement, the parties accept the determination that the decision to build the regulated portion of the Tacoma LNG facility was prudent and PSE may include its investment in rates through a tracker with costs subject to refund and challenge if not prudently incurred. There is an extensive record in this case
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore the benefits of Tacoma LNG cost-recovery mechanism as proposed in the stipulation pursuant to a separate tracker. So for these reasons, AWEC continues to recommend that the Commission adopt the Tacoma LNG settlement stipulation and agreement as filed. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions. In the settlement, the parties accept the determination that the decision to build the regulated portion of the Tacoma LNG facility was prudent and PSE may include its investment in rates through a tracker with costs subject to refund and challenge if not prudently incurred. There is an extensive record in this case demonstrating that the decision to construct and operate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore the benefits of Tacoma LNG cost-recovery mechanism as proposed in the stipulation pursuant to a separate tracker. So for these reasons, AWEC continues to recommend that the Commission adopt the Tacoma LNG settlement stipulation and agreement as filed. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions. In the settlement, the parties accept the determination that the decision to build the regulated portion of the Tacoma LNG facility was prudent and PSE may include its investment in rates through a tracker with costs subject to refund and challenge if not prudently incurred. There is an extensive record in this case demonstrating that the decision to construct and operate the regulated portion of the Tacoma LNG facility for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	tracker that allows only prudent, used and useful costs to be recovered. Regarding cost causation, the settlement agreement ensures that costs are allocated only to sales customers as those customers are the beneficiaries of PSE's investment. This treatment is also consistent with the stipulation approved by the Commission in Docket UG-151663, wherein the stipulating parties agreed to allocate Tacoma LNG project costs to sales customers. And, finally, I just want to note that the opposition related to the Tacoma LNG settlement has been entered around the prudence of PSE's decision to construct the plant. No party has challenged the rate-making treatment for costs that are deemed prudent and used and useful, which serves to further underscore the benefits of Tacoma LNG cost-recovery mechanism as proposed in the stipulation pursuant to a separate tracker. So for these reasons, AWEC continues to recommend that the Commission adopt the Tacoma LNG settlement stipulation and agreement as filed. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The parties engaged in prolonged settlement negotiations over a two-month period and the Commission has a substantial body of evidence before it to make a decision: Direct testimony; response testimony; settlement testimony; response testimony. So the point is, it was a complex case. The parties did their due diligence. They had the full allotted time and the Commission has the full benefit of their reviews. For these reasons, we ask the Commission to, again, consider these two settlements were negotiated together and consider the gives and takes that are between the settlements and not look at the LNG testimony LNG settlement stipulation in isolation. PSE respectfully requests the Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement without conditions. In the settlement, the parties accept the determination that the decision to build the regulated portion of the Tacoma LNG facility was prudent and PSE may include its investment in rates through a tracker with costs subject to refund and challenge if not prudently incurred. There is an extensive record in this case demonstrating that the decision to construct and operate

58 (Pages 469 to 472)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	D 492		
	Page 473		Page 475
1	prudent.	1	to engage with the Tribe, although, weirdly outreach by
2	With regard to the question about whether	2	PSE at the manager level was ignored.
3	that decision should be delayed to the 2023 filing,	3	PSE elevated outreach to the executive
4	PSE's response is, we ask, respectfully, no.	4	level.
5	Given the significant evidence in the	5	PSE provided the Tribe additional
6	record, the time that the parties have had to review	6	information on safety studies associated with the
7	this significant evidence on need and alternatives,	7	project's design and development.
8	it it would be burdensome to have a second proceeding	8	PSE came to understand that activities on
9	where all of this was again presented.	9	the Hylebos Waterway was a major concern for the Tribe.
10	And, of course, we've had several months to	10	And as a Shorelines Hearing Board decision, Exhibit
11	look at the Tacoma LNG in this proceeding.	11	RJR-33 shows PSE stipulated that it would not construct
12	So PSE respectfully requests that we that	12	on the Hylebos Waterways and it abandoned that portion
13	the Commission approve the language of the settlement	13	of the project.
14	that allows a determination that there is a need for	14	Also important to recognize that the Tacoma
15	this. And then in the tracker, all costs can be	15	LNG facility was designed and constructed so it can be
16	challenged if they are not prudently incurred.	16	operated safely. PSE extensively considered safety
17	I think it's important to recognize that	17	concerns in its design and construction of the Tacoma
18	although the Board's decision and PSE's decision to move	18	LNG facility.
19	forward with the Tacoma LNG facility occurred in 2016	19	And in addition to PSE, safety was
20	and then was re-evaluated in 2018, before the equity	20	extensively considered by the City of Tacoma as part of
21	standard was in the public equity was in the public	21	its EIS. The PCHB in hearing the appeal of the air
22	interest standard, it's important to recognize that	22	permit.
23	there are several benefits, as we heard today, to	23	The pipelines safety subdivision in its
24	neighborhoods and areas surrounding the Tacoma LNG	24	reviews during construction of the facility and ongoing
25	facility.	25	reviews of facility operations and Tacoma fire to
	Page 474		Page 476
1	In fact, the record shows that the Tacoma	1	confirm Tacoma LNG facilities fire protection and safety
2	LNG facility will have a profound positive impact on the	2	systems conform to applicable LNG codes and standards.
3	communities surrounding the Port of Tacoma.	3	In summary, the construction of the LNG
4	Mr. Roberts testified that the facility	4	facility is complete. Commissioning was completed in
5	reduces criteria pollutants in the air.	5	February 2022. PSE met all the prongs of the
6	In addition, there are improved	6	Commission's prudent standard in developing and
5 7	environmental conditions on-site and in waterways around	7	constructing the facility as is set forth in testimony
8	the Port of Tacoma.	8	and, therefore, PSE respectfully requests that
9	The record shows that PSE replaced creosote	9	Commission approve the Tacoma LNG settlement stipulation
10	pilings with steel pilings, which benefits water and	10	without conditions.
11	sediment conditions in the Blair Waterway.	11	Thank you.
12	-		-
	PSE Installed a stormwater rain darden		ILIDGE HOWARD. All right Thank you
13	PSE installed a stormwater rain garden to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely	12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
13 14	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely	13	I believe that would essentially conclude
14	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway.	13 14	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements.
14 15	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the	13 14 15	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would
14	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the Hylebos and off-site mitigation in Commencement Bay by	13 14 15 16	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would like to speak in favor of the Tacoma LNG settlement, I
14 15 16	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the Hylebos and off-site mitigation in Commencement Bay by removing overwater structures which directly benefits	13 14 15 16 17	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would like to speak in favor of the Tacoma LNG settlement, I might allow them a couple of minutes. A few minutes.
14 15 16 17	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the Hylebos and off-site mitigation in Commencement Bay by removing overwater structures which directly benefits juvenile salmon.	13 14 15 16 17 18	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would like to speak in favor of the Tacoma LNG settlement, I might allow them a couple of minutes. A few minutes. MR. ROBERSON: I need about a minute, Judge
14 15 16 17 18	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the Hylebos and off-site mitigation in Commencement Bay by removing overwater structures which directly benefits juvenile salmon. And PSE revegetated portions of the 50-foot	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would like to speak in favor of the Tacoma LNG settlement, I might allow them a couple of minutes. A few minutes. MR. ROBERSON: I need about a minute, Judge Howard. I will be very brief.
14 15 16 17 18 19	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the Hylebos and off-site mitigation in Commencement Bay by removing overwater structures which directly benefits juvenile salmon. And PSE revegetated portions of the 50-foot marine buffer at the project, again, benefiting salmon	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would like to speak in favor of the Tacoma LNG settlement, I might allow them a couple of minutes. A few minutes. MR. ROBERSON: I need about a minute, Judge Howard. I will be very brief. THE COURT: Please proceed.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the Hylebos and off-site mitigation in Commencement Bay by removing overwater structures which directly benefits juvenile salmon. And PSE revegetated portions of the 50-foot	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would like to speak in favor of the Tacoma LNG settlement, I might allow them a couple of minutes. A few minutes. MR. ROBERSON: I need about a minute, Judge Howard. I will be very brief. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MR. ROBERSON
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the Hylebos and off-site mitigation in Commencement Bay by removing overwater structures which directly benefits juvenile salmon. And PSE revegetated portions of the 50-foot marine buffer at the project, again, benefiting salmon and improving water quality.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would like to speak in favor of the Tacoma LNG settlement, I might allow them a couple of minutes. A few minutes. MR. ROBERSON: I need about a minute, Judge Howard. I will be very brief. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MR. ROBERSON MR. ROBERSON: Staff also signed onto the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the Hylebos and off-site mitigation in Commencement Bay by removing overwater structures which directly benefits juvenile salmon. And PSE revegetated portions of the 50-foot marine buffer at the project, again, benefiting salmon and improving water quality. PSE also engaged with the Puyallup Tribe	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would like to speak in favor of the Tacoma LNG settlement, I might allow them a couple of minutes. A few minutes. MR. ROBERSON: I need about a minute, Judge Howard. I will be very brief. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MR. ROBERSON MR. ROBERSON: Staff also signed onto the settlement, urges the Commission to adopt it.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to decrease the flow of untreated water from a largely industrial peninsula into the Hylebos Waterway. PSE engaged in on-site mitigation in the Hylebos and off-site mitigation in Commencement Bay by removing overwater structures which directly benefits juvenile salmon. And PSE revegetated portions of the 50-foot marine buffer at the project, again, benefiting salmon and improving water quality. PSE also engaged with the Puyallup Tribe during the lead-up to the decision to build the Tacoma	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I believe that would essentially conclude the statements in support of the settlements. I would consider if one more party would like to speak in favor of the Tacoma LNG settlement, I might allow them a couple of minutes. A few minutes. MR. ROBERSON: I need about a minute, Judge Howard. I will be very brief. THE COURT: Please proceed. CLOSING STATEMENTS BY MR. ROBERSON MR. ROBERSON: Staff also signed onto the

59 (Pages 473 to 476)

	Page 477		Page 479
1	terms of rate making. The costs here involve a deferral	1	respect to the proposed settlement.
	pro forma plant, tester plant, forecasted O&M.	2	Just briefly in terms of the the terms
3	Moving things to a tracker allows Staff to	3	that Public Counsel supports from the revenue
	review them at the end of the rate year when all those	4	settlement, those include the electric and natural gas
5	costs are known and measurable. Part of what staff	5	rate spread and rate design terms, the A&I terms,
	bargained for here was the ability to challenge all	6	Colstrip cost recovery, low income issues, time varying
	those costs for whether they were known and measurable,	7	rate pilot, distributional equity analysis, gas line
	used and useful, prudent.	8	extension terms, decarbonization and electrification
9	You know, Staff is not done with its review	9	study, CETA costs, the PCORC terms, and the
10	of this project. It's just removing it to a later time	10	performance-based rate-making terms.
	which will allow for a better review.	11	I will go into more detail in our written
12	Thank you.	12	brief about what we support about those things. I agree
13	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	13	with a lot of the statements that were made earlier on
14	So that was the statements in support of the	14	those terms.
15	three multi-party settlements.	15	But I do want to turn to the terms that
16	I now turn to the parties who have opposed	16	Public Counsel opposes.
17	any aspect of the settlements. And I would include The	17	And I want to start with the capital
18	Energy Project if the because The Energy Project	18	structure and the ROE terms. The revenue settlement
19	intends to oppose, if I recall correctly, Tacoma LNG on	19	sets PSE's return on equity at 9.4 percent and the
20	the briefs.	20	equity ratio at 49 percent.
21	So we have we have Public Counsel, we	21	Our witness finds that that is excessive and
22	have Puyallup Tribe, we have CENSE, and The Energy	22	it results in customer rates that are too high. Public
23	Project.	23	Counsel recommends that the Commission reject this part
24	I would turn first to Public Counsel. If	24	of the revenue settlement and set PSE's return on equity
25	Public Counsel would like to give a closing argument in	25	at 8.8 percent and the equity ratio at 48.5 percent.
	Page 478		Page 480
1	opposition to any of the settlements.	1	The settling parties have not demonstrated
2	CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION	2	that increasing PSE's equity is justified. In contrast,
3	MS. GAFKEN: Yes. Thank you.	3	Public Counsel's recommended 48.5 percent equity is in
4	Public Counsel's position in this case is	4	line with PSE's historical capitalization which PSE has
5	nuanced. It's not completely straightforward because	5	successfully used to finance its operations and maintain
6	we're seeking different positions depending on which	6	its credit rating.
7 8	issue we're talking about. And I know that's not	7	Various proxy groups have been presented in
8 9	necessarily a simple path. But, you know, we heard earlier that Public	9	this case. The proxy groups contain companies with similar characteristics as PSE, except the proxy group
10	Counsel supports the Green Direct settlement; Public	10	companies have average common equity ratios that are
11	Counsel opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement; and with	11	well below 48.5 percent.
12	respect to the revenue settlement, we support portions	12	They range from the low or the high 30s
13	of it; we take no position on other portions and we	13	to low 40s. Even though Public Counsel's recommendation
14	specifically oppose the capital structure and return on	14	is still higher than the average common equity ratio of
15	equity terms. That is the only part of the revenue	15	the proxy group, it is closer to the proxy group than
16	settlement that we specifically opposed.	16	the settlement.
17	My comments today are not intended to cover	17	Similarly, the settling parties propose ROE
18	all of the arguments that Public Counsel will present in	18	as 9.4 and that is too high in light of market
19	our closing brief.	19	conditions and company risk. ROE is supposed to
20	I addressed the Green Direct settlement	20	compensate investors for the risk they take with their
21	earlier. I won't talk more about that one now.	21	investment. Public Counsel's witness, Dr. Woolridge,
22	I will briefly highlight areas of the	22	demonstrated in his testimony that 9.4 percent ROE is
23	revenue settlement that Public Counsel does support, and	23	excessive and that a more fair ROE is 8.8 percent.
24	then I'll spend probably the bulk of my time talking	24	While the interest rates have increased
25	about the issues that Public Counsel contests with	25	during 2022, authorized ROE has not reflected the
		1	

60 (Pages 477 to 480)

	Page 481		Page 483
1	historically low rates in recent years. Dr. Woolridge	1	In addition to the prudent standard, the
2	points out that even though interest rates declined	2	Commission must consider the public interests with
3	about 150 basis points in recent years, authorized ROEs	3	respect to PSE's rates, services, and practices. The
4	for electric utilities declined nationally by only about	4	public interest, as defined in RCW 80.28.425 subsection
5	20 percent or 20 basis points.	5	(1) includes environmental health and greenhouse gas
6	Moreover, even with the recent interest rate	6	emission reductions, health and safety concerns,
7	increases, interest rates are still at historically low	7	economic development, and equity.
8	levels. Similarly, while the 40-year high	8	The Tacoma LNG project fails on all
9	year-over-year inflation rates are as high as 9.0	9	standards.
10	percent, investors expect long-term inflation to be	10	The Commission should reject the Tacoma LNG
11	significantly lower at about 5 I'm sorry, 2.5	11	settlement and disallow all costs associated with the
12	percent.	12	LNG project.
13	Additionally, while the stock market	13	Dr. Earle, witness for Public Counsel, sets
14	declined in the first half of 2022, utilities stock	14	out his analysis of the Tacoma LNG project in his
15	consistently outperformed the S&P 500 indicating the	15	testimony, both his direct testimony on behalf of Public
16	utility equity return requirements have not increased.	16	Counsel and his opposition testimony to the settlement.
17	In responding to the proposed settlement,	17	Dr. Earle explains how PSE's forecast
18	Dr. Woolridge also points out flaws in Staff's response	18	declined over time, how forecasted needs never
19	testimony presented by witness Parcell. This critique	19	materialized, and how forecasts consistently
20	undergirds Dr. Woolridge I'm sorry undergirds	20	exceeded actual outcomes.
21	Dr. Woolridge's concerns about the cost of capital and	21	Dr. Earle explains how PSE does not take
22	capital structure presented in the revenue settlement.	22	these factors into account nor how nor did it
23	Despite witness Parcell's recommendation on	23	consider viable alternatives in its assessment of need.
24	ROE of 9.25 percent, his analysis supports a much lower	24	Additionally, PSE inadequately communicated
25	ROE closer to Public Counsel's recommendation. The	25	with its Board of Directors. As Dr. Earle describes in
	Page 482		Page 484
1	settlement presents a capital structure that is too	1	his testimony, PSE presented over 1800 pages of Board
2	heavily weighted with equity and contains an ROE that is	2	materials. And those materials did not discuss
3	higher than necessary.	3	declining forecasts or disappearing projected needs.
4	By contrast, Public Counsel's capital	4	PSE's management also did not present alternatives for
5	structure and ROE proposal are more reasonable and we	5	the LNG project to the Board.
6	encourage the Commission to adopt them.	6	In short, PSE failed to act prudently as it
7	I'd like to turn to the Tacoma LNG issue,	7	decided to move forward with the LNG project and as it
8	briefly.	8	decided to continue with the project.
9	The Commission is being asked to find the	9	Not only does the LNG project fail the
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		····· ···· ··· ··· ··· ···· ····
10	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated	10	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the
	-	10 11	
10	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated		Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic
10 11 12 13	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission	11 12 13	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is
10 11 12 13 14	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and	11 12 13 14	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact
10 11 12 13 14 15	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew	11 12 13 14 15	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time	11 12 13 14 15 16	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time they made a decision. This test applies to the need and	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts. Any greenhouse gas emissions reductions
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time they made a decision. This test applies to the need and the appropriateness of the expenditures.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts. Any greenhouse gas emissions reductions realized from switching marine fuel to LNG is
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time they made a decision. This test applies to the need and the appropriateness of the expenditures. The Commission has identified four factors	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts. Any greenhouse gas emissions reductions realized from switching marine fuel to LNG is irrelevant, because the marine fuel component of the LNG
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time they made a decision. This test applies to the need and the appropriateness of the expenditures. The Commission has identified four factors that it typically focuses on but no single set of	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts. Any greenhouse gas emissions reductions realized from switching marine fuel to LNG is irrelevant, because the marine fuel component of the LNG facility is a non-regulated activity.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time they made a decision. This test applies to the need and the appropriateness of the expenditures. The Commission has identified four factors that it typically focuses on but no single set of factors determines prudence.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts. Any greenhouse gas emissions reductions realized from switching marine fuel to LNG is irrelevant, because the marine fuel component of the LNG facility is a non-regulated activity. And locating the LNG facility on the border
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time they made a decision. This test applies to the need and the appropriateness of the expenditures. The Commission has identified four factors that it typically focuses on but no single set of factors determines prudence. The four factors that have been identified	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts. Any greenhouse gas emissions reductions realized from switching marine fuel to LNG is irrelevant, because the marine fuel component of the LNG facility is a non-regulated activity. And locating the LNG facility on the border of the Puyallup Tribe's land perpetuates systemic harm
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time they made a decision. This test applies to the need and the appropriateness of the expenditures. The Commission has identified four factors that it typically focuses on but no single set of factors determines prudence. The four factors that have been identified are the need for the resource, evaluation of	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts. Any greenhouse gas emissions reductions realized from switching marine fuel to LNG is irrelevant, because the marine fuel component of the LNG facility is a non-regulated activity. And locating the LNG facility on the border of the Puyallup Tribe's land perpetuates systemic harm by continuing to overburden an already overburdened
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time they made a decision. This test applies to the need and the appropriateness of the expenditures. The Commission has identified four factors that it typically focuses on but no single set of factors determines prudence. The four factors that have been identified are the need for the resource, evaluation of alternatives, communication with and involvement of the	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts. Any greenhouse gas emissions reductions realized from switching marine fuel to LNG is irrelevant, because the marine fuel component of the LNG facility is a non-regulated activity. And locating the LNG facility on the border of the Puyallup Tribe's land perpetuates systemic harm by continuing to overburden an already overburdened population. This is certainly not equitable. In fact,
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Tacoma LNG investment prudent and that costs associated with the project be included in a tracker that will ultimately become part of customer rates. With respect to prudence, the Commission looks at what a reasonable Board of Directors and utility management would have done given what they knew or reasonably should have known to be true at the time they made a decision. This test applies to the need and the appropriateness of the expenditures. The Commission has identified four factors that it typically focuses on but no single set of factors determines prudence. The four factors that have been identified are the need for the resource, evaluation of	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Commission's prudent standard, but it also fails the public interest standard. While it may provide some economic development with jobs located at the facility, it is undeniable that the LNG facility will negatively impact the environmental health of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians whose land the facility abuts. Any greenhouse gas emissions reductions realized from switching marine fuel to LNG is irrelevant, because the marine fuel component of the LNG facility is a non-regulated activity. And locating the LNG facility on the border of the Puyallup Tribe's land perpetuates systemic harm by continuing to overburden an already overburdened

61 (Pages 481 to 484)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 485		Page 487
1	inequitable.	1 If vo	u are observing, please keep your lines
2	Dr. Sahu, one of the Tribe's witnesses,	2 muted.	
3	explains in greater detail how the LNG project fails the		sorry, Mr. Thomas. I won't count
4	public interest standard in his rate testimony.	4 against your	-
5	Public Counsel recommends that the		THOMAS: Your Honor, thank you.
6	Commission rejects the Tacoma LNG settlement and		was talking about the FEIS and safety
7	disallow recovery of cost associated with the LNG		nted by a facility like this.
8	project and rates.		before the Commissioners right now, the
9	Thank you for your time.		ies are distilled to its essence asking the
10	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	51	n to publicly determine that it was prudent to
11	I would turn next to the Puyallup Tribe.		ty that pollutes the air and presents a
12	CLOSING STATEMENTS IN OPPOSITION		psion on the border of an Indian
13	MR. THOMAS: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor.	13 reservation.	
14	Good afternoon, Commissioners.		Commissioners the Tribe requests
15	I'll be brief. But I'd like to start with		rmine it is not prudent to make that
16	the discussion over the last 20 minutes or so regarding		on on the company's parts and we will expound
17	whether or not Tacoma LNG presents a greenhouse gas		ur closing briefing.
18	benefit or disbenefit.		e very least and Commissioner Doumit
19	And I want the Commissioners to be aware		a little bit earlier. At the very least,
20	that this issue is still in active litigation. And this		pre work to do to establish prudence. And
21	is an issue on which the Attorney General of the State		ssed in both the testimony submitted by
22	of Washington has appeared in Court proceedings in an		r the Tribe and the testimony submitted by
23	amicus capacity challenging the determination that		a. So equity matters and the public interest
24	Tacoma LNG presents greenhouse gas benefits, as well as	24 also matters	
25	the methodology by which that conclusion was reached.		Commissioners heard from the community
	Page 486		Page 488
1	So with that said and just you know, I	1 located near	r Tacoma LNG the evening of September 28th.
2	wanted to make sure the Commissioners were aware. I'll	2 Respectfully	y, Mr. Roberts does not speak for them. They
3	turn to some other items.	3 can speak for	or themselves and they spoke pretty
4	From the Tribe's perspective, equity	4 resolutely.	
5	considerations have an important role in deciding this	5 Ever	ry comment concerning Tacoma LNG was
6	case. And we submit that equity matters today; equity	6 strongly aga	ainst the facility. And as this Commission
7	mattered in 2018; equity mattered in 2016.	7 is aware, the	e community opposed this facility in 2016,
8	Now, the Tacoma LNG is not pulling pollution	8 the commun	nity opposed the facility in 2018, and the
9	out of the air; it is adding pollution to it. No	9 community of	opposes the facility now.
10	permitting agency I'll repeat no permitting agency	10 Was	hingtonians and the Tribe are requesting
11	says otherwise.	11 that this Cor	mmission protect them from financing a
12	When you only look at the FEIS as an	12 facility that,	one, we heard today is predominantly, if
13	example, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency recognizes	13 not entirely,	for TOTE and, two, presents potentially
14	that this is a new source of air pollution; otherwise,	14 harmful imp	acts to those located near it.
15	it would not need an air permit.	15 So th	hank you so much for allowing me to
16	Now, staying on the FEIS for a second, that	16 provide thes	se remarks and I will leave it there.
17	document also states that the facility presents safety	17 Thar	nk you.
18	risks. There is no serious argument to the contrary.	18 JUD	GE HOWARD: All right. Thank you,
19	The UTC understands this well. The UTC has	19 Mr. Thomas	S.
20	an important role in assessing	20 Wou	IId CENSE like to give an approximately
21	(Audio disruption)		closing argument?
22	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, should I wait for	And	this would be in addition to your brief
23	this person to go on mute?	23 which will be	e due later on October 31st.
24	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. The wrong person is	24 CLO	SING STATEMENTS BY MR. HANSEN
24 25	muted right now. I see okay.	25 MR.	HANSEN: We just have about less than

62 (Pages 485 to 488)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 489		Page 491
1	two-minute closing	1	questions about the prudency of PSE's decision by
2	JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead.	2	carefully reviewing the need for the plant, the
3	MR. HANSEN: comments. We've got three	3	evaluation of alternatives, and the documentation
4	items, Your Honor, and I'll just read them here.	4	provided to the Board of Directors.
5	Mr. Lauckhart has pointed out in his	5	The Commission should review Public
6	testimony, RL-1T on page 17 that PSE has failed to meet	6	Counsel's testimony and conclude that the decision to
7	any of the four factors that WUTC looks for in a	7	build the project was not prudent.
8	prudency review.	8	TEP urges the Commission to carefully
9	Number 2, Mr. Lauckhart has identified seven	9	evaluate the equity and public health concerns raised by
10	fatal flaws in the load flow studies they ran to justify	10	the Tribe. This is an environmental justice issue. The
11	Energize Eastside.	11	Commission should conclude that the Tacoma LNG
12	See Exhibits RL-3, slides 20 through 37.	12	settlement perpetuates environmental injustice and is
13	PSE has chosen not to rebut the Lauckhart	13	not in the public interest.
14	seven fatal flaws, so that testimony by Mr. Lauckhart is	14	Thank you.
15	unrebutted in this proceeding.	15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
16	Three, the Lauckhart-Schiffman Load Flow	16	Did I miss any parties who oppose any aspect
17	Study Report Exhibit RL-4, finds that one or more of the	17	of the three settlements?
18	seven fatal flaws are corrected that EE is not need.	18	All right. I don't believe I did.
19	The evidence is convincing that EE is imprudent. And we	19	But hearing none, do we have any questions
20	thank you very much for the opportunity to present our	20	for counsel from the bench?
21	testimony today.	21	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor, if I
22	Thank you.	22	might, please.
23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	23	THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.
24	I would would The Energy Project like to	24	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Just following up on
25	give any oral closing argument with respect to its	25	the question that I was pursuing prior to the closings,
23	give any oral closing argument with respect to he		
	Page 490		Page 492
1			
1	opposition to the Tacoma LNG settlement?	1	which I think the question that I posed was answered by
1	opposition to the Tacoma LNG settlement? MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your	1 2	which I think the question that I posed was answered by Ms. ErdahI then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and
2	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your	2	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and
2 3	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a	2 3	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs
2 3 4	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION	2 3 4	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed.
2 3 4 5	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG	2 3 4 5	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note
2 3 4 5 6	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not	2 3 4 5 6	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG plant is located in the Tribe's community, a highly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to refund depending on what the Commission does at the time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG plant is located in the Tribe's community, a highly impacted community with vulnerable populations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to refund depending on what the Commission does at the time PSE trues-up the tracker.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG plant is located in the Tribe's community, a highly impacted community with vulnerable populations. The Commission must give appropriate weight	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to refund depending on what the Commission does at the time PSE trues-up the tracker. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. If there's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG plant is located in the Tribe's community, a highly impacted community with vulnerable populations. The Commission must give appropriate weight to these facts when determining if the Tacoma LNG	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to refund depending on what the Commission does at the time PSE trues-up the tracker. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. If there's no disagreement on that question, I have a follow-up,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG plant is located in the Tribe's community, a highly impacted community with vulnerable populations. The Commission must give appropriate weight to these facts when determining if the Tacoma LNG settlement is in the public interest.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to refund depending on what the Commission does at the time PSE trues-up the tracker. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. If there's no disagreement on that question, I have a follow-up, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG plant is located in the Tribe's community, a highly impacted community with vulnerable populations. The Commission must give appropriate weight to these facts when determining if the Tacoma LNG settlement is in the public interest. Public Counsel's testimony also questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to refund depending on what the Commission does at the time PSE trues-up the tracker. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. If there's no disagreement on that question, I have a follow-up, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG plant is located in the Tribe's community, a highly impacted community with vulnerable populations. The Commission must give appropriate weight to these facts when determining if the Tacoma LNG settlement is in the public interest. Public Counsel's testimony also questions the process that PSE used to approve the decision to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to refund depending on what the Commission does at the time PSE trues-up the tracker. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. If there's no disagreement on that question, I have a follow-up, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead. MS. CARSON: That is my understanding as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG plant is located in the Tribe's community, a highly impacted community with vulnerable populations. The Commission must give appropriate weight to these facts when determining if the Tacoma LNG settlement is in the public interest. Public Counsel's testimony also questions the process that PSE used to approve the decision to build the LNG facility.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to refund depending on what the Commission does at the time PSE trues-up the tracker. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. If there's no disagreement on that question, I have a follow-up, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead. MS. CARSON: That is my understanding as well. I agree with Mr. Roberson.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. ZAKAI: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project. I have a brief statement in closing. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. CLOSING ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION MR. ZAKAI: TEP opposes the Tacoma LNG settlement because the settling parties have not demonstrated that it's in the public interest. SB 5295, which applies to this rate case, established the Commission's public interest standard to include an evaluation of equity and environmental health impacts. The Tribe's testimony clearly describes the equity, environmental health and safety impacts on the community in which PSE cited the LNG plant. The LNG plant is located in the Tribe's community, a highly impacted community with vulnerable populations. The Commission must give appropriate weight to these facts when determining if the Tacoma LNG settlement is in the public interest. Public Counsel's testimony also questions the process that PSE used to approve the decision to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ms. Erdahl then and reinforced by Ms. Carson and Mr. Roberson and that's the prudency on the LNG costs can be determined in the tracker that is filed. I just want to go a little further and note that the LNG costs are recovered under the rates under the settlement at paragraph 18. And the question I have is will the Commission be correct in understanding that because LNG distribution costs would be included in the rates unlike the LNG facility costs, they would not be subject to later review and possible refund? MR. ROBERSON: I'll take that one. Yeah. The distribution costs, because they are on base rates, they wouldn't be subject to retrospective review. But everything that is in the tracker would be subject to refund depending on what the Commission does at the time PSE trues-up the tracker. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. If there's no disagreement on that question, I have a follow-up, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead. MS. CARSON: That is my understanding as

63 (Pages 489 to 492)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Daga 102		Dage 105
	Page 493		Page 495
1	Can someone explain how the four miles of	1	the Green Direct settlement.
2	pipeline connecting the Tacoma LNG facility to PSE's	2	The 30-page limit, I should clarify, for the
3	distribution system are used and useful for core gas	3	revenue requirement settlement includes the Energize
4	customers before the facility is able to serve as a peak	4	Eastside issue.
5	shaving resource?	5	Are there any questions about post-hearing
6	MS. CARSON: Well, I'm happy to try to	6	briefs or page limits?
7	address that.	7	MS. CARSON: I do have a question. I want
8	My understanding is the facility is ready to	8	to make sure I understand.
9	serve as a peaking resource. It's just the weather	9	Are you talking about three different briefs
10	isn't cold enough yet for that need to to be	10	or are you talking about one brief that would
11	actualized, but it is ready. It is ready to be used and	11	potentially be up to 70 pages?
12	useful. The pipes are in the ground and ready. And	12	JUDGE HOWARD: I would say that if a party
13	when the weather turns cold, it will be a resource. It	13	does not have any conditions on its participation in the
14	will be a it's a resource today. But it will be a	14	case or has voluntarily limited its scope of
15	used resource at that point in time.	15	participation, if a party has addressed all the issues
16 17	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.	16	in the case, it may submit one brief up to 70 pages if
	No further questions for me, Your Honor.	17	it is addressing each of the three settlements at issue.
18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further	18	Those would be additive page limits for the brief.
19 20	questions for counsel? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: None from me. Thank	19 20	MS. CARSON: Thank you.
20		20	JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions on that
21	YOU.	21	topic?
22	CHAIR DANNER: None from me. Thank you.	23	MR. HANSEN: Yes, I have a question, Your Honor.
24	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. In that case, I'll just turn to a couple of administrative matters.	24	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.
25	We have a deadline for post-hearing briefs	25	MR. HANSEN: For the Energize Eastside
23	we have a deadline for post heating blocs	25	
	Page 494		Dama 106
			Page 496
1		1	Page 496
1 2	already in the schedule for October 31st.	1	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would
2	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable	2	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare.
	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier?	2 3	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit
2 3	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes.	2	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then
2 3 4	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier?	2 3 4	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the
2 3 4 5	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those	2 3 4 5	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of
2 3 4 5 6	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were.	2 3 4 5 6	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the
2 3 4 5 6 7	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages	2 3 4 5 6 7	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our post-hearing briefs, we have the one round of post-hearing briefs and the page limits would be essentially based on the settlement the brief is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address it; whereas a party like PSE and many others who have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our post-hearing briefs, we have the one round of post-hearing briefs and the page limits would be essentially based on the settlement the brief is addressing. The brief can a party can address more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address it; whereas a party like PSE and many others who have multiple issues in the revenue requirement settlement, has 30 pages to address Energize Eastside as well as all the other issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our post-hearing briefs, we have the one round of post-hearing briefs and the page limits would be essentially based on the settlement the brief is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address it; whereas a party like PSE and many others who have multiple issues in the revenue requirement settlement, has 30 pages to address Energize Eastside as well as all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our post-hearing briefs, we have the one round of post-hearing briefs and the page limits would be essentially based on the settlement the brief is addressing. The brief can a party can address more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address it; whereas a party like PSE and many others who have multiple issues in the revenue requirement settlement, has 30 pages to address Energize Eastside as well as all the other issues. So I I guess I do have some concerns about the fairness of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our post-hearing briefs, we have the one round of post-hearing briefs and the page limits would be essentially based on the settlement the brief is addressing. The brief can a party can address more than one settlement, if that's within the scope of its participation in the case. So parties may submit 30 pages of briefing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address it; whereas a party like PSE and many others who have multiple issues in the revenue requirement settlement, has 30 pages to address Energize Eastside as well as all the other issues. So I I guess I do have some concerns about the fairness of that. JUDGE HOWARD: Would any other party like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our post-hearing briefs, we have the one round of post-hearing briefs and the page limits would be essentially based on the settlement the brief is addressing. The brief can a party can address more than one settlement, if that's within the scope of its participation in the case. So parties may submit 30 pages of briefing in support of or in opposition to the revenue	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address it; whereas a party like PSE and many others who have multiple issues in the revenue requirement settlement, has 30 pages to address Energize Eastside as well as all the other issues. So I I guess I do have some concerns about the fairness of that. JUDGE HOWARD: Would any other party like to address that concern?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our post-hearing briefs, we have the one round of post-hearing briefs and the page limits would be essentially based on the settlement the brief is addressing. The brief can a party can address more than one settlement, if that's within the scope of its participation in the case. So parties may submit 30 pages of briefing in support of or in opposition to the revenue requirement settlement, 30 pages of briefing in support	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address it; whereas a party like PSE and many others who have multiple issues in the revenue requirement settlement, has 30 pages to address Energize Eastside as well as all the other issues. So I I guess I do have some concerns about the fairness of that. JUDGE HOWARD: Would any other party like to address that concern? I'm going to revisit my decision, because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our post-hearing briefs, we have the one round of post-hearing briefs and the page limits would be essentially based on the settlement the brief is addressing. The brief can a party can address more than one settlement, if that's within the scope of its participation in the case. So parties may submit 30 pages of briefing in support of or in opposition to the revenue requirement settlement, 30 pages of briefing in support of or in opposition to the Tacoma LNG settlement, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address it; whereas a party like PSE and many others who have multiple issues in the revenue requirement settlement, has 30 pages to address Energize Eastside as well as all the other issues. So I I guess I do have some concerns about the fairness of that. JUDGE HOWARD: Would any other party like to address that concern? I'm going to revisit my decision, because this is an elaboration that I've added about the 30-page
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	already in the schedule for October 31st. The were the Commissioners comfortable with the page limits we discussed earlier? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. CHAIR DANNER: Remind me, Judge, what those were. JUDGE HOWARD: I think it was 30 pages allocated to each of the three settlements well, 30 pages for Tacoma LNG; 30 pages for revenue requirement; 10 pages for Green Direct, and that will be in support of or in opposition to any of those settlements. CHAIR DANNER: Yes. And that's fine with me, yes. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So for for our post-hearing briefs, we have the one round of post-hearing briefs and the page limits would be essentially based on the settlement the brief is addressing. The brief can a party can address more than one settlement, if that's within the scope of its participation in the case. So parties may submit 30 pages of briefing in support of or in opposition to the revenue requirement settlement, 30 pages of briefing in support	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	brief, it wasn't clear to me how many pages we would prepare. JUDGE HOWARD: It would be the 30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement. And then because CENSE CENSE's participation is limited to the prudency of Energize Eastside, which is one aspect of that settlement, CENSE could devote all 30 pages to the Energize Eastside issue. Your page limit is effectively 30 pages. MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. CARSON: And, Your Honor, I guess I would just note that that presents the the situation where a party who has one issue and the revenue requirement settlement has 30 pages to address it; whereas a party like PSE and many others who have multiple issues in the revenue requirement settlement, has 30 pages to address Energize Eastside as well as all the other issues. So I I guess I do have some concerns about the fairness of that. JUDGE HOWARD: Would any other party like to address that concern? I'm going to revisit my decision, because

64 (Pages 493 to 496)

	Page 497		Page 499
1	I'm going to say that the Energize Eastside	1	Exhibit 3, because we have the supplemental. We have
2	issue because it is one issue among others in the	2	the bench request that's going to be for workpapers
3	revenue requirement settlement up to 15 pages can be	3	that will be due before that.
4	devoted to Energize Eastside. And that is within the	4	Okay. Are there any other administrative
5	30-page limit for the revenue requirement settlement.	5	matters?
6	So that I I would change what I just said	6	All right. Hearing none, I want to thank
7	to to CENSE and I would say that CENSE is because	7	all the parties for their efforts in this proceeding.
8	of CENSE's limited participation in the case, CENSE	8	This process depends on the professionalism and the hard
9	would have a 15-page limit for its post-hearing brief.	9	work of all the attorneys, the representatives, and the
10	And I'm changing that decision given	10	witnesses of record. It also depends on many advisors,
11	given I am persuaded that if if a party is speaking	11	accountants, legal support staff, and other individuals
12	in favor of or in opposition to the entirety of the	12	who may not be recognized by name today.
13	revenue requirement settlement there are a number of	13	I wanted to take a brief moment to recognize
14	issues beyond on Energize Eastside.	14	everyone's contributions in this complex case. And with
15	Mr. Hansen, were you going to speak?	15	that we are adjourned.
16	MR. HANSEN: No, Your Honor. I was just	16	Thank you.
17	saying, just to clarify, Energize Eastside will have 15	17	
18	pages and that's fine.	18	(Hearing concluded at 4:20 p.m.)
19	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	19	
20	MS. CARSON: Thank you, Your Honor.	20	
21	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And in terms of	21	
22	other administrative matters, we have the bench request	22	
23	for workpapers, which Commissioner Rendahl discussed	23	
24	earlier. And we have the supplemental aspect of that.	24	
25	And that will be issued shortly. And we plan on giving	25	
	Page 498		Page 500
1	a 7-day turn around. It might be out the door here	1	2
1 2	tomorrow, hopefully.	2	CERTIFICATE
3	Are there any other administrative matters	3	0 E R TH TORTE
4	we should address?	4	
5	Ms. Gafken.	5	STATE OF WASHINGTON)
6	MS. GAFKEN: Yes, thank you.) ss.
7	At the top of the hearing we talked about	6	COUNTY OF KITSAP)
8	the public comment exhibit, and I've since been in touch	7	
9	with Andrew Roberts and he informs me that there is well	8	I, CRYSTAL R. McAULIFFE, a Certified Court
10	in excess of a thousand comments. And so he is	9 10	Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
11	gathering the ones that has gone into the Commission.	10	certify that the foregoing transcript of the videoconference settlement hearing on OCTOBER 3, 2022,
12	So I would I would ask that that date be	12	is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill
13	moved from October 10th to October 17th. It's one week	13	and ability.
14	later.	14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
15	THE COURT: That should be	15	and seal this 10th day of October, 2022.
16	MS. GAFKEN: I was going to ask for a date	16	
17	during the week of October 10th, but we also have the	17	
18	AVISTA public comment due that same week.	18	
19	And so I think if we can move this one to	19	A. I.A. MCALAMO
20	the 17th, that would really ease the administrative	20	CRYSTAL R. MCAULIFFE, RPR, CCR #2121
21	burden. So if that works for you, that would be	21	URISTAL R. WCAULIFFE, RPR, UUR #2121
22	wonderful.	21	
23	JUDGE HOWARD: I think I think that's a	23	
24	reasonable request given the number of comments.	24	
	And I would plan an marking that Danah	25	
25	And I would plan on marking that Bench	25	

65 (Pages 497 to 500)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 dgc 501
A	438:23 483:22	411:10 422:25	247:23 330:20	278:12,19 292:16
A&I 479:5	accountants 499:11	435:3 439:17	410:15 462:10	320:9
a.m 247:2,5 253:16	accounted 351:23	475:5	493:24 497:22	affirms 455:23
253:17,23 313:8,9	accounting 247:12	additionally 458:1	498:3,20 499:4	affluent 449:15
313:13,13,14	247:14 331:3	481:13 483:24	administratively	afforded 346:16
314:16 362:9	accounts 438:13	additions 306:12	330:6	affording 469:24
AAG 248:20 271:7	439:10	additive 351:25	admissibility	afternoon 253:21
abandoned 475:12	accrue 434:25	495:18	252:17 254:19	362:20 444:19
abide 285:7	accurate 281:18	address 252:13	268:1	450:24 456:12
ability 283:15	307:14 334:24	253:5 257:8,16	admission 256:18	468:18 469:1
411:6 427:22	380:9 500:12	260:25 327:25	261:19 265:3,11	485:14
477:6 500:13	achieve 405:21	342:18 409:12,19	admitted 268:5,11	afuller@omwlaw
able 253:13,17	achieved 465:9	410:17 411:13	274:13 380:16,17	245:7
257:4 269:6	achieves 331:12,17	437:10 443:21	409:24 410:1	Ag 350:2
283:11 291:25	acquiring 458:13	446:2 450:15	admitting 267:16	Agencies 243:11
292:1 294:9	act 350:24 351:2	456:11 464:20	adopt 254:21 256:9	249:19,22 272:5,8
292.1 294.9 298:23 326:19	352:10 458:7	493:7 494:18	457:15 462:11	290:16,20
373:16 416:23	484:6	496:14,17,22	466:19 470:21	agency 434:5
	action 396:20	498:4	476:23 482:6	486:10,10,13
417:3,19,20,23	active 418:3 485:20	addressed 356:7	adopted 327:14	aggressive 446:12
425:11 426:5	activities 475:8	386:25 409:5	350:7,12 372:21	ago 277:5 446:10
432:15 449:11	activity 484:20	410:16 460:2	adopting 254:6	451:4 453:23
493:4	actual 322:1 329:22	478:20 495:15	332:4	agree 261:7,12
abreast 418:9	330:25,25 404:23	addresses 412:19	adoption 256:6	279:20,22 283:11
419:5	419:14 483:20	431:25 449:2	advance 264:17	284:17 312:16
abruptly 304:15	actualized 493:11	addressing 252:11	advanced 416:18	330:6,8 333:2
absolutely 348:16	add 264:12 285:25	436:22 494:18	448:4	345:5 348:3
389:25 426:4	302:21 345:6	495:17	advantaged 435:5	371:12 383:16
abuts 484:16	346:3 349:21	adequate 386:18,20	advise 259:1 324:9	391:23 436:3
accept 262:13,19	391:14 435:6,8	428:24 482:25	advise 239.1 324.9 advisor 452:17	448:14 449:6,7
263:9 281:4	added 324:4 326:1	adjourned 499:15	advisors 499:10	458:12 479:12
382:10,13 436:1	346:12 350:10	adjusted 284:22	advisory 455:12	492:24
456:4 472:17	355:6 401:11	adjustment 280:4	advisory 455.12 advocates 244:7	agreeable 256:17
accepted 247:18	496:24	281:7 282:2,5	250:22 273:11,17	agreed 280:8,19
262:12	adding 486:9	318:2,18 341:24	444:9 446:3	282:5,10 293:16
accepts 372:8 373:2	addition 282:23	345:21 436:10	456:11,17	306:17 319:4
436:6	431:18 433:24	adjustments	Affairs 275:23	325:5 330:14
access 280:10 349:6	449:21 458:11	316:12,16 320:14	289:10 291:13	332:11 347:23
455:16	462:25 474:6	administer 463:22	affiant 262:14	354:6 375:10
accident 420:11,14				
accidents 418:10	475:19 483:1	administering	affidavit 262:8,11 262:16	383:4 400:19
419:6,22	488:22	329:7,11		402:17 411:15
accompanied	additional 265:25	Administration	affirm 277:24	448:13 461:8,23
272:13 275:6	266:20 282:16,21	397:15	363:10 414:9	470:9
accompany 250:3	324:11 326:1	administrative	affirmation 292:13	agreed-upon
account 352:3	340:15 346:13	241:13 242:2	affirmative 278:2	406:13 446:14
	l			l

				Ŭ
452:25 466:6	359:11	482:24 483:23	378:4 392:1 397:8	271:4 272:18,20
agreeing 432:16	Alex 246:6 276:17	484:4 491:3	annually 391:22	272:23 273:25
agreement 258:8	290:23 298:8,25	ambiguity 328:21	396:9 404:5,10	274:4,25
259:18 281:17	299:4 300:4 414:2	336:10 357:16	answer 303:15	appearances 248:9
285:7 293:16	Ali 246:8 290:18	Ambiguous 392:18	319:15 321:8,12	413:8
302:25 306:13	310:7 313:19	amenable 361:14	332:23 334:3,18	appeared 241:14
315:7 316:11	aligned 436:25	AMI 453:18	334:21 343:3	318:21 485:22
322:2 328:2,24	ALJ 277:10	amicus 485:23	347:6 371:8,12	appearing 248:21
339:7 344:13,14	Alliance 243:2	amortized 338:21	372:3 373:16	249:1 250:2,14,18
372:7,25 375:9	249:6 271:21	amortizes 339:9	377:1 393:19	251:23 271:7,13
383:3 400:19	allocate 429:16	amortizing 339:8	407:12 416:24	271:14,20 272:1,2
402:9,9,14,16	470:10	amount 280:8,18	417:3,8 428:8	272:13 273:8,22
420:24 432:11	allocated 427:23	281:18 282:21	430:1 464:9	274:1,8 275:14
456:23 457:3	428:1 464:2 466:9	306:14 319:3	answered 336:24	276:10 288:3,22
463:2 468:22	470:5 494:8	320:18 329:21	398:3 401:10	290:20 291:8
470:5,22	allocating 429:19	336:4 340:1	492:1	362:17 413:3
agreements 341:7	463:11	346:15 405:2	answering 286:6	appears 254:22
343:10 344:7	allotted 472:8	438:4	425:23	355:14 401:25
432:4,13	allow 253:15 260:6	amounts 412:22	answers 278:2	429:24 441:1
agrees 327:12	267:10 304:19,21	447:16 455:20	anticipate 255:4	appending 262:22
337:14	369:7 371:6	ample 389:21	280:25 285:21	apple 382:18
Agriculture 349:22	372:17,21 375:1	469:24	415:7	applicable 476:2
Agriculture's	399:19 401:3	analyses 306:24	anticipated 329:23	application 267:20
350:9	417:11 441:5	analysis 346:24	350:4	405:9
ahead 257:5 264:2	442:9,14 448:18	371:1,24 382:5	anticipating 254:14	applications
265:24 308:8	449:9 455:21	386:18 392:11	269:1 338:11	405:12
315:5 345:2	476:17 477:11	393:5,20,21	anybody 351:11	applies 482:17
346:25 350:19	allowed 261:3	394:15 404:12	anybody's 435:19	490:10
387:24 406:8,16	allowing 253:10	430:13,19 450:3	anyway 260:20	apply 248:5 263:13
406:17 426:18	257:19 262:25	452:20,22,22	330:6 374:15	264:25 316:6
465:18 489:2	312:9 381:21	479:7 481:24	389:11	423:9 433:8 451:6
490:5 491:23	388:7 488:15	483:14	apart 471:12	452:23 453:10
492:22	allows 262:7 303:1	analyst 276:6	apologies 344:3	appreciate 260:24
air 261:23 263:19	303:6 447:24	analyzed 337:3	apologize 257:3	261:12 279:24
263:22 416:6,9,11	448:9 470:2	and/or 393:4	265:20 270:1	284:10,14 286:2,6
416:16,16,22	473:14 476:25	Andrea 440:8	275:3 298:21	345:12 346:17
417:21 418:2	477:3	Andrew 245:4	440:14	356:8 439:17
433:13 434:10	alternately 364:16	251:23 274:7	appeal 475:21	approach 330:1
474:5 475:21	alternative 370:4,5	415:6 498:9	appear 279:9 295:9	364:10 466:11
486:9,13,14,15	370:11,24 371:22	Ann 242:5 249:3	357:9 380:8 401:6	approaching 360:3
487:11	403:12 435:11	271:14	441:6	appropriate 255:22
Al-Jabir 246:8	alternatives 369:23	annual 335:5,6,21	appearance 248:18	255:23 257:9
290:17,18 292:21	370:1,7,25 371:23	341:14 342:10,25	249:18 250:12,16	261:14 263:22
310:7 311:2	382:6 386:18	346:9 351:23	250:21 251:4,10	264:8,11,14 304:8
313:19,20 359:6	449:8,23 473:7	376:24 377:2,9,14	251:21 270:17,19	345:8 357:25
	1	1		1

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

Ρ	ag	e	5	0	3

				Fage 303
409:7,17 469:4	441:3,6 442:13	assessments 376:25	326:13 365:15	338:9 341:11
490:19	443:15 467:23	377:3,10,14,16	379:12 380:1	342:5,20 364:15
appropriately	478:18	378:4 395:25	485:21	389:3 390:15
263:20 395:20	arms 331:9	396:9,11,18 397:9	attorneys 499:9	397:2,6 400:3,6,8
431:24 466:7	array 327:4	397:17,20	attractive 285:19	400:18 402:7
appropriateness	arrearage 455:14	assigned 277:10	audio 269:8,9	418:9 419:5,9,13
482:18	ascertain 354:25	assist 455:7	272:17 278:15	419:15 420:10,13
approval 453:10	Ash 317:18 320:22	assistance 446:23	294:11 334:6	420:14 485:19
approve 322:22	Ash 317.18 320.22 321:2,3,13 337:15	447:15	486:21	486:2 488:7
450:18 454:12	337:17	Assistant 242:8,20	August 351:1	AWEC 249:7,10
456:18 459:10	aside 256:21	249:1,4 271:13,15	420:17 421:9	271:17 289:25
461:15 462:19			author 262:16	290:2 352:8 414:4
	267:15,24 343:17	associate 277:4		
466:18 472:16	asked 287:13	416:13	authorities 397:10	414:5 432:2 445:5
473:13 476:9	304:22 367:1	associated 319:2	authorizations	467:7,10 468:9,21
490:23	406:25 417:1,5	326:16 337:15	451:16	470:20
approved 280:5	432:22 482:9	430:16 475:6	authorize 345:8	AWEC's 468:23
281:13 460:10	asked-and-answe	482:10 483:11	authorized 480:25	awkward 362:4
470:8	303:16	485:7	481:3	awkwardly 304:15
approving 322:22	asking 258:4	Associates 290:19	authorizing 247:11	B
454:14 460:11	269:14 280:24	assuage 330:17	availability 288:10	
approximately	295:15,17 296:21	assume 329:17	358:18	Bachelor 415:16
253:16 363:17	304:6 309:7,16	430:9 440:3	available 256:9	back 293:6 313:9
447:7 462:8	311:23 367:3,7	assumed 320:21	262:14,24 286:6	313:17 314:15
464:17 488:20	374:9 375:2	354:12 404:18	291:21 302:2,3	329:25 330:1
approximation	385:17 399:8	406:12,15	349:4,4 352:13	331:6 333:21
283:10 464:5,11	412:10 425:14	Assumes 417:10	361:3 379:15	345:16 362:10
April 341:24	438:1 443:6 487:9	assuming 318:16	387:15 396:4,5,7	365:14 367:16
area 312:6 344:23	asks 461:14 462:18	388:4	427:8 469:5	369:14,21 370:12
377:18,18 378:8	466:18	assumption 330:7	Avenue 242:22	370:20 401:19
401:5 404:7,12	aspect 267:6	assumptions 330:3	243:13 244:9,14	409:11,14 410:11
405:14 433:11	443:19 477:17	390:18 394:7	244:18,23 245:5	428:16 433:1
450:8	491:16 496:6	Atrium 292:6	average 448:21	434:15 435:1
areas 473:24	497:24	attached 351:6	480:10,14	441:17 442:1,7
478:22	aspects 285:18	attempt 264:6	AVISTA 498:18	467:25 468:2
argue 345:18	438:15	302:19	avoid 333:23	471:16
argued 261:2	aspiration 285:2	attempts 300:10	421:14	background
argues 252:14	assess 322:23 323:2	474:25	avoided 282:14	344:22 405:11
argument 246:18	323:9 325:12	attend 260:20	284:24	415:13 471:16
255:13 261:1,13	464:17	attending 262:23	avoiding 282:21	Baker 250:3 272:14
441:9 442:18	assessed 404:10	278:11	461:3	275:6
445:9 477:25	assessing 357:25	attorney 242:8,9,20	avoids 462:6	balance 447:11
478:2 486:18	486:20	242:21 243:13	aware 266:22 269:8	balanced 423:20
488:21 489:25	assessment 377:5	249:1,4 251:8	295:24 296:18,21	471:7
490:6	395:12 404:9,18	271:13,15 273:23	299:22 303:24	balancing 461:6
arguments 436:15	483:23	275:11 302:19	306:20 326:22	Baldwin 244:3
				250:7,8 272:24,25
	I	I	I	l í

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 ugo 004
298:25,25 299:3	276:10 283:18	244:16	Betty 246:9,10	Boehm 245:16,16
300:4,7,7,18	290:20 291:8	bench 246:5,12	289:23 348:2	250:17,18 273:7,8
301:15	292:6 304:3	252:24 266:16	361:1,19 362:14	298:13 359:23
Ball 254:6 401:12	313:20 362:24	278:20 287:6	362:24 376:3	360:2
Ball's 254:15 255:5	363:3 374:11	314:22,24 315:3	413:20	Bonneville 397:14
bargained 477:6	465:16 468:20	315:12,13,16,18	Betty's 408:8	booted 467:16
base 317:25 321:7	483:15	315:22 316:5	beyond 285:8 309:2	468:1
327:20 339:13,16	Behle 244:3 250:8	319:10 320:12	339:8,9 365:8	border 484:21
339:18 394:5	272:25	358:10 360:10	366:15 374:19	487:12
429:16 492:14	believe 254:9,17	406:4 407:25	375:17 377:19,24	borne 330:4 463:9
based 282:4 321:11	256:2,14 259:22	408:10,15 426:14	419:20,25 431:16	463:10
324:18 329:6,22	266:3,19 268:23	437:14,25 438:18	438:8 497:14	bottom 321:7
355:5 382:11	272:17 289:18	438:20 439:4,22	Bieber 246:5 291:3	Box 242:9
394:17 401:13	291:20 293:11	440:10,16,22	291:4 292:20	BP 430:9
402:24 416:20	300:25 303:4,14	491:20 497:22	293:11 294:8,10	BPA 388:4 397:17
417:19 422:10	304:7 307:13	498:25 499:2	294:15,19,23	Brad 290:1,13
463:22 494:17	310:7 311:5 313:6	benchmarks	298:4,12 314:8,8	326:5,7 352:8
baseline 281:7	328:16 329:12,20	326:12,15 327:1	359:24,25 414:23	353:18 356:6
326:17 455:23	330:22 333:10	beneficial 435:4	biennial 457:18	357:21 414:5
basically 262:21	334:20 335:24	beneficiaries 470:6	bigger 471:5	432:2
351:25 436:24	349:25 350:16	benefit 257:25	bill 353:3,11	Bradley 246:7,7
basing 284:13	354:4 361:11	356:12 382:5	355:13,15,19	305:17 308:6
basis 280:5 281:10	362:2 363:5	431:6,13 433:24	356:13 433:6	361:2
282:2 309:1	365:22 366:24	469:9 472:8	447:15 454:15	breadth 388:25
333:19 334:5	367:20 368:20	485:18	455:13	break 253:15,21
346:11 352:14	371:9 378:6	benefiting 474:20	billion 447:18,22	313:7,8,8,12
355:7,21 401:20	379:16 380:10	benefits 282:16	Birud 275:25	314:17 361:16,18
411:13 436:4	383:20,25 385:21	330:15,15 351:8	289:11 340:11	362:6,8 408:23
469:22 481:3,5	393:14 397:16,21	351:25 352:9	bit 264:18 268:21	409:12,14 410:9
battery 343:13	398:3,4 407:20	403:3 433:11	293:15 294:11	442:1,3,4,5
Bauman 440:7	412:11 426:12	434:7,25 448:24	328:18 330:2	breaking 253:18
Bay 474:16	431:23 438:16	451:18 452:5,8,11	334:16 344:1,2	Brew 243:18 250:2
BDJ-JDT 340:10	444:5 445:6	452:12,13,15	360:23 405:11	272:13 275:5
BDJ-JDT-9 340:7	452:23 457:23	454:3 455:22	410:7 444:21	Bridle 244:23
began 395:10	464:25 465:9	457:10 458:11	487:19	brief 252:10 258:10
beginning 248:9	466:24 468:2	462:3 463:9,11	bite 382:18	267:10 270:17
275:14 362:17	476:13 491:18	464:1 466:8	black 286:18	385:12 408:23
395:13 413:4	believes 283:8	470:17 473:23	Blair 474:11	461:20 465:16
433:3	465:5	474:10,17 485:24	board 263:18,21	468:21 476:19
behalf 248:20	Bellevue 242:16	benzene 416:21	382:7 386:19	478:19 479:12
249:1,10,15 250:9	392:10 449:25	best 254:12 256:10	451:12 475:10	485:15 488:22
250:14,18,25	Ben 244:13 251:6	347:4 500:12	482:14,25 483:25	490:4 494:17,18
251:24 261:8	273:21 288:5	better 282:7 285:24	484:1,5 491:4	495:10,16,18
271:13,21 272:1,2	444:25 465:15	294:19 334:11,16	Board's 473:18	496:1 497:9
273:1,4,8 274:8	ben.mayer@klga	461:24 477:11	body 472:3	499:13

				1 490 000
briefing 487:17	bullet 317:18,21,24	278:11,14 287:24	careful 259:6	459:18 460:2,18
494:21,23,25	318:5	301:19 313:16,18	391:12	460:20,21 462:21
briefly 264:1	bulleted 341:4	373:24 412:25	carefully 471:7	462:23 463:2,3
265:22 409:2	bullets 317:14	467:16,25	491:2,8	464:11,21 466:19
410:19 441:19	bunch 411:10	Callahan 248:22	Carson 242:14	468:23 469:2
445:2 478:22	burden 458:4	271:8	246:11,12,14,17	471:16,16,23,25
479:2 482:8	462:10 498:21	called 452:9,24	248:12,13 255:8	472:6,22 478:4
briefs 253:25	burdened 447:8	calling 252:25	256:1 263:6	480:8 486:6
327:24 477:20	burdens 451:18	274:12,22 362:12	264:12 268:4	490:10 493:23
493:25 494:15,16	452:5 454:3	436:14	269:16 270:13,22	494:20 495:14,16
495:6,9	burdensome 473:8	Calls 311:21 401:1	270:23,25,25	497:8 499:14
bring 263:23 431:9	businesses 457:2	camera 270:14	291:18 292:9	case-by-case
464:24 465:3	button 322:16	291:23 381:12	316:1 334:12	352:14
bringing 292:9		440:4	370:16 388:8,24	cases 267:20
328:11	C	cameras 248:4,8	390:7 392:17	284:20 285:3,22
brings 463:19	C 242:1 243:1	275:17 287:23	399:5 401:1	312:5 342:11
broad 352:12	244:1 245:1	288:25 358:16	403:23,25 406:2	424:11 459:14
405:23	293:13 298:16	362:19 408:20	409:20,21 410:5	461:4 462:9
broader 327:19	301:23 305:20	413:6 440:2	417:9 426:11	466:15
broke 424:17	308:9 310:9 311:8	Canada 421:25	436:22 444:1,20	cash 448:19
471:12	363:23 381:15	422:2 423:21	445:4,18,20,21	catch 270:20,20
Brombaugh 285:15	385:13 386:13	425:20	459:3,8,9 461:22	categories 353:14
285:17 288:9,18	403:24 415:10	canceled 388:6	464:23 467:10,15	causation 429:21
brought 283:24	500:2,2	capacity 285:23	467:23,25 468:1	469:16 470:4
317:19 321:1,4	Cadeo 256:8	331:8,14,18,25	468:10 470:25	cause 419:14
Brownfield 434:11	calculate 281:21	332:10 428:16,20	471:2,3 492:2,23	caused 420:12
Brubaker 290:19	328:3 463:5,21	448:8 450:13	493:6 495:7,19	caution 296:8
Brumbaugh	464:9	485:23	496:11 497:20	CCR 241:25
276:13,14	calculated 328:17	capital 306:12	Cascade 453:22	500:20
BTC-IT 353:6	332:10,12,20	318:18 319:10,18	case 247:13,18	Cebulko 246:7
budget 321:10	333:6 334:5	319:25 320:6	252:3 253:20	266:10,13 290:13
budgeting 466:13	calculates 465:1	337:14 349:17	258:20 264:15	290:13 292:20
buffer 474:20	calculating 282:9	360:6,8,20,21	268:22 277:10,16	308:6,22,23 309:8
build 326:17,25	282:14 284:19	448:18,22 451:8	280:6 281:11	310:2 326:5,6,7
436:2 472:18	328:25 336:11	453:11 478:14	286:25 287:10	327:11 353:15,16
474:23 487:11	459:25 460:4,7	479:17 481:21,22	302:21 306:11	353:18,19 354:5,7
490:24 491:7	461:2 466:12	482:1,4	309:3 316:17	354:16,20 355:2
building 326:24	calculation 282:4	capitalization	320:7 327:6 341:3	356:23,25 357:15
427:15	318:3 332:5,8,18	480:4	345:20 347:10	Cebulko's 309:2
built 388:5 446:20	calculations 319:6	captioned 247:8	351:24 355:14	353:6 357:21
449:15	330:3 335:21	capture 294:9	362:4 369:12	358:5
bulk 394:25 395:6	437:17	carcinogens 417:6	389:20 394:5	CEII 385:25 400:9
395:23 396:15,25	California 243:9,14	417:18	401:24 405:17	405:9,12
397:4,13 398:1	349:20 350:5,7	card 323:22	407:23 410:3,4	CEIP 316:13
429:24 478:24	call 252:19 260:7	career 416:7,13	430:13 434:20	317:11 332:22
	269:9 275:10			
	1	1	1	1

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

F				- 1 dgc 606
333:6,18 334:4,22	299:25 317:11	299:17 311:10	281:19 452:2,3	clearly 323:13
336:17,20,23	345:6 347:8	437:10	490:16	326:9 334:12
337:1,3	350:25 352:21	change 285:8 346:7	cities 393:6,7	336:22 432:24
cell 278:14	357:22 358:3	423:25 497:6	City 244:5 370:4,10	490:14
CENSE 251:11,13	424:9 433:4,19	changed 282:3,4,9	389:18 392:10	Cleve 243:3 245:10
251:14 252:12	434:3 442:2	423:21 425:21	393:20,22 397:18	249:9
253:2,7 255:17	484:24	changes 425:20	398:2,7,12,15	climate 457:10
257:19 259:14,21	certainty 462:4	456:19 457:20	434:8,15 449:25	458:7
260:7 261:8,12	465:8 466:14	458:11	475:20	closed 378:13
266:6,15,23	476:25	changing 346:14	claimed 401:11	closely 375:21
267:22,24 273:25	certified 398:12,15	497:10	claims 297:21	383:1
274:2,19 292:18	500:8	channels 447:15	clarification	closer 294:16
293:2,21 298:19	certify 398:7	characteristics	284:11,14 286:14	370:10 480:15
302:1 305:23	500:10	480:9	332:8 335:11	481:25
308:12 310:16	CETA 433:5 479:9	characterized	349:7 443:25	closing 246:12,13
311:14 314:20	Chair 242:5 247:24	395:8	clarified 407:25	246:13,14,14,15
361:8 363:16	270:9,11 271:6,11	charge 279:6,6,13	clarify 282:2	246:15,16,16,17
364:1 367:22	271:18 286:9	280:1,5 281:11	286:11 310:13	246:17,18,18,19
375:23 376:24	287:2 288:4,7	465:24 466:6,12	320:20 332:3	246:19 253:10
379:21 385:17	314:11,12 322:15	charges 279:12	337:8 373:11	436:15 441:3,6,9
410:1 442:16	323:12 324:15	charging 349:15	396:5 402:11,23	441:10,14 442:11
449:14 477:22	325:3,9 326:4,6	chart 443:13	405:6 427:1,10	442:12,13,17
488:20 496:5,7	327:8,10,21 329:1	Chase 440:7	439:7,8 495:2	443:15,19 445:20
497:7,7,8	329:17 330:18	check 280:11,22	497:17	445:24 450:23
CENSE's 255:10	331:5 332:3,24	281:1,3,4 287:14	clarifying 279:2	455:3 456:14
256:2 258:21	333:7,13,20	287:19 361:8	283:1 380:1,2	459:8 461:19
259:12 260:5	334:23 335:2,10	371:16 384:19	clarity 312:12	462:16 465:19
261:2 267:16	337:10,24 338:13	checking 391:5	371:14 381:5	467:23 468:17
292:25 293:5	338:18 339:11,20	398:24	439:18	471:2 476:21
367:8 376:7 380:7	340:5,8,16,19	chemical 416:15	classify 438:14	477:25 478:2,19
380:12 385:23	358:11,23 360:16	chime 350:18	clean 289:15	485:12 487:17
388:16 440:20	408:17 439:23	chosen 489:13	317:12 332:13,16	488:21,24 489:1
450:9 496:5 497:8	441:24 493:22	Chris 276:5 279:21	351:6 411:4 446:6	489:25 490:4,6
center 370:3,11	494:5,12	281:15	446:12,17 447:9	closings 442:4
454:17	Chairman 340:3	Cincinnati 245:17	451:25 486:13	491:25
Centered 250:23	challenge 372:9	circulated 265:12	cleaner 297:15	Club 244:23 250:22
251:2 273:12,16	373:2 418:1 437:6	267:15	cleanup 434:11	251:2 273:12,16
centers 456:21	469:18 472:21	circumstance	clear 328:19 334:13	290:8,10
458:4	477:6	410:22	343:24 344:6,9	clumsy 425:15
CenturyLink 262:5	challenged 262:16	circumstances	349:9 375:24	co-representatives
certain 320:16,18	303:3 470:14	285:7 420:13	377:1 408:11	270:16
320:20 442:17	473:16	citation 370:9	412:6 446:4	CO2 421:11
444:7	challenges 470:1	463:8	458:14 463:8	Coalition 244:21
certainly 269:18	challenging 485:23	citations 373:24	496:1	250:23 251:1,10
285:21 297:1	chance 294:7	cited 264:16 281:18	clear-cut 336:7	273:15 290:6
	•	•	•	•

				5
code 393:24	comment 268:18	482:19 483:2,10	355:3,9,22 356:1	commit 348:4
codes 476:2	268:19,21 286:4	485:6 487:10	356:3,6,17,22,25	commitment
cognizant 463:17	345:1 352:9	488:6,11 490:19	357:4,18 358:6,12	260:17 458:7,7
Coie 242:15 248:13	460:11 488:5	491:5,8,11 492:9	358:13,22,24	commitments
271:1 467:21	498:8,18	492:17 498:11	360:11,12,14,18	455:23
coincident 331:13	comments 255:11	Commission's	406:6,7,9,24	committed 343:3
334:2	268:25 327:11	326:23 327:5	407:4,8,24 408:3	committing 331:24
cold 427:14 428:23	345:13 348:1	345:10 373:25	408:7,12,16	common 319:1
435:12,18 457:10	350:18 468:21	432:24 451:6	426:16,19 427:9	464:25 480:10,14
493:10,13	469:1 478:17	453:25 466:1	427:13,17 428:7,9	communicated
collaborative	489:3 498:10,24	476:6 484:10	429:1,11 431:4,21	483:24
460:17 462:22,25	commercial 457:5	490:11	434:17 435:22	communication
463:1 464:20	457:22	Commission-led	436:12,19 437:8	386:19 400:13
colleague 251:25	commission 241:2	348:6	437:15,15 438:7	482:24
274:9 391:12	241:4 242:7 247:9	commissioned	438:12,19 439:12	communications
432:22	247:16,23 260:15	426:24 427:2	439:19,24 440:18	262:5 399:16,18
colleagues 286:8	262:5,7,10,13,15	Commissioner	440:24,25 453:4	communities
322:12 346:20	262:19 263:13,13	242:5,6 247:25,25	487:18 491:21,24	435:21 450:12
collect 430:15	263:21 264:23	269:19,20,22,25	492:19,25 493:16	452:6,18 453:17
collectively 457:20	267:18 268:25	270:3,4,5,8	493:20 494:4	453:18,19 454:8
colloquy 435:2	269:3 276:6	274:16 276:21,22	497:23	456:3 458:3,3
color 324:12	279:22 280:5	276:23 277:8	commissioner's	474:3
Colorado 415:15	284:6 285:1	278:7,22,24 279:1	263:23	community 244:23
415:21	287:14 289:22,23	279:17,23 280:14	commissioners	487:25 488:7,8,9
Colstrip 317:19	322:21 323:2,9,23	281:2,14 282:1,22	242:4 247:24	490:16,17,18
320:22 321:13	324:7,10 325:7	284:8 285:5,14,17	252:19 269:14	companies 480:8
337:12,15 338:2,4	326:24 327:15	286:1 287:7,13	270:17 271:6,12	480:10
338:6,11,20,24	332:14 335:23	314:14,14 315:1	271:19,25 272:6	company 245:15
339:13,17,19,21	345:6,19 346:23	315:17 316:8,24	272:25 273:4,8,14	250:19 266:19
458:15 479:6	347:4,8,15,19,22	317:8 318:12,25	273:21 274:7,11	268:3 273:9 291:4
combination	347:23 348:4	319:14,21 320:3	275:22,25 276:5	315:25 321:23
325:10 455:14	363:3 369:10	320:19,24 321:14	289:6,9 292:5	322:24 323:19
come 263:1 315:19	384:8 385:15	321:19 322:5,9	314:10 348:21	324:8 325:12
319:18 321:16	411:10 412:2	334:7 335:14,16	352:18 353:18	328:10,22 330:14
370:19 386:4	436:6,7 450:18	336:15,21 337:7	358:21 383:23	331:11,17 332:2
394:8 409:11,14	453:5,9,10,22	340:22 341:16,19	409:4 445:23	333:18 336:1,6
429:6 442:1	454:12 456:4,12	341:22 342:14,17	450:25 455:5	343:2 344:17
452:20	459:10,19 460:12	342:22 343:1,8,25	456:16 465:21	347:18,18 351:15
comfortable 494:2	461:10,15 462:10	344:24 345:3,11	466:18 468:19	352:4 355:23
coming 256:3 334:9	462:11,18 463:1	346:17,22 347:1	485:14,19 486:2	356:21,24 368:23
361:7 382:23	466:15 469:6	347:25 348:10,19	487:8,14,25 494:2	412:10 413:11
422:1 428:19	470:8,21 471:7,14	348:22 349:12	Commissioning	416:15 432:22
443:24 447:4	472:2,8,10,15	350:3,15,22 351:1	476:4	438:14 439:3
Commencement	473:13 476:9,23	352:7,16,22 354:4	Commissions	445:12 480:19
474:16	479:23 482:6,9,13	354:10,16,18,23	272:11 290:18	company's 282:18
	•	•	•	•

F				1 age 500
284:24 285:12	component 297:1	condition 398:6,10	422:15 451:17	249:7 271:21
324:6,25 328:20	435:6 484:19	453:5 462:19	454:3 472:11,12	283:15
332:13 341:9	components 434:3	conditional 398:6	476:15 483:2,23	contact 268:24
343:23 344:4,22	434:9	398:10 403:15	considerable	269:2 398:21
357:23 381:23	Compound 392:18	449:24	451:13	contain 480:8
	-			
436:9 458:13	comprehension	conditions 450:19	consideration	contained 389:23
487:16	285:8	459:11 461:16	350:14 358:3	432:8 434:14
company-by-com	comprehensive	472:16 474:7,11	449:8 458:17	contains 420:25
348:9	306:7 457:12	476:10 480:19	considerations	482:2
compared 319:12	comprised 449:14	495:13	486:5	contest 432:15
compelling 307:17	compromise	conduct 312:20	considered 259:20	contests 478:25
compensate 283:6	427:22 465:23,25	conducted 295:14	306:24 316:18	context 302:24
480:20	compromised	299:16 302:17	352:11 475:16,20	312:6 336:16
compensated	448:11	303:11 306:10	considering 247:17	429:22
283:21	computer 272:16	conducting 255:16	260:4	contingencies
competing 447:12	concede 415:1	415:4	considers 312:17	394:8
compile 268:20	concern 327:22	confer 258:24	431:24	contingency 450:6
Complainant 241:5	342:23 345:23	391:12	consistency 285:20	continually 404:10
complete 264:4	384:4 412:20	conference 460:23	consistent 332:12	continuation
309:18 403:2	475:9 496:22	confirm 260:11	333:5 336:11	347:13
416:3 426:22	concerned 302:23	281:18 304:11	339:25 349:24	continue 252:25
463:4 476:4,25	383:24 388:14	316:15,20 317:3	350:1 353:23	253:21,22 256:25
completed 416:2	concerning 488:5	337:17,23 338:23	429:20 453:24	334:25 404:11
476:4	concerns 268:8	339:15 391:8	454:5 469:4 470:7	430:25 447:13
completely 478:5	277:14,20 309:5	392:11 409:23	consistently 332:20	450:14 464:21
completes 301:12	330:17 342:19,20	476:1	481:15 483:19	484:8
305:9 307:24	345:17 348:12	confirmed 395:11	consists 261:21	Continued 243:1
309:23 310:25	358:21,22,23	395:13 405:25	consolidated 241:5	244:1 245:1
313:1 385:8	377:18 385:17	conflict 350:8,10	247:6,14	continues 461:10
403:19	411:22 447:2	,	·	470:20
		350:11,13	constantly 447:11	
completion 402:25	460:9 475:17	conform 328:1	constituents 433:13	continuing 343:9
complex 253:19	481:21 483:6	476:2	constraints 428:19	434:18 484:23
471:8,16 472:6	491:9 496:19	conformance 325:8	construct 470:14	contract 341:11
499:14	conclude 253:13	confused 267:8	472:23 475:11	342:6 421:5 425:8
compliance 289:7	380:19 436:14	confusion 412:3	constructed 425:10	contracted 393:4,6
317:1 327:23	476:13 491:6,11	connecting 493:2	425:16 426:1	393:20
332:13,17 341:2,7	concluded 401:14	connection 266:6	475:15	contracts 283:22
341:12,15,17	434:24 499:18	connections 272:21	constructing 476:7	342:13 448:7
342:10,25 343:4	concludes 380:21	conservation	construction	contrary 486:18
416:9 449:12	conclusion 341:3	457:18	426:21 475:17,24	contrast 480:2
451:11,11	394:10 401:2	consider 255:18	476:3	482:4
complies 465:1,6	485:25	266:22 267:1,11	consult 452:14	contributing 430:5
complimenting	conclusions 394:9	288:15 292:12	consultant 290:19	431:14
327:3	concurrent 469:21	295:1,10 363:6	392:9	contribution
comply 349:19	concurs 461:21	367:6 381:20	consumers 243:2	430:22
	I	I	I	I

				1 490 000
contributions	407:15 415:17,18	321:22 329:7,10	345:17,23 440:11	Crane 440:8
499:14	417:5 419:23	330:8,20,21,25	478:4 480:3,13,21	create 452:8,11
control 263:17,20	420:21 421:2,7,8	331:4 338:1,21,24	481:25 482:4	463:18
convenient 432:14	421:20,22 422:14	338:25 340:23	490:22,25 491:6	created 383:14
conversation 354:2	423:5,17 424:6	341:1 343:11,14	count 487:3	403:6
409:9 410:7	425:1,5,12,18	343:17 345:25	counter-designate	creates 469:25
convinced 265:4	426:3,5 444:2,11	351:22 381:21,24	410:25 411:12	creating 452:15
convincing 489:19	445:1 492:9	382:17 383:14,19	counter-designat	Credentials 364:22
cooperate 315:5	corrected 394:2	383:19 384:1	411:7,25	credible 450:11
coordination	489:18	403:6 407:10,19	counter-designat	credit 279:6 280:1
451:24	correcting 390:18	407:20,22 429:16	411:5	280:6 281:11,22
copy 268:15 310:19	391:21 456:25	429:17,19 430:5	counter-designat	282:12 283:5
377:2 380:9	corrections 265:17	430:16,20 431:15	411:17	284:19 448:20
core 427:12,24	287:18,21	435:3 436:24	counting 333:24	459:25 460:5,15
428:2 429:20	corrective 396:20	437:6,7 439:9	County 244:12,17	461:2,7 463:5
436:10 454:1	correctly 264:10	448:10,18 452:12	251:4,6 273:19,22	464:7,17 465:2,25
493:3	353:15 440:15	452:13,15 458:15	276:14 285:19,25	466:6,12 480:6
cornerstone 455:15	477:19	463:9,11 464:1	394:25 395:7,24	credits 279:13
corporate 451:8,16	corrects 457:9	469:12,19,25	396:16,25 397:5	339:5 351:6
453:11	Corridor 388:5	470:2,5,10,15	397:14 398:1	creosote 474:9
correct 279:13	cost 280:4,6 281:7	472:20 473:15	444:25 445:2	criteria 294:24,25
297:8,24,25 301:9	282:2,5,14,15	476:25 477:1,5,7	459:21 465:16,22	295:1,8,10,11,24
301:10 304:13	284:24 289:12	479:9 482:10	466:3,13,14,18	374:3 382:2,3
305:7,8 307:22	303:1 316:17	483:11 492:3,6,10	500:6	400:24 401:13,18
309:21,22 310:23	339:3 341:4,8,17	492:11,14	County's 276:12	401:21,23 433:19
310:24 312:24	341:24 345:15,20	counsel 242:19,21	couple 326:8	454:14 474:5
315:20 318:19	345:21 360:6,7,20	248:24 249:2	403:23 423:22	critical 333:3
321:18 324:19	360:21 381:25	258:10 268:17	425:21 476:17	critique 481:19
331:21 332:1,6	382:5,15 401:14	271:10,14 276:10	493:24	cross 246:5,6,6,7,7
333:9 338:17	407:16 429:21	277:1 283:2,5,8	course 257:25	246:8,8,9,9,10,11
340:18 341:21	431:11 435:11,11	303:16 342:21	335:1 347:15	252:23 253:2
342:16 354:15,20	436:4 446:15	359:22 414:14,22	361:7 432:23	257:15,22 258:19
356:19 365:24	448:22 449:12	435:23,24 436:16	471:25 473:10	259:13 260:7
366:7 368:21	456:21 457:1	437:10 440:7	court 259:2,7	261:3,14 266:23
371:16 372:12	464:18 466:8	442:16 443:6,17	268:16 294:9,14	266:25 267:2,16
373:5,8 375:16	469:11,14,14,15	444:23 459:4,20	301:21 360:3	278:6,17 292:25
377:4 383:9,15	469:19 470:4	462:14,18,25	391:13 456:13	314:19,20 360:7
385:6 386:21	479:6 481:21	465:4 477:21,24	467:5 476:20	361:9 375:23
387:10 390:2,22	485:7	477:25 478:10,11	485:22 491:23	376:7,10 381:3,3
392:5,16 394:2,14	cost-effective 458:8	478:18,23,25	498:15 500:8	381:7 399:20
395:1,7,24 396:16	cost-recovery	479:3,16,23	cover 430:20	410:1 414:22
397:1,5,15 398:2	470:17	483:13,16 485:5	478:17	415:1,4 426:13
398:9,14,15 400:5	costly 456:23	491:20 493:19	covered 439:7	440:6,13,20
400:12,22 402:22	costs 276:1 282:21	counsel's 276:8	covering 431:11	cross-exam 409:22
402:23 403:7	303:2 318:16	283:12 342:19	crafted 471:8	cross-examination
	•	•	•	•

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				T age 510
252.12 16 252.12	C+ 272.9	250.1 272.12	Jama 264.22 297.16	229.24
252:12,16 253:12	Curt 273:8	250:1 272:12	days 264:22 287:16	338:24
262:14,20,24	customer 355:1	274:24 275:4	316:1,2,4 371:17	decrease 474:13
263:2 264:6,7	425:3,6 430:16,20	304:2	412:14 428:14,20	decreasing 433:25
265:15,21 266:1,4	431:9,20 446:20	Dan 246:10,11	428:23	deem 265:7,8
266:13,17 292:18	452:2,3 455:22	362:14,20 385:21	DC 243:20	deemed 469:13
292:22 414:15	456:2,24 479:22	Dan'l 253:6 267:16	deadline 316:6	470:15
cross-examinatio	482:12	274:20 307:12	493:25	deep 351:15
361:15	customers 279:7,10	Danner 242:5	deal 255:15	deeper 446:17
cross-examine	279:11 283:6,19	247:25 270:10,11	dealing 306:11	defending 261:15
258:6 259:15	283:20,23 284:19	271:6,11,18 286:9	deals 369:22	defer 322:7,12
266:15 363:16	338:6,15 348:13	287:2 288:4,7	dealt 352:13 416:15	347:8
378:16 381:9	349:6 351:9,17	314:11,12 322:15	Deb 254:15	deferral 477:1
cross-examines	352:1 353:10	322:15 323:12	decade 446:10	deferred 247:12
253:7	354:13,14 355:4	324:15 325:3,9	448:23	355:2 437:16
cross-examining	355:12,20 356:11	326:4,6 327:8,10	decarbonization	deficiencies 404:7
370:20	375:14 383:8	327:21 329:1,17	446:4,7 447:9	404:12
cross-exhibit	402:21 403:3	330:18 331:5	456:20 457:8,11	deficiency 368:24
259:21 260:3,5	405:8 420:21,22	332:3,24 333:7,13	458:12 479:8	378:7 395:11
267:22	421:23 423:10,11	333:20 334:23	decarbonization	404:19,22 405:5
cross-exhibits	424:10 427:3,12	335:2,10 337:10	444:10	449:3,19 450:15
253:6 256:22	427:24 428:2	337:24 338:13,18	December 338:25	define 327:15
266:10 267:17,24	429:7,8,20 431:7	339:11,20 340:4,5	339:4	defined 329:16
274:14,19 385:23	431:12,13 433:11	340:8,16,19	decide 345:7	373:22 381:17
cross-questions	435:4,15 436:11	358:11,23 360:16	376:15	483:4
261:8	447:1,3,7,8,16,20	408:17 439:23	decided 383:20	defines 331:7
cross-subsidizati	448:24 450:12	441:24 493:22	484:7,8	definitely 343:2
461:25	452:4 455:8,17,22	494:5,12	deciding 486:5	degree 330:13
crossed 368:4	456:3 457:6,6,13	data 373:9 376:23	decision 295:23	degrees 416:18
crosses 361:17	457:16 458:2	379:21 380:7	306:13,14 381:24	delay 316:13 318:9
crossing 258:22	459:21,22 460:1,5	396:11 400:11	382:14 384:9	318:10,13
cryogenic 421:17	460:8,13,18 461:3	402:8 405:21,25	390:9 432:25	delayed 406:11
422:8	461:8,9,9,13	471:25	436:1 470:13	473:3
CRYSTAL 241:25	462:1,24 463:6	date 241:24 373:13	472:4,18,23 473:3	delaying 436:8
500:8,20	464:2 466:3,9	391:2,8 406:22	473:18,18 474:23	delicately 471:8
CUP 389:18	469:10 470:6,6,10	427:11 498:12,16	475:10 482:17	deliver 446:11
current 281:23,25	493:4	dated 391:10	490:23 491:1,6	delivering 451:19
282:13 317:16	customers' 283:18	dates 406:11,18	496:23 497:10	467:23
350:13 433:8	cut 251:16	Dave 242:5 322:15	decision-making	delivery 431:2
448:13	cutting 278:8,10	David 242:14	382:8 434:2	453:12
currently 256:8	cybersecurity	248:16 440:8	decisions 386:20	delta 430:22
279:7,10 314:17	448:2	Davison 243:3	433:9	demand 324:22
338:14 349:22		245:10 249:9	declined 481:2,4,14	331:13,24 334:2
351:15 438:17	D	day 366:24 374:25	483:18	343:13 344:10
449:19 452:9	d 333:3 385:13	409:15 435:12,13	declining 484:3	370:24 371:22
453:6	403:24	435:18 500:15	decommissioning	458:8,13
	Damon 243:18			10010,10
	l		I	I

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 490 011
372:10 373:3	description 416:1	455:12 457:3,12	270:15 271:2	295:6 297:12,19
400:21	453:25	developed 329:13	274:23 275:11	299:11,13 300:15
demonstrated	design 387:3 398:9	353:9	277:16,21 278:6	302:10,12 306:3
296:19 299:23	398:13,17 422:25	developing 329:7	278:17 279:3,5,7	307:9 308:17
303:25 306:21	429:5 435:12	329:11 357:19	279:11 281:22	311:19 312:14
364:16 387:8	475:7,17 479:5	463:4 476:6	282:12,17 283:5,6	364:7 365:3
480:1,22 490:9	designated 420:6	development	283:7,14,18,19,20	366:12 383:25
demonstrates	429:8	330:20 348:14	284:5,16,19,23	389:15 432:14
449:18 469:2	designed 339:2	450:14 475:7	288:1,11 293:9	disagreement
demonstrating	423:23 425:19	483:7 484:13	315:8 347:5,21	330:2 492:20
389:22 472:23	428:13 433:18	devote 496:7	349:17 387:17	disallow 483:11
demonstration	455:7 475:15	devoted 497:4	402:2,6 426:20	485:7
295:13 296:16	desk 418:17	devoled 497.4 dex@smxblaw.c	443:3,7 444:22	disappearing 484:3
299:15,20 302:16	Despite 481:23	243:21	445:2 456:9	disbenefit 485:18
303:10,22 306:9	detail 355:10	diesel 433:23	458:23,25 459:2	discomfort 330:13
306:19 364:13	479:11 485:3	difference 295:12	458.23,25 459.2	discount 455:13
382:5 386:17	detailed 255:4	295:15,20 299:14	460:1,3,5,13,14	discourse 329:21
387:6	355:11	299:19 302:15	460:17,22 461:3,7	discovery 342:4
denied 265:8	details 263:22	303:9 306:8	461:9,12,13,15	378:13
268:14	375:21 419:13	373:14 420:19	462:1,19,24 463:6	discretion 345:10
deny 260:6 262:9	determination	430:23	463:9,12,20,25	discuss 353:21
312:3,4	303:1 373:13	differences 319:13	464:2,8,12,14,16	366:21 376:10
Department 349:22	382:11 384:2	different 279:12	464:18 465:2,4,8	484:2
350:2,9	401:20 404:3	281:20 283:2	465:14,22,24	discussed 337:18
depending 478:6	436:1,8 449:7	284:1 320:14	466:3,7,9,9,19,23	337:19 397:25
492:17	472:17 473:14	321:10,11 357:6,7	472:4 478:10,20	414:17,20 433:3
depends 354:7	485:23 487:16	357:8,11 386:4	483:15 494:10	442:21 487:21
499:8,10	determine 295:22	388:15 430:7	495:1	494:3 497:23
deposited 416:23	297:2 368:17	438:15 443:8	directed 254:14	discussing 256:25
417:22	381:20 382:1,17	446:10 464:24	256:15 354:17	437:19
depth 374:5	387:2,5,11 394:16	478:6 495:9	414:23	discussion 258:3
deputy 251:7	403:17 409:16	differentiate	directive 466:1	259:2 334:6
273:23	454:15 487:10,15	302:19	directly 255:15	336:25 337:2
DER 329:8 452:24	determined 319:8	differently 365:16	321:12 396:17	338:19 391:6
453:1,20	329:13,18 333:19	differs 364:11	466:4 474:17	393:11 418:12
derived 330:16	383:20 384:4	difficult 447:4	Director 275:22	465:4 485:16
describe 416:5	389:22 393:23	difficulty 334:8	289:6,10 291:13	discussions 324:13
described 268:2	492:4	diligence 472:7	316:25	460:14,17,19
341:8 401:9	determines 284:22	diligently 464:19	Directors 386:19	464:21 466:1
422:23 453:3	482:21	diminished 294:12	482:14,25 483:25	dispersion 416:6,11
describes 262:17	determining	424:9	491:4	displace 351:21
329:5 483:25	323:16,16 383:18	direct 246:14	Directors' 382:7	disposal 337:15,19
490:14	490:20	247:20 252:22,23	disadvantaged	dispose 247:18
describing 282:7	detriment 324:18	258:11,14 261:21	348:13 433:12	disputed 256:22
400:10	develop 451:16	262:22 264:5	disagree 294:5,25	386:5

[1 490 012
486:21	491:3	331:14,18 333:23	duration 286:16	260:8 266:9,19
distilled 487:9	documented	335:4 336:22	DVR 355:1	293:4,7 297:23
distinction 295:24	401:18	411:1,12 420:2,5		300:10 301:8
distribute 452:4	documents 372:4	440:14 441:20	E	302:23 304:13
454:3	378:11,19 388:22	453:19 464:3,10	E 242:1,1 243:1,1	305:6 307:21
distributed 343:12	415:14	480:21 481:1,18	244:1,1 245:1,1	308:25 309:20
344:10	doing 262:9 286:13	481:20,21 483:13	245:17 293:13	310:23 312:23
distribution 423:16	286:15 313:15	483:17,21,25	298:16 301:23	361:6,10 362:13
424:4,24 428:4	361:15 380:1	485:2 487:22	305:20 308:9	366:21 368:18
429:15,17,19,23	389:10	draft 349:23 350:2	310:9 311:8	369:4,11,24 370:1
430:5,11,15	dollars 349:16	370:25 371:3,23	363:23 381:15	372:8 373:1
431:17,18,20	door 498:1	372:1	385:13,13,13	375:11,13 377:10
438:24,25 439:8	double 331:3,4	drafted 453:21	386:13 403:24,24	377:15,18 378:5
451:18,20 452:1,1	333:23 458:13	dramatic 433:20	403:24 415:10	382:15 383:4,7,15
452:21 453:12	double-check	drew 374:1	500:2,2	386:16 389:23
472:25 492:10,14	360:25	drive 330:2	Earle 276:9,10	390:19 392:5,8,15
493:3	Doumit 242:6	DRK 379:17,18	279:20,20 280:13	393:2,18,22
distributional	247:25 269:19,20	385:25	282:25 440:8	394:11,13 395:17
346:24 452:19,22	269:22,25 271:6	DRK-12 371:10	464:3,10 483:13	398:9,14,17
454:2 479:7	271:12,19 276:21	DRK-28X 267:17	483:17,21,25	400:19 402:17,20
distributions	276:22,23 277:9	DRK-29X 267:21	earlier 287:13	403:7 404:6,7,12
451:24	287:7 314:14	268:13 274:20	292:13 336:7	406:4,12,19 444:8
diverse 459:19	346:22,23 347:1	376:8 379:20	363:5 386:3	446:1 449:1,12
461:24	347:25 348:10,19	385:24 410:2	391:23 404:4,13	450:8,11 489:11
divided 445:25	350:22 351:1	DRK-34X 267:18	410:20 413:8	495:4,25 496:6,8
docket 262:4	352:7,16,22 354:4	DRK-35X 267:21	435:1 478:9,21	496:17,25 497:1,4
280:12,14 302:22	354:10,18,23	268:13 274:15,20	479:13 487:19	497:14,17
302:22 326:23	355:3,9,22 356:1	399:4,24 410:2,3	494:3 497:24	easy 428:16 463:21
327:15 332:22	356:17 358:13,24	dry 317:18 320:22	earliest 286:24	echo 327:11
333:19 334:22	360:18 408:16	321:2,3,13 337:15	early 336:10	economic 463:22
347:11 382:25	426:16,19 427:9	337:17,18	395:11 407:1	483:7 484:12
418:1 466:2 470:9	427:17 428:7,9	dsteele@perkins	416:7 460:22	economically 435:5
dockets 241:3	429:1,11 431:4,21	242:18	earning 344:19	economics 292:6
247:6,8	434:17 435:22	due 253:25 256:3	446:23	415:17
document 263:16	436:12,19 437:8	262:10 352:10	earnings 343:14,18	ED 325:20
297:8 299:6	439:24 440:24	463:25 472:7	344:8,15	education 416:5,20
300:24 320:10	453:4 487:18	488:23 498:18	Earth 250:25	417:20
321:25 379:18,21	491:21,24 492:19	499:3	273:14	EE 489:18,19
380:3 486:17	492:25 493:16	duplicative 330:19	Earthjustice 244:8	effect 456:19
documentation	downstream	durability 285:20	ease 498:20	effective 437:1
296:4 370:6,15	421:18 422:8	durable 284:18	easier 330:5,11	457:1
371:2,25 377:8,13	dozen 471:20	285:3,13 459:24	easily 425:20	effectively 496:8
378:3 386:20	Dr 323:18 325:11	460:7 461:1 463:4	east 449:3 450:13	efficacy 456:22
389:14 390:2	326:11 329:5,7,8	463:18 465:5	eastside 244:21	efficiency 325:19
396:3 482:25	329:24 331:8,12	466:11	251:10 253:4	457:19
			258:22 259:18	
	•	•	•	·

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				ÿ
efficient 258:1	484:17	450:11 489:11	engines 420:20	349:5
effort 318:21	emitted 416:21	495:3,25 496:6,8	enhance 448:1	equitable 446:7
347:22,24	417:7,19	496:17,25 497:1,4	enhanced 446:22	451:13,17 484:24
efforts 499:7	emphasize 284:3	497:14,17	ensure 328:23	484:25
EIS 393:6 403:10	304:20	energy 241:7	438:17 446:15	equitably 452:4
434:7,12,15	emphasized 451:3	242:13 243:2,7	ensures 466:8	454:4
449:24 475:21	EMV 357:25 358:1	244:21 247:10,11	469:14,24 470:5	equities 434:21
either 287:1 355:6	enable 458:6	247:14 249:7,12	ensuring 461:25	equity 346:24
410:2 423:12	enabling 353:1	249:15 250:23	entails 346:6	431:25 432:7,8
456:9 459:5	355:13 356:12	251:1,1,11 257:14	enter 356:18	433:3 434:4,9,19
468:10	encompasses 348:8	266:2,7 267:4,7,9	entered 342:7	444:8 446:2
elaborate 404:16	encountered	271:1,21,23 272:2	453:23 464:15	448:12,14 451:1,4
433:14	421:18 422:8	271:1,21,23 272:2 272:3 273:15	470:13	451:6 452:16,16
elaboration 496:24	encourage 287:19	275:23 279:5,6,13	enterprise-wide	452:19,21,22
electric 302:22	368:8 378:25	279:25 280:5	451:14	453:16,22 454:15
304:6 322:24	379:1 456:20	281:11 284:19	entire 404:5 415:8	454:17 455:9
	457:1,16 460:13		431:18 444:18	456:21 458:5
333:23 348:24,25 349:4,15 395:6	482:6	289:15,16 290:6 290:12,14,18,24		473:20,21 478:15
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ends 252:7 298:2		entirely 402:23 488:13	,
396:15,25 397:4 397:13 398:1		292:7 317:12		479:7,19,20,24,25
	Energies 276:18	325:19 326:7	entirety 390:11	480:2,3,10,14
435:15 450:5	Energize 253:4	332:13,16 343:13	407:10 411:15	481:16 482:2
479:4 481:4	258:21 259:18	351:6 353:19	412:8,11 497:12	483:7 486:4,6,6,7
electrical 325:12	260:8 266:9,18	362:21 413:15	entities 397:11,19	487:23 490:12,15
394:25 395:23	293:3,7 297:23	418:6 419:1	entity 397:20	491:9
electrification	300:10 301:8	424:15 442:16	environmental	equity-related
317:13 450:15	302:23 304:13	444:8 446:2,6,12	244:7 250:22	452:8,11
456:1 457:1,4,12	305:6 307:21	446:17 447:8,9,13	273:11,16 383:13	ER 411:21
457:17 458:5	308:25 309:20	448:8,8 451:25	385:16 393:7	Erdahl 246:9,10
479:8	310:23 312:23	453:25 454:24	403:5,9,17 416:8	254:5,21 289:22
electrify 457:17	361:6,10 362:13	455:16 456:3	416:14 434:5,7	289:23 313:23,24
elegant 463:21	366:21 368:18	457:18,22 458:4	444:9 446:3	348:2,2 361:1,13
element 332:15,16	369:4,11,23 370:1	459:15,25 460:4	449:24 456:11,17	361:20 362:14,24
448:25	372:8 373:1	461:2,7 465:24	474:7 483:5	362:24 363:5
elevated 422:1	375:10,13 377:10	466:6,12 477:18	484:15 490:12,15	374:9 375:23,24
475:3	377:15 378:5	477:18,22 489:24	491:10,12	376:3 381:4,6,11
Eli 256:7	382:15 383:4,7,14	490:3	envision 329:19	384:20,24 385:11
eligible 343:14,18	386:16 389:23	Energy's 280:4	envisioning 443:24	385:15 386:24
344:7,14	390:19 392:5,8,15	engage 460:17	equal 264:25 464:7	406:16,18 407:3,6
eliminate 466:14	393:2,18,22	475:1	464:18	407:14 408:2
email 399:2 400:9	394:11,13 395:17	engaged 418:4	equation 434:19	413:20,20 492:2
embedded 324:24	398:9,14,17	472:1 474:15,22	equipment 348:24	especially 412:20
325:4	400:19 402:17,20	engineer 415:16	348:25 349:18	essence 487:9
emission 483:6	403:6 404:6 406:4	416:8	353:11 424:12,12	essential 455:17
emissions 416:10	406:11,19 444:8	engineering 415:20	426:23	466:13
416:16 457:21	446:1 449:1,12	415:22	equipment-owned	essentially 256:18
	1	1	1	1

r				1 age 014
283:14 328:8	372:21	480:23	267:19 268:2,5,11	406:14 427:25
330:24 333:11	everybody 348:8	exchangers 421:15	274:13 293:21	429:18 431:7
344:12,21 352:1	everybody's 285:8	exclude 337:14	370:12 386:5	493:1
392:21 430:13	everyone's 499:14	excluded 316:16	392:7 399:6	explained 262:7
476:13 494:17	everyone 3499.14 evidence 262:3,13	exclusion 454:10	409:22 410:1	312:4 441:4
establish 284:18	263:12,14 264:24	excuse 267:5	414:22,25 471:24	explaining 365:16
368:10 377:17	376:9 379:4	348:23 441:20	489:12	412:15
392:5,8,14 393:1	380:13 386:7		exist 464:16	
	389:6 396:3 410:4	excused 260:13,23 288:10,16 359:1,6		explains 319:7
393:18 455:13 487:20		· · · ·	existing 324:25	464:10 483:17,21 485:3
	417:10 472:3	359:15 360:1,24	434:11 449:4,16	
established 303:7	473:5,7 489:19	excusing 358:19	457:5	explanation 333:2
308:21 327:12	evidentiary 256:25	executive 243:11	expand 447:15	explicit 354:2
349:20 393:24	EVSE 349:15 350:5	249:19,21 272:4,7	expect 248:7	explicitly 410:2
490:11	350:17,21	290:16,20 475:3	261:15 293:5	469:17
establishes 466:11	exact 370:8	exhibit 257:6	295:22 481:10	exploration 415:23
establishing 460:4	exactly 323:20	261:19,22,24	expectation 285:5	explored 370:9
estimate 322:2	340:17 430:18	262:2,8,25 265:12	286:20 287:1	explosion 419:10
438:5	examination 246:4	265:22 267:15	354:9 460:12	419:15 420:12
estimated 253:11	275:12 362:5	268:12,15,18,21	expectations	487:12
329:6,10 407:10	380:19,21	297:3 298:19	336:12	expound 487:16
estimates 330:11	examinations	300:2 302:1	expected 328:25	expressed 342:23
ethane 422:1	386:4	305:23 307:4	expects 286:12	expressly 463:13
423:10	examine 378:5	308:12 310:16	expediency 381:5	extended 448:7
EV 333:22,24,25	examined 377:10	311:14 315:6	expenditures	extension 430:13
evaluate 324:8	377:15	316:10,12 319:6	318:24 482:18	456:25 479:8
326:19,20 327:6	examiner 389:20	320:1,1,5 337:20	expense 339:14	extensive 403:10
357:6 373:19	390:5 393:23	340:7,10 364:1,24	expenses 320:22	472:22
394:6 429:1	Examiner's 390:9	365:18,21 369:21	321:2 339:16	extensively 475:16
432:25 491:9	example 262:1	369:25 370:17	experience 300:19	475:20
evaluated 336:23	320:23 325:19	376:7,8,22 380:12	experienced 282:16	extent 328:21 336:2
403:13	429:23 434:8	380:17 384:12,16	experiencing 458:3	351:20,21 430:21
evaluating 306:24	486:13	384:21 385:1	expert 258:1	433:4
311:24 351:16	exceed 444:20	386:6 387:13	262:17 296:23	extra 412:3
356:10 357:7,11	exceeded 394:20	390:20 392:10	299:25 300:20	eye 269:11
evaluation 312:20	395:17 404:21,25	396:13 398:20,22	307:2 364:21	eyes 368:23
356:15,18 357:1	404:25 405:2	398:25 399:1,9,12	373:17 394:5	•
357:21,23 382:6	483:20	399:13,14,15,20	411:16 412:7	F
482:23 490:12	exception 268:12	399:24 402:1	expert's 369:15	F 500:2
491:3	274:14 361:1	410:20 420:3	expertise 416:6,20	face 447:4
evening 488:1	385:24 413:9	475:10 489:17	417:20	facilities 418:11
event 316:5 405:4	excerpts 261:21	498:8 499:1	experts 377:19	419:7,7,22 430:25
427:16	264:5 377:6,19,24	exhibits 252:18	explain 256:22	476:1
events 339:8	396:10	256:19 257:6	262:11 281:9	facility 261:24
428:23	excess 498:10	260:2 265:1,3,11	318:13 319:16	317:21 338:5
eventually 321:10	excessive 479:21	265:13,16 267:16	338:3 368:3 404:1	420:11,15 423:13
2, chicaung 521.10		203.13,10 207.10	550.5 500.5 404.1	423:23 424:3
	1	I	I	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				Tage 515
425:10,11,16,17	fairly 260:22	feedback 272:16	398:8,13,16	363:19,25 364:13
425:19 426:1,22	286:18 334:13	335:20 451:23	401:14 453:14	384:2 387:6,21
427:2,7,8 429:2	336:3 343:24	feel 248:11 257:8	finalize 358:1	388:1 392:22
429:25 430:6	344:6 416:11	262:2 264:10	finalized 343:6	406:20,23 414:18
432:15 434:7	464:12 465:1	278:24 459:6	finally 455:25	428:3 430:4
436:2,4 439:9	fairness 496:20	FEIS 486:12,16	470:11	442:21 445:12
458:15 472:19,24	fallback 347:23	487:6	finance 480:5	446:22 451:8,10
473:19,25 474:2,4	falls 332:2	fell 353:14	financial 330:15	451:22 455:11
474:24 475:15,18	familiar 309:9,11	FERC 396:16,17	331:2 446:16,22	459:1,4 462:4
475:24,25 476:4,7	309:14 312:19	438:13,23 439:10	447:4,17 448:19	467:3,14 468:8,11
484:13,14,16,20	338:8 365:17,21	ffitch 249:16	financially 446:13	468:12 471:17
	,		Ũ	
484:21 486:17	368:10 375:21	265:19,20,25	financing 488:11	477:24 481:14
487:7,11 488:6,7	380:3,9 386:6	266:21 267:13	find 280:16 322:16	firsthand 300:24
488:8,9,12 490:24	399:8,11,13,15,18	272:3 308:19	370:8 385:7	301:4 308:22
492:11 493:2,4,8	400:13 405:14	309:6 310:3	394:18 482:9	368:6
facility's 427:20	416:11	field 300:1	findings 371:3	fish 434:10
fact 286:22 324:2	far 297:9 319:25	fifth 242:22 245:5	372:1 457:7,9	five 287:16 292:18
344:6,13,16 351:4	389:3 435:21	317:24	finds 375:13 383:6	316:2 323:5 333:9
394:19 423:7	467:24	figure 269:3	402:19 479:21	371:17 394:22
474:1 484:24	faster 447:9	file 264:20 411:15	489:17	395:17 404:13,15
factor 296:16	fatal 297:8,11,13	411:18 412:10	fine 258:24 260:19	411:7,25 450:16
299:20 303:22	297:20 300:9,14	438:18	269:4 359:9,21	466:2
306:19 307:1	300:16 307:7,10	filed 247:13 255:10	367:12 409:11	five- 343:5
364:13 387:6	365:1,4 366:11,13	255:11,11 262:8	459:4,5 468:14	five-business-day
404:2	367:18 387:19	265:16 267:17	494:12 497:18	255:17
factors 294:2,6,7	388:1,4,23 389:16	309:2 385:24	finish 253:22 270:1	five-minute 442:1,3
295:7 299:9,12	390:1,18 391:21	405:12,16 406:20	finished 314:19	five-tier 455:13
302:8,11,13 306:1	391:23 394:2	407:17,19,23	fire 388:2 475:25	fixed 431:11,15
306:4,6 308:15,18	489:10,14,18	446:21 460:20	476:1	435:3 447:3
311:17,20,24	favor 462:14	463:2 470:22	firm 250:8 275:6	flaw 388:2,4
312:15,16,18	466:22 467:2	471:16,18,19,21	277:2,4 290:19	flaws 297:8,11,14
364:5,8,9 369:22	470:25 476:16	492:4	448:8	297:20 300:9,14
386:15 387:2,3	497:12	files 400:4,6,9	first 252:13 254:9	300:17 307:8,11
482:19,21,22	FEA 313:20 359:5	filing 318:20	261:1,13 263:7	365:1,5 366:11,13
483:22 489:7	features 326:1	319:13,25 320:13	268:3 279:4	367:19,21,22
facts 262:11,13	422:25	341:2,7,12,15,17	281:16 284:4	387:19 388:23
417:10 490:20	February 391:10	341:17,20,22,24	293:10 296:16	389:16 390:1,18
fail 484:9	476:5	341:25 342:10,15	299:20 300:25	391:21,23 394:2
failed 484:6 489:6	fed 424:24	342:25 343:5,7	303:22 305:22	481:18 489:10,14
fails 450:4 483:8	federal 243:11	351:22 436:10	306:19 309:9,15	489:18
484:10 485:3	249:19,21 272:4,7	437:1 449:13	310:11 316:15	flexibility 345:7
failure 325:1	290:16,20 352:2	451:11 469:20	317:1,14 326:8	Floor 243:19
fair 329:21 416:1,3	450:5	473:3	327:19 336:4	flow 296:19,20,23
443:11 463:4	feed 421:11 423:2	filings 317:6	349:13 353:5	297:1,11 299:23
469:9 480:23	424:13,15,21	final 319:10 350:12	356:23 359:2	299:24 300:14
	,			
		l		l

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

303:25 304:1 formally 254:21 289:5.6 fonctional 427:6 487:23 306:21,22,23 263:11 275:11 317:11 318:19 300:16 300:22 204:5 306:17,19 forms 328:11 317:15 320:23 321:1,19 320:23 321:1,19 320:22 388:1 351:17,19 447:16 317:25 318:6 306:17,19 forms 421:4 476:7 320:23 321:6 300:222 388:6 309:16 391:20,25 317:19 300:21 341:10.10.18,21 352:16 421:11.17 421:14.17 390:16 391:20,25 317:19 433:321 426:17,277 422:10 422:11 422:17 390:16 391:20,166 487:17 350:20 352:17 423:21 421:10,17 404:11 484:7 ass:1456:24 488:16 439:5,17 350:20 352:17 422:20 427:23,12 focused 255: found 262:15 Freeport 420:11,15 350:42,23 399:20 406:2,19 429:20,23,312 <					1 age 010
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	202.25 204.1	formally 254.21	280.5 6 216.24 25	functional 127.6	187.22
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		•			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				0	0
366:11 368:17.19 forum 263:21 322:18 337:22.22 455:24 322:23 388:2 373:18 387:9,9,20 forward 263:23 338:8,17 339:1,18 funds 351:20 352:4 418:10 419:7 390:16 391:20,25 317:19 320:21 341:10,10,18,82 352:6 420:19,20,21,23 392:16 393:13,14 321:1,4,16 323:20 342:6,16,20,25 further 251:17 421:11,17 422:1,7 404:11 448:19 434:3,21 460:6 408:7 413:13,13 286:7 287:6 423:21 424:13,15 474:13 489:10,16 465:3 473:19 437:19 438:2,2,10 322:10 337:9 424:19,21,23 focuss 489:24 484:7 438:16 439:5,17 350:20 352:17 425:20 427:3,12 focuss 482:20 307:17 334:22 422:7 423:7 437:1,14 408:5,14 426:8 459:6 folks 258:6,7 390:19 394:13,24 frequenty 312:5 411:2,16 463:18 435:17,13 488:9 folks 258:6,7 395:6 399:4 Friday 25:12 470:16 492:5 472:24 493:3 follow 264:24 450:10 fro 425:0232 52:12 470:16 492:5 473:14 493:3 follw - y 335:16 327:13 365:7 73	, ,			, ,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-		· · · · · ·	,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $, , ,		
392:16 393:13,14 321:1,4,16 323:20 342:6,16,20,25 further 251:17 421:11,17 422:1,7 394:1,4 400:4,11 327:16 433:1 343:2 352:1 408:6 261:5 277.20 423:21 424:13,15 474:13 489:10,16 465:3 473:19 437:19 438:2,2,10 322:10 337:9 423:21 424:13,15 474:13 489:10,16 465:3 473:19 438:16 439:5,17 350:20 352:17 423:21 424:13,15 focus 425:5 found 262:15 Freeport 420:11,15 399:20 406:2,19 427:24 428:2,18 focus 482:20 307:17 334:22 422:7 423:7 437:9,13 439:22 436:11 456:24 follow 264:24 300:10 934:13,24 Frequently 312:5 411:2,16 463:18 457:5,7,13 458:9 follow 264:24 450:10 Fro 291:6 Furthermore 483:51,72 493:3 356:4,23 357:20 foundation 323:15 front 250:23 251:2 409:10 433:23 375:12 389:516 gates 433:25 follow 264:24 450:13 300:11 430:21 389:21 395:16 gates 433:25 Gates 244:14 251:6 273:21 492:20 four 294:2,5,7 434:16 285:13,22 316:18 389:21 395:16 gates 43:21 gater 43:21 follow 264:25 399:14 <td></td> <td></td> <td>, , ,</td> <td></td> <td></td>			, , ,		
394:1,4 400:4,11 327:16 433:1 343:2 352:1 408:6 261:5 277:20 422:16 423:2,11 404:11 448:19 434:3,21 460:6 408:7 413:13,13 286:7 287:6 423:21 424:13,15 474:13 489:10,16 465:3 473:19 437:19 438:2,10 322:10 337:9 422:12 424:13,15 flows 429:23 484:7 438:16 439:5,17 350:20 352:17 352:20 427:3,12 focused 255:5 found 262:15 Freeport 420:11,15 399:20 406:2,19 429:20,23 431:2 349:10 468:24 280:21 297:8 frequently 312:5 441:2,16 463:18 457:5,7,13 436:9 folks 258:6,7 390:19 394:13,24 frequently 312:5 470:16 492:5 436:11 456:24 folks 258:6,7 395:6 399:14 fro291:6 Furthermore 483:5 484:17 follow 264:24 450:10 fro 291:6 Furthermore gases 433:25 follow 287:16 295:6 299:9,11 full 20:24 423:4 317:6,7 338:16 gather 268:25 follow up 335:16 302:8,10,12 306:1 429:10 433:23 375:12 383:5 gathering 498:11 292:19 336:20 302:8,10,12 306:1 429:10 433:23					
404:11 448:19 434:3,21 460:6 408:7 413:13,13 286:7 287:6 423:21 424:13,15 474:13 489:10,16 405:3 473:19 437:19 438:2,2,10 322:10 337:9 424:19,21,23 focus 389:2 454:1 fossi 456:24 458:8 459:6 356:1 358:9 425:20 427:3,12 focused 255:5 found 262:15 freege 421:11,17 399:20 406:2,19 425:20 427:3,12 focuses 482:20 307:17 334:22 422:7 423:7 437:9,13 439:22 436:11 456:24 focuses 482:20 307:17 334:22 frequenty 312:5 441:2,16 463:18 457:5,7,13 458:9 folks 258:6,7 395:6 399:4 Friday 255:12 470:16 492:5 472:25 479:4,7 follow 264:24 450:10 for 291:6 Furthermore 389:21 395:16 389:21 395:16 389:21 395:16 392:4:41:4 251:6 405:18,19 431:4 371:5 463:3 300:11 430:21 284:20,22 285:3 273:21 gather 279:11 gather 279:11 gather 268:25 394:11 295:6 299:9,11 402:24 423:4 375:12 383:5 gathering 498:11 gathering 498:11 gathering 498:11 gathering 498:11 gathering 498:12 273:21 246:15,18 248:22 247:13 249:1,4	,				
474:13 489:10,16 465:3 473:19 437:19 438:2,2,10 322:10 337:9 424:19,21,23 fows 429:23 684:7 438:16 439:5,17 350:20 352:17 425:20 427:3,12 focused 255:5 found 262:15 750:00 426:2,19 429:20,23 431:2 427:24 428:2,18 focused 32:7 390:19 394:13,24 freeze 421:11,17 408:5,14 426:8 436:11 456:24 folks 258:6,7 390:19 394:13,24 Frequently 312:5 471:2,16 463:18 457:5,71 3458:9 follow 264:24 450:10 frod 250:23 251:2 389:21 395:16 389:21 395:16 389:21 395:16 356:4,23 357:20 four 294:2,5,7 four 242:2,5,7 434:16 284:20,22 38:32 gates 244:14 251:6 405:18,19 431:4 371:5 463:3 300:11 430:21 284:20,22 88:32 gathering 498:11 292:19 336:20 four 294:2,5,7 434:16 284:20,22 88:32 gathering 498:11 292:19 336:20 306:3 313:15 fuel 420:24 423:4 317:6,7 338:16 gathering 498:11 292:19 336:20 306:3 313:15 fuel 420:24 423:4 317:6,7 338:16 gathering 498:11 292:19 336:27 392:14 491:44:1446:15 321:6,7 322:10 345:	· · ·				,
flows 429:23 484:7 438:16 439:5,17 350:20 352:17 425:20 427:3,12 focused 255:5 found 262:15 found 262:15 found 262:15 state 459:6 350:20 352:17 425:20 427:3,12 focused 255:5 found 262:15 found 262:15 foregott 420:11,15 399:20 406:2,19 429:20,23 431:2 focuses 482:20 307:17 334:22 420:7 423:7 437:9,13 439:22 436:11 456:24 focuses 482:20 307:17 334:22 Frequently 312:5 441:2,16 463:18 457:5,7,13 458:9 folks 258:6,7 395:6 399:4 Friday 255:12 470:16 492:5 472:25 479:4,7 follow 264:24 450:10 fro 291:6 Furthermore 485:17,24 493:3 gase 433:25 found 261:7 273:12,15 298:22 389:21 395:16 gase 433:25 follow:0287:16 302:8,10,12 306:1 300:11 430:21 284:20,22 285:3 gather 268:25 gather 264:25 394:11 9 402:18 460:14 general 242:8,9,20 437:4 491:24 311:17,19 312:15 full 264:21 265:5 461:4 466:15 247:13 249:1,4 forece 264:25		,	,		
focus 389:2 454:1 fossil 456:24 458:8 459:6 356:1 358:9 427:24 428:2,18 focused 255:5 found 262:15 Freeport 420:11,17 399:20 406:2,19 429:20,23 431:2 focuses 482:20 307:17 334:22 freeze 421:11,17 408:5,14 426:8 435:15,19 436:9 focuses 482:20 307:17 334:22 freeze 421:11,17 408:5,14 426:8 457:5,7,13 458:9 folks 258:6,7 395:6 399:4 Friday 255:12 411:2,16 463:18 457:5,7,13 458:9 follow 264:24 450:10 fro 291:6 Furthermore 483:5 17,24 493:3 follow-up 335:16 327:13 365:7 273:12,15 298:22 future 279:11 Gates 244:14 251:6 following 287:16 295:6 299:9,11 fuel 420:24 423:4 317:67 338:16 gathering 498:11 292:19 36:20 302:8,10,12 306:1 429:10 433:23 375:12 383:5 gathering 498:11 292:19 36:27 366:4,57 302:16 303:10 469:19 271:13,15 31:24 fore 264:25 394:14 395:14 306:3 303:10 326:6,73 303:10 345:20 350:23 fore 264:25 394:17,19 404:13 44:6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
focused 255:5 found 262:15 Freeport 420:11,15 399:20 406:2,19 429:20,23 431:2 349:10 468:24 280:21 297:8 freeze 421:11,17 408:5,14 426:8 435:15,19 436:9 focusing 432:7 390:19 394:13,24 frequently 312:5 441:2,16 463:18 435:5,7,13 458:9 folks 258:6,7 395:6 399:4 Friday 255:12 470:16 492:5 472:25 479:4,7 gass 35:42 450:10 fro 291:6 Furthermore 485:17,24 493:3 356:4,23 357:20 foundation 323:15 four 291:6 Furthermore 485:17,24 493:3 402:20 four 294:2,5,7 434:16 285:13,22 316:18 gathering 498:11 292:10 336:20 302:8,10,12 306:1 429:10 433:23 375:12 383:16 gathering 498:11 292:19 336:20 302:8,10,12 306:1 429:10 433:23 375:12 383:16 gathering 498:11 499:15 357:7,8 364:5,7 302:16 303:10 429:10 433:21 375:12 383:5 gathering 498:11 469:15 357:7,8 364:5,7 302:16 303:10 30:15:1,18 248:25 469:19 271:13,15 317:24 438:17 451:5 453:25			,		,
349:10 468:24 focuses 482:20280:21 297:8 307:17 334:22freeze 421:11,17 422:7 423:7408:5,14 426:8 437:913 439:22435:15,19 436:9 436:11 456:24focusing 432:7 folks 258:6,7399:19 394:13,24 395:6 399:4frequently 312:5 Friday 255:12441:2,16 463:18 477:25 479:4,7437:7,13 458:9 477:16 492:5477:12 479:4,7 483:17,18 495:20follow 264:24 450:10450:10 fro 291:6fro 291:6 fro 291:6Furthermore statist 485:17,24 493:3 389:21 395:16485:17,24 493:3 (ass: 484:17follow 264:24 450:10450:10 statist 357:7fron 250:23 251:2 390:11 430:21389:21 395:16 288:22 285:3gase 433:25 gather 268:25follow 10 327:15 492:20four 294:2,5,7 fuel 420:24 423:4317:6,7 388:16 300:11 430:21gather 268:25 288:12,22 315:18 gather 268:25following 287:16 292:19 336:20302:8,10,12 306:1 302:8,10,12 306:1429:10 433:23 429:10 433:23 303:10,12 306:1317:6,7 338:16 429:10 433:23follow 422:11 437:4 491:24 311:17,19 312:15 fore 264:25312:6,7 322:10 315:9,14 377:2G Gafken 242:20 246:15,18 248:251 249:12 285:23 249:12 285:23 249:12 285:23 249:12 482:21forecast 433:19 488:3 forecast 433:19fourth 242:15 fourth 242:15Fuller 245:24:248:10 251:22,23 257:1,2 246:15,18 248:251 249:12 285:23 296:211 249:12 285:23 296:21 249:12 285:23 296:212 249:12 281:338:9 400:6 418:9 2417:2fo					· · · · ·
focuses 482:20 307:17 334:22 422:7 423:7 437:9,13 439:22 436:11 456:24 focusing 432:7 390:19 394:13,24 frequently 312:5 441:2,16 463:18 457:5,7,13 458:9 folks 258:6,7 395:6 399:4 Friday 255:12 470:16 492:5 472:25 479:4,7 follow 264:24 450:10 fro 291:6 Furthermore 483:5 484:17 follow-up 335:16 327:13 365:7 273:12,15 298:22 furthermore 483:5 484:17 d05:18,19 431:4 371:5 463:3 300:11 430:21 284:20,22 285:3 gather 268:25 following 287:16 295:6 299:9,11 fuel 420:24 423:4 317:6,7 338:16 gathering 498:11 g22:19 336:20 302:8,10,12 306:1 429:10 433:23 375:12 383:5 gathering 498:11 general 242:8,9,20 431:47,19 312:15 full 264:21 265:5 460:14 346:14 346:15 247:13 249:1,4 forec 264:25 394:21 401:9,10 315:15 302:16 303:10 345:20 325:23 266:21 following 287:16 357:7,8 364:5,7 302:16 303:10 325:17,8 364:5,7 302:16 303:10 345:20 350:23			-	,	
focusing 432:7 390:19 394:13,24 frequently 312:5 441:2,16 463:18 457:5,7,13 458:9 folks 258:6,7 395:6 399:4 7riday 255:12 470:16 492:5 472:25 479:4,7 280:16 357:11 400:10 434:9 256:3 399:14 493:17,18 495:20 483:5 484:17 follow 264:24 450:10 fron 250:23 251:2 389:21 395:16 gase 433:25 follow-up 335:16 327:13 365:7 273:12,15 298:22 future 279:11 Gates 244:14 251:6 405:18,19 431:4 371:5 463:3 300:11 430:21 284:20,22 285:3 273:21 92:20 four 294:2,5,7 434:16 285:13,22 316:18 gather 268:25 following 287:16 302:8,10,12 306:1 429:10 433:23 375:12 383:5 gather 268:25 341:14 395:14 306:3 308:15,17 484:18,19 402:18 460:14 general 242:8,9,20 437:4 491:24 311:17,19 312:15 full 264:21 265:5 461:4 466:15 247:13 249:1,4 forece 264:25 394:21 401:9,10 315:9,14 377:2 451:5,824:23 452:10 334:12 foreceast 394:17,19 404:13 444:6 382:1 384:24			-	<i>'</i>	,
folks 258:6,7 395:6 399:4 Friday 255:12 470:16 492:5 472:25 479:4,7 280:16 357:11 400:10 434:9 256:3 399:14 493:17,18 495:20 483:5 484:17 follow 264:24 450:10 fro 291:6 399:14 493:17,18 495:20 483:5 484:17 405:18,19 431:4 371:5 463:3 300:11 430:21 284:20,22 285:3 273:21 492:20 four 294:2,5,7 434:16 285:13,22 316:18 gather 268:25 92:19 336:20 302:81,01,2 306:1 429:10 433:23 371:5,7,8 364:5,7 302:16 429:10 433:23 375:12 383:5 gathering 498:11 341:14 395:14 306:3 308:15,17 484:18,19 402:18 460:14 general 242:8,9,20 437:4 491:24 311:17,19 312:15 full 264:21 265:5 469:19 271:13,15 317:24 fore 264:25 394:21 401:9,10 315:9,14 377:2 302:16 303:10 321:67, 322:10 forecast 394:17,19 404:13 444:6 382:1 384:24 249:1 268:23 269:6,11 271:11 212:67 32:10 forecast 483:19 fourt 422:15 Fulle 245:4 246:11 211:21 412:19 285:23 296:21 285:23 296:21 forecast 483:19 fourth 242:15 Fulle 2	focuses 482:20	307:17 334:22	422:7 423:7	437:9,13 439:22	436:11 456:24
280:16 357:11 400:10 434:9 256:3 399:14 493:17,18 495:20 483:5 484:17 follow 264:24 450:10 fro 291:6 Furthermore 485:17,24 493:3 356:4,23 357:20 foundation 323:15 front 250:23 251:2 389:21 395:16 gates 433:25 follow-up 335:16 327:13 365:7 273:12,15 298:22 future 279:11 Gates 244:14 251:6 492:20 four 294:2,5,7 434:16 285:13,22 316:18 gather 268:25 following 287:16 295:6 299:9,11 fuel 420:24 423:4 317:6,7 338:16 gathering 498:11 292:19 336:20 302:8,10,12 306:1 429:10 433:23 375:12 383:5 gathering 498:11 292:19 336:20 302:8,10,12 306:1 429:10 433:23 375:12 383:5 gathering 498:11 292:19 336:20 300:308:15,17 484:18,19 401:14 466:15 247:13 249:1,4 follow 422:11 311:17,19 312:15 full 624:21 265:5 461:4 466:15 247:13 249:1,4 follow 422:11 312:16,18 353:7 292:13 312:16 246:15,18 248:25 249:12 68:23 forecast 394:17,19 404:13 444:6 382:1 384:24 246:15,18 248:25 249:12 68:23 forecast 48	focusing 432:7	390:19 394:13,24		441:2,16 463:18	457:5,7,13 458:9
follow 264:24 450:10 fro 291:6 Furthermore 485:17,24 493:3 356:4,23 357:20 foundation 323:15 front 250:23 251:2 389:21 395:16 gases 433:25 405:18,19 431:4 371:5 463:3 300:11 430:21 284:20,22 285:3 273:21 492:20 four 294:2,5,7 434:16 295:6 299:9,11 fuel 420:24 423:4 317:6,7 338:16 gather 268:25 341:14 395:14 306:3 308:15,17 484:18,19 402:18 460:14 general 242:8,9,20 469:15 357:7,8 364:5,7 302:16 303:10 306:92 386:15,19 306:92 386:15,19 306:92 386:15,19 fore 264:25 394:21 401:9,10 315:9,14 377:2 392:15 393:2,18 246:15,18 248:25 246:15,18 248:25 forecast 394:17,19 404:13 444:6 382:1 384:24 269:6,11 271:11 328:7 330:13 forecast 394:17,19 404:13 444:6 382:1 393:2,18 249:1 268:23 269:6,11 271:11 forecast 394:17,19 404:13 444:6 382:1 384:24 269:6,11 271:11 338:9 400:6 418:9 483:18 493:1 456:5 472:7,8 249:1 268:23 269:6,11 271:11 285:23 296:21 forecast 483:19 fourth 242:15 <t< th=""><td>folks 258:6,7</td><td>395:6 399:4</td><td>Friday 255:12</td><td>470:16 492:5</td><td>472:25 479:4,7</td></t<>	folks 258:6,7	395:6 399:4	Friday 255:12	470:16 492:5	472:25 479:4,7
356:4,23 357:20 foundation 323:15 front 250:23 251:2 389:21 395:16 gases 433:25 405:18,19 431:4 371:5 463:3 300:11 430:21 284:20,22 285:3 273:21 492:20 four 294:2,5,7 434:16 284:20,22 285:3 gates 443:21 292:19 336:20 300:30:11 430:21 284:20,22 285:3 gater 268:25 following 287:16 295:6 299:9,11 fuel 420:24 423:4 317:6,7 338:16 gatter 268:25 341:14 395:14 306:3 308:15,17 484:18,19 402:18 460:14 general 242:8,9,20 437:4 491:24 311:17,19 312:15 full 264:21 265:5 461:4 466:15 247:13 249:1,4 600:05 357:7,8 364:5,7 302:16 303:10 345:20 350:23 321:6,7 322:10 force 264:25 394:21 401:9,10 315:9,14 377:2 Gafken 242:20 462:1 485:21 forecasts 394:17,19 404:13 444:6 382:1 384:24 249:1 268:23 249:1 268:23 forecasts 483:19 493:1 456:5 472:7,8 249:1 268:23 328:7 330:13 forecasts 483:19 fourt 242:15 Fulle 245:4 246:11 418:15,15 442:23 <td< th=""><td>280:16 357:11</td><td>400:10 434:9</td><td>256:3 399:14</td><td>493:17,18 495:20</td><td>483:5 484:17</td></td<>	280:16 357:11	400:10 434:9	256:3 399:14	493:17,18 495:20	483:5 484:17
follow-up 335:16 327:13 365:7 273:12,15 298:22 future 279:11 Gates 244:14 251:6 405:18,19 431:4 371:5 463:3 300:11 430:21 284:20,22 285:3 273:21 492:20 four 294:2,5,7 434:16 285:13,22 316:18 gather 268:25 following 287:16 295:6 299:9,11 fuel 420:24 423:4 317:6,7 338:16 gears 431:21 341:14 395:14 306:3 308:15,17 484:18,19 402:18 460:14 general 242:8,9,20 437:4 491:24 311:17,19 312:15 full 264:21 265:5 461:4 466:15 247:13 249:1,4 follow 422:11 312:16,18 353:7 295:13,21 299:15 469:19 271:13,15 317:24 fore 264:25 394:21 401:9,10 315:9,14 377:2 Gafken 242:20 462:1 485:21 forecast 394:17,19 404:13 444:6 382:1 384:24 246:15,18 248:25 328:5 325:23 296:21 forecasts 483:17 451:5 453:25 392:15 393:2,18 249:1 268:23 general's 242:21 forecasts 483:19 fourth 242:15 Fuller 245:4 246:11 418:15,15 442:23 338:9 400:6 418:9 484:3 244:14 317:21 251:22,2	follow 264:24	450:10	fro 291:6	Furthermore	485:17,24 493:3
405:18,19 431:4 492:20371:5 463:3 four 294:2,5,7300:11 430:21 431:16284:20,22 285:3 285:13,22 316:18 317:6,7 338:16273:21 gather 268:25 gathering 498:11 gears 431:21following 287:16 292:19 336:20 341:14 395:14295:6 299:9,11 302:8,10,12 306:1fuel 420:24 423:4 429:10 433:23317:6,7 338:16 375:12 383:5gathering 498:11 gears 431:21341:14 395:14 439:14306:3 308:15,17 312:16,18 353:7484:18,19 295:13,21 299:15402:18 460:14 461:4 466:15general 242:8,9,20 271:13,15 317:24 321:6,7 322:10469:15 force 264:25 force 264:25 force 264:25394:21 401:9,10 315:9,14 377:2306:9 313:15 306:9 313:15 306:9 313:15G G Gafken 242:20 246:15,18 248:25 249:1 268:23 249:1 268:23 249:1 268:23 249:1 268:23 392:15 453:25392:15 393:2,18 249:1 268:23 249:1 268:23 249:1 268:23 249:1 268:23 249:1 268:23 285:3 296:21 338:9 400:6 418:9 484:3493:1 451:5 453:25 265:9 274:6,7 246:21.6,17 465:12 247:3 249:1,23 246:16,17 465:12 247:3 338:9 400:6 418:9 484:3244:14 317:21 251:22,23 257:1,2 261:20 264:1,2,3 261:20 264:1,2,3 462:16,17 465:12 488:13244:14 317:21 338:9 400:6 418:9 417:2251:22,23 257:1,2 442:24 443:23 419:4419:4 generate 452:3 generate 452:3 generate 326:23 generator 370:10 generator 388:3 generator 388:3 generator 370:10 generator 388:3fore case 12 825:13 fore case 12 80:22 267:8 form 392:17 412:24343:2 433:2418:13,21,23 428:1427:23 428:1 278:22 433:6415:6,6,11 417:15 428:12 428:1gallons 427:23 428:1generator 388:3 generic	356:4,23 357:20	foundation 323:15	front 250:23 251:2	389:21 395:16	gases 433:25
492:20four 294:2,5,7434:16285:13,22 316:18gather 268:25following 287:16295:6 299:9,11fuel 420:24 423:4317:6,7 338:16gathering 498:11292:19 336:20302:8,10,12 306:1429:10 433:23375:12 383:5gathering 498:11341:14 395:14306:3 308:15,17484:18,19402:18 460:14general 242:8,9,20437:4 491:24311:17,19 312:15full 264:21 265:5461:4 466:15247:13 249:1,4follows 422:11312:16,18 353:7295:13,21 299:15469:19271:13,15 317:24fore 264:25394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2Gafken 242:20462:1 485:21forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25345:20 30:23forecasted 477:2482:19,22 489:7427:22,25 428:10269:6,11 271:11285:23 296:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8211:2 414:19338:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23338:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23462:16,17 465:12foresight 360:23342:24 343:6415:6,6,11 417:15gallons 427:23generate 452:3forma 92:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1garbled 344:2generators 388:3form 477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2getting 260:22formadehydeFrancisco 243:9,14477:2 453:24Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1	follow-up 335:16	327:13 365:7	273:12,15 298:22	future 279:11	Gates 244:14 251:6
following 287:16295:6 299:9,11fuel 420:24 423:4317:6,7 338:16gathering 498:11292:19 336:20302:8,10,12 306:1429:10 433:23317:6,7 338:16gathering 498:11341:14 395:14306:3 308:15,17484:18,19402:18 460:14general 242:8,9,20437:4 491:24311:17,19 312:15full 264:21 265:5461:4 466:15247:13 249:1,4follows 422:11312:16,18 353:7295:13,21 299:15469:19271:13,15 317:24469:15357:7,8 364:5,7302:16 303:10369:22 386:15,19306:9 313:15315:9,14 377:2fore 264:25394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2345:20 350:23345:20 350:23forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25General's 242:21forecast 477:2482:19,22 489:7427:22,25 428:10269:6,11 271:11285:23 296:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19fourth 242:15Fuller 245:4 246:11218:15,15 442:23338:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2462:16,17 465:12generate 452:3foresaght 360:23frame 341:25265:9 274:6,7478:3 498:5,6,16gallons 427:23formagp:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1generators 388:3formadP7:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2generators 266:22formadPry2eframe 243:9,14477:2453:24	405:18,19 431:4	371:5 463:3	300:11 430:21	284:20,22 285:3	273:21
following 287:16295:6 299:9,11fuel 420:24 423:4317:6,7 338:16gathering 498:11292:19 336:20302:8,10,12 306:1429:10 433:23375:12 383:5gathering 498:11341:14 395:14306:3 308:15,17484:18,19402:18 460:14general 242:8,9,20437:4 491:24311:17,19 312:15full 264:21 265:5461:4 466:15247:13 249:1,4follows 422:11312:16,18 353:7295:13,21 299:15469:19271:13,15 317:24469:15357:7,8 364:5,7302:16 303:10321:6,7 322:10345:20 350:23fore 264:25394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2Gafken 242:20462:1 485:21forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25General's 242:21forecasted 477:2482:19,22 489:7427:22,25 428:10269:6,11 271:11285:23 296:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19fourth 242:15Fuller 245:4 246:11418:15,15 442:2338:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foresight 360:23342:24 343:6415:6,6,11 417:15gallons 427:23generate 452:3forma 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1generators 388:3formadPryceFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24428:1generators 388:3fore 477:2frame work 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbel 344:2generators 386:3	492:20	four 294:2,5,7	434:16	285:13,22 316:18	gather 268:25
292:19 336:20 341:14 395:14 437:4 491:24302:8,10,12 306:1 306:3 308:15,17 311:17,19 312:15429:10 433:23 484:18,19 full 264:21 265:5 295:13,21 299:15 469:15375:12 383:5 402:18 460:14 461:4 466:15 461:4 466:15gears 431:21 general 242:8,9,20 247:13 249:1,4 271:13,15 317:24469:15357:7,8 364:5,7 369:22 386:15,19 force 264:25306:9 313:15 306:9 313:15469:19271:13,15 317:24 321:6,7 322:10fore 264:25394:21 401:9,10 443:17315:9,14 377:2 394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2 315:9,14 377:2Gafken 242:20 246:15,18 248:25 249:1 268:23 269:6,11 271:11 271:12 414:19462:1 485:21 328:7 330:13forecast 477:2 483:18493:1 446:5 472:7,8456:5 472:7,8 415:6,6,11 417:15 484:35112 212:22,23 257:1,2 265:9 274:6,7 478:3 498:5,6,16 gallons 427:23 483:1238:9 400:6 418:9 419:4foreseable 285:13 form 392:17 412:24 417:2frame 341:25 433:2265:9 274:6,7 413:24,323 418:13,21,23 418:13,21,23 418:13,21,23 418:13,21,23418:13,21,23 428:1 garbled 344:2 garden 474:12 Garrett 440:8generai 226:23 265:22 267:8 356:11 407:1	following 287:16	295:6 299:9,11	fuel 420:24 423:4	317:6,7 338:16	8
341:14 395:14306:3 308:15,17484:18,19402:18 460:14general 242:8,9,20437:4 491:24311:17,19 312:15full 264:21 265:5461:4 466:15247:13 249:1,4follows 422:11312:16,18 353:7295:13,21 299:15469:19271:13,15 317:24469:15357:7,8 364:5,7302:16 303:10G315:9,14 377:236fken 242:20345:20 350:23force 264:25394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2Gafken 242:20345:20 350:23462:1 485:21forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25392:15 393:2,18249:1 268:23forecasted 477:2482:19,22 489:7427:22,25 428:10269:6,11 271:11285:23 296:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19fourth 242:15Fuller 245:4 246:11418:15,15 442:23419:4484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foresight 360:23342:24 343:6415:6,6,11 417:15generate 452:3generate 452:3form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1generators 388:3generators 388:3form 477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garden 474:12generators 26:23formaldehydeFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1	Ũ	302:8,10,12 306:1	429:10 433:23	,	8
437:4 491:24311:17,19 312:15full 264:21 265:5461:4 466:15247:13 249:1,4follows 422:11312:16,18 353:7295:13,21 299:15469:19271:13,15 317:24469:15357:7,8 364:5,7302:16 303:10315:9,14 377:2369:22 386:15,19306:9 313:15345:20 350:23force 264:25394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2Gafken 242:20462:1 485:21forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25462:1 485:21forecasted 477:2482:19,22 489:7427:22,25 428:10269:6,11 271:11285:23 296:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19fourth 242:15Fuller 245:4 246:11418:15,15 442:2338:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foresight 360:23342:24 343:6415:6,6,11 417:15gallons 427:23generate 452:3form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1generators 388:3form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1forma 477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garden 474:12265:22 267:8formaldehydeFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1	341:14 395:14	, ,	484:18,19	402:18 460:14	8
follows 422:11312:16,18 353:7295:13,21 299:15469:19271:13,15 317:24469:15357:7,8 364:5,7302:16 303:10306:9 313:15345:20 350:23fore 264:25394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2Gafken 242:20462:1 485:21forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25249:1 268:23483:17451:5 453:25392:15 393:2,18269:6,11 271:11285:23 296:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8211:2 414:19338:9 400:6 418:9484:3493:1456:5 472:7,8418:15,15 442:23388:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2462:16,17 465:12388:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21261:20 264:1,2,3462:16,17 465:12388:9 400:6 418:9484:3341:25265:9 274:6,7478:3 498:5,6,16generate 452:3foresight 360:23342:24 343:6415:6,6,11 417:15428:1generators 388:3form 392:17 412:24433:2frame 341:25265:9 274:6,7428:1forma 477:2framevork 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2generators 388:3forma 477:2framework 327:14427:2 453:24427:2garbled 344:2fore 248:11 278:25471:22Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1		,	· ·		0
469:15357:7,8 364:5,7302:16 303:10321:6,7 322:10Font 256:7369:22 386:15,19306:9 313:15G345:20 350:23force 264:25394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2Gafken 242:20462:1 485:21forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25General's 242:21483:17451:5 453:25392:15 393:2,18249:1 268:23269:6,11 271:11General's 242:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19fourth 242:15Fuller 245:4 246:11418:15,15 442:23338:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foresight 360:23342:24 343:6415:6,6,11 417:15428:1generate 452:3form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23gallons 427:23generators 388:3form 477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2generators 388:3form 4477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2generators 386:3form 3477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2 <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td>		-			-
Font 256:7369:22 386:15,19306:9 313:15G345:20 350:23force 264:25394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2Gafken 242:20462:1 485:21forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25249:1 268:23483:17451:5 453:25392:15 393:2,18249:1 268:23269:6,11 271:11483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19fourth 242:15Fuller 245:4 246:11418:15,15 442:23389:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foregoing 500:10370:24 371:22261:20 264:1,2,3462:16,17 465:12389:9 400:6 418:9foresight 360:23342:24 343:6415:6,6,11 417:15478:3 498:5,6,16generate 452:3form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23frame work 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2forma 477:2framework 327:14427:2 453:24garden 474:12265:22 267:8formaldehydeFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1		,	,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
force 264:25394:21 401:9,10315:9,14 377:2Gafken 242:20462:1 485:21forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25General's 242:21483:17451:5 453:25392:15 393:2,18249:1 268:23generally 262:12forecasted 477:2482:19,22 489:7427:22,25 428:10269:6,11 271:11285:23 296:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19fourth 242:15Fuller 245:4 246:11418:15,15 442:23338:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foresight 360:23370:24 371:22261:20 264:1,2,3462:16,17 465:12generate 452:3form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1generators 388:3form 477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2generators 388:3formaldehydeFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24garden 474:12265:22 267:8417:2free 248:11 278:25471:22Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1		, , ,		G	·
forecast 394:17,19404:13 444:6382:1 384:24246:15,18 248:25General's 242:21483:17451:5 453:25392:15 393:2,18249:1 268:23249:1 268:23285:23 296:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19fourth 242:15Fuller 245:4 246:11251:22,23 257:1,2242:24 443:23484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foregoing 500:10370:24 371:22261:20 264:1,2,3462:16,17 465:12generate 452:3foresight 360:23342:24 343:6415:6,6,11 417:15418:13,21,23generation 370:10form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1generators 388:3forma 477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2generators 326:23formaldehydeFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24471:22265:22 267:8417:2free 248:11 278:25471:22Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1		,		Gafken 242:20	
483:17451:5 453:25392:15 393:2,18249:1 268:23generally 262:12forecasted 477:2482:19,22 489:7427:22,25 428:10269:6,11 271:11285:23 296:21483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19fourth 242:15Fuller 245:4 246:11418:15,15 442:2338:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foregoing 500:10370:24 371:22261:20 264:1,2,3462:16,17 465:12generate 452:3foresight 360:23342:24 343:6415:6,6,11 417:15gallons 427:23generation 370:10form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1generators 388:3form 477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2generic 326:23formaldehydeFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1		· · · · · ·		246:15,18 248:25	
forecasted 477:2 483:18482:19,22 489:7 493:1427:22,25 428:10 456:5 472:7,8269:6,11 271:11 271:12 414:19285:23 296:21 328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19 484:3fourth 242:15 244:14 317:21Fuller 245:4 246:11 251:22,23 257:1,2271:12 414:19 418:15,15 442:23338:9 400:6 418:9 419:4foregoing 500:10 foresight 360:23 form 392:17 412:24370:24 371:22 433:2261:20 264:1,2,3 265:9 274:6,7462:16,17 465:12 478:3 498:5,6,16 gallons 427:23 428:1generate 452:3 generation 370:10 generators 388:3form 392:17 412:24 formaldehyde 417:2framework 327:14 free 248:11 278:25fully 329:15 332:21 471:22garbled 344:2 garden 474:12 Garrett 440:8getting 260:22 265:22 267:8 356:11 407:1	,			249:1 268:23	
483:18493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13forecasts 483:19493:1456:5 472:7,8271:12 414:19328:7 330:13484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2418:15,15 442:23338:9 400:6 418:9484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foregoing 500:10370:24 371:22261:20 264:1,2,3462:16,17 465:12generate 452:3foreseeable 285:13frame 341:25265:9 274:6,7478:3 498:5,6,16generation 370:10form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1generic 326:23form 477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2generic 326:23formaldehydeFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24332:1garbled 344:2getting 260:22417:2free 248:11 278:25471:22Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1			,	269:6,11 271:11	e .
forecasts 483:19 484:3fourth 242:15 244:14 317:21Fuller 245:4 246:11 251:22,23 257:1,2418:15,15 442:23 442:24 443:23338:9 400:6 418:9 419:4foregoing 500:10 foreseeable 285:13 foresight 360:23370:24 371:22 frame 341:25261:20 264:1,2,3 265:9 274:6,7462:16,17 465:12 478:3 498:5,6,16 gallons 427:23generate 452:3 generation 370:10 generators 388:3form 392:17 412:24 forma 477:2433:2418:13,21,23 framework 327:14427:2 453:24 427:2 453:24428:1 garden 474:12 garden 474:12generic 326:23 getting 260:22formaldehyde 417:2Francisco 243:9,14 free 248:11 278:25427:2 453:24 471:22garrett 440:8356:11 407:1		,	· ·	271:12 414:19	
484:3244:14 317:21251:22,23 257:1,2442:24 443:23419:4foregoing 500:10370:24 371:22261:20 264:1,2,3462:16,17 465:12generate 452:3foreseeable 285:13frame 341:25265:9 274:6,7478:3 498:5,6,16generation 370:10form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1generic 326:23forma 477:2framework 327:14fully 329:15 332:21garbled 344:2generic 326:23formaldehydeFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24Garrett 440:8356:11 407:1			,		
foregoing 500:10 370:24 371:22 261:20 264:1,2,3 462:16,17 465:12 generate 452:3 foreseeable 285:13 frame 341:25 265:9 274:6,7 478:3 498:5,6,16 generation 370:10 form 392:17 412:24 433:2 418:13,21,23 428:1 generators 388:3 forma 477:2 framework 327:14 fully 329:15 332:21 garbled 344:2 getting 260:22 formaldehyde Francisco 243:9,14 427:2 453:24 garden 474:12 265:22 267:8 417:2 free 248:11 278:25 471:22 Garrett 440:8 356:11 407:1				,	
foreseeable 285:13 foresight 360:23frame 341:25 342:24 343:6265:9 274:6,7 415:6,6,11 417:15478:3 498:5,6,16 gallons 427:23generation 370:10 generators 388:3 generic 326:23form 392:17 412:24433:2418:13,21,23428:1 garbled 344:2generic 326:23 generic 326:23formaldehydeFrancisco 243:9,14427:2 453:24 471:22471:22garden 474:12 Garrett 440:8265:22 267:8 356:11 407:1					
foresight 360:23 342:24 343:6 415:6,6,11 417:15 gallons 427:23 generators 388:3 form 392:17 412:24 433:2 418:13,21,23 gallons 427:23 generic 326:23 forma 477:2 framework 327:14 fully 329:15 332:21 garbled 344:2 getting 260:22 formaldehyde Francisco 243:9,14 427:2 453:24 garden 474:12 265:22 267:8 417:2 free 248:11 278:25 471:22 Garrett 440:8 356:11 407:1	0 0		· ·	,	0
form 392:17 412:24 433:2 418:13,21,23 428:1 generic 326:23 forma 477:2 framework 327:14 fully 329:15 332:21 garbled 344:2 getting 260:22 formaldehyde Francisco 243:9,14 427:2 453:24 garden 474:12 265:22 267:8 417:2 free 248:11 278:25 471:22 Garrett 440:8 356:11 407:1			,		0
forma 477:2 framework 327:14 fully 329:15 332:21 garbled 344:2 getting 260:22 formaldehyde Francisco 243:9,14 427:2 453:24 garden 474:12 265:22 267:8 417:2 free 248:11 278:25 471:22 Garrett 440:8 356:11 407:1	e			0	0
formaldehyde Francisco 243:9,14 427:2 453:24 garden 474:12 265:22 267:8 417:2 free 248:11 278:25 471:22 Garrett 440:8 356:11 407:1					0
417:2 free 248:11 278:25 471:22 Garrett 440:8 356:11 407:1			v	0	0 0
	•	,		0	
	41/.2	1100 240.11 278:23	4/1.22		330.11 407.1
					I

				Page 517
1150	400 0 400 0			
415:8	489:2 490:5	251:5,12,22 256:5	283:7,13,16,17,18	368:22 373:6
GHG 457:21	491:23 492:5,22	270:11,12,22	283:20 284:4,16	389:13 432:1,12
Gig 427:7	goal 451:25 464:25	271:5,11,18,24	284:19,23 288:1	434:23 437:23
give 248:11 252:9	465:10	272:6,11,24 273:3	288:11 315:8	471:4 496:11,19
253:10 255:17	goals 327:6	273:3,7,13,20	443:3,7 444:22	guidance 266:1
261:16 269:14	goes 263:18 267:11	274:6,6 275:21,24	445:2 456:9	432:25 453:22
270:17,19 277:25	278:13 348:11	276:4,5,9,13,17	458:23,25 459:2	
280:16 293:22	416:12 431:16	279:1 286:9 289:5	459:10,17,22,25	H
294:7 302:3 320:1	going 248:7 252:4	289:14,22 290:1,5	460:3,5,13,14,17	H2O 421:11
322:3,3 340:4,8	252:10 254:2,5	290:9,13,17,23	460:22 461:2,7,9	habitat 434:10
363:11 367:4	257:5 258:18	291:3,7,12 292:5	461:12,15 462:1	half 353:1,3 355:15
382:13 384:24	260:6,6 265:7,7	313:7 362:20	462:19,24 463:5,9	355:15,19,20
405:11 414:10	265:21 266:22	423:11 436:18	463:12,20,25	356:11,12 481:14
467:19 477:25	267:1,15 270:14	450:24 460:19	464:2,8,12,13,15	halfway 362:4
488:20 489:25	275:12 280:7	464:5 468:18	464:18 465:2,4,7	hand 256:4 257:1
490:19	282:19,20 293:1,5	485:14	465:14,22,24	259:25 261:4
given 252:3 254:3	300:21,22 304:14	governing 285:24	466:3,7,8,9,19,23	277:23 288:5
267:5 268:22	308:19 309:7	government 291:13	478:10,20 494:10	292:15 326:5
330:12 344:1	312:3 313:16,16	352:2	495:1	359:2 363:8 414:8
350:4 352:11	315:13 316:4	graduated 415:15	greenhouse 433:25	441:17 500:14
410:23,24 411:11	320:4,21 327:11	grant 258:18	483:5 484:17	handle 254:12
473:5 482:15	327:16 328:24	300:21,22 303:17	485:17,24	handled 408:9
497:10,11 498:24	330:8,19 331:6	365:11 368:1	grid 448:3	hands 345:1
gives 471:12 472:12	333:21 336:7,9,23	375:19 388:10	ground 416:23	Hansen 244:22
giving 497:25	350:8 352:4,5	390:10 392:19	417:22 493:12	246:5,6,6,7,7,8,8
Glenn 440:8	353:22 354:21	399:23	grounds 263:15	246:9,9,10,19
Gloria 290:9	355:10 356:23	granted 259:11	group 256:8 452:16	251:12,13,16,18
359:19	361:19 362:12	292:22	452:17 455:12	255:20,23 257:21
go 252:11 256:20	365:11 368:1	gray 312:6	464:23 480:9,15	257:24 258:4,18
264:2 265:24	369:8,20 371:6	GRC 403:9 453:23	480:15	259:3,14,17 261:2
267:2 270:18	372:17 375:1,19	great 271:3 292:8	grouping 357:11	261:7,10 274:1,1
308:8 309:2 313:9	384:13 385:22	313:25 314:7,9	groups 353:8,10	274:3 293:8,11,14
315:5 345:2,16	388:10.24 391:1	316:3 327:2,2	354:6 356:10	294:13 295:2
346:25 350:18	392:19 399:23	337:22 418:18	357:8 449:15	296:7,10,13,15
351:9 354:21	401:3,19 404:17	434:8 445:18	452:14 454:10	298:1,6,8,15,17
382:15 387:24	407:9,12 411:18	455:2 468:18	480:7,8	299:4,7,8 300:12
	407.9,12 411.18		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	300:23 301:1,3,11
406:8,16,17 426:18 430:12		greater 485:3 green 246:14	grown 331:23	301:17,20,24
	434:21 441:5	0	growth 450:8,14 456:24	303:12,13,14,20
433:1,18 434:12	444:3,6 445:6	247:19 252:22,23		303:21 304:6,10
435:1,19 436:24	496:23 497:1,15	258:11,13 270:15	guess 310:11 315:2	304:14,24 305:3,4
441:16 442:21	498:16 499:2	271:2 274:23	316:15 324:6	305:9,15,18,21
445:14 458:25	good 247:4 248:12	275:10 277:16,21	325:22 328:5	307:24 308:4,7,10
465:18 467:6,14	248:19,25 249:8	278:6,17 279:3,4	332:21 343:20	308:21 309:7,12
468:8,10,11,12	249:13,20,25	279:6,11 281:22	344:16 351:13	308:21 309:7,12
479:11 486:23	250:7,13,17,24	282:12,17 283:5,6	353:5 354:10	
				310:8,10,25 311:5

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

311:7,9,23 312:9	happy 349:13	257:20 260:12	Higgins 246:6	298:13 304:2
312:11,13 313:1	444:21 459:3	261:23 262:23	291:7,8 292:20	305:13,18 307:25
361:14,19,22	467:6 468:12	264:8 265:12	301:19,22 304:4	308:2,7,19 310:3
362:2 363:20,21	471:3 493:6	268:10,10,19	305:12 314:5,5	311:3,7,21 312:1
363:24 365:13,19	Harbor 243:4	269:15 277:20	413:24,24 414:23	313:2,5 314:3,5
365:20 366:4,16	245:11 427:7	278:5 286:5,11	high 423:10 479:22	315:2 346:22
366:18 367:2,10	hard 259:7 280:25	287:17 288:15	480:12,18 481:8,9	348:20 350:22
367:14,16 368:3,7	321:8 465:2 499:8	315:19,19 358:20	higher 280:3	351:3 352:17,20
368:12,14 369:13	harm 484:22	358:25 360:1,24	281:12,24,25	356:2,3 358:13
369:19 370:22	harmful 424:11	361:4 375:12	480:14 482:3	359:4,10,11,13,23
371:11,21 372:22	488:14	380:15 383:6	highlight 455:9	360:2,17,18
372:24 374:7,12	hate 436:12	389:18,20 390:4,8	464:19 478:22	370:16 376:2
374:13,20,23	Haves 243:9	393:23 402:19	highly 433:12	388:8 399:5
375:5,7,22,25	head 279:17 326:3	406:25 439:25	452:6,17 453:17	403:20 408:16,17
376:12,18,19	health 416:14	440:12,19 443:24	454:8 458:2	409:1,15,16
378:10,12,14,17	433:20 434:25	444:14 458:21	490:17	410:18 414:19
378:18,21,23	446:16 448:20	460:11 475:10,21	hired 392:10	415:7 426:16
379:6,25 380:18	483:5,6 484:15	491:19 498:7	historical 347:14	436:20 437:11
380:20 381:2,9,13	490:12,15 491:9	499:6,18 500:11	480:4	439:20,24 440:24
381:14,16 384:14	healthy 446:13	hearings 263:18,20	historically 481:1,7	440:25 441:18,20
384:16,18,22	hear 248:24 249:6	403:16	hits 422:20	441:24 444:1
385:1,6,20 386:2	249:12 250:6	hearsay 262:1	hold 285:2 416:18	445:22 454:23
386:9,12,14	255:13 269:6,20	263:15	holistically 432:18	456:10 462:17
388:12,18,21	270:4,6,23 271:10	heat 421:15 424:10	homes 449:15	485:13 486:22
389:1,7,10,12	271:16 273:10,18	424:16,19 457:10	457:1	487:5 489:4 490:3
390:13 391:1,7,11	275:18,20 276:3,8	457:11	Honor 248:12	491:21 492:21
391:16,19 392:20	276:16 281:1	heating 424:15,25	249:8,13,25 250:4	493:17 495:23
392:24,25 393:10	289:1,20,25 290:4	428:21	250:7,13,17,24	496:11 497:16,20
393:12 396:22,23	290:22 291:6,24	heavies 422:20,24	251:5,12,22 256:5	hooked 430:10
398:19,24 399:2,4	291:25 292:2	423:22,23 424:13	257:2 258:14	hooks 431:9
399:7,10,17,22	294:19 334:12,13	heavily 482:2	260:10 261:20	hope 285:1,12
400:1,15,16	334:14 353:15	heavy 421:17 422:7	263:6 265:9,20	327:13 351:3
401:16 403:19	375:5 409:9	422:10,12 423:1,3	266:1,14 267:13	hopeful 253:13
409:8 440:21	413:19 450:21	held 460:23	268:4 269:16	hopefully 278:13
488:24,25 489:3	467:4 468:16	Hello 353:18	270:22 271:24	336:12 412:19
495:22,25 496:10	heard 265:2 278:19	415:12	272:24 273:3,7,13	427:16 498:2
497:15,16	326:9 334:24	help 280:12 339:24	273:20 274:6,24	hoping 359:6
hansennp@aol.c	346:1 348:18	340:2 457:6	275:7,21,24 276:5	horizon 394:17
244:25	473:23 478:9	helpful 279:19	276:9,13,21,23	hot 405:1
happen 336:16,25	487:25 488:12	358:7 370:14	277:17 278:23	hour 280:2,3 281:8
410:23	hearing 241:9	374:8	280:13 282:25	281:12 360:4
happened 335:22	246:1 247:6 248:2	helps 284:11	287:8 288:4,18	361:8,16
happening 262:21	252:6,10 253:9,14	446:15	289:5,9,11 290:5	hours 253:12
283:13 437:3	254:2,16 255:5,16	hereunto 500:14	290:17 291:7,18	427:20 448:9
happens 381:25	256:9,13 257:12	hesitant 399:19	291:18 292:5	household 455:16
L				

				1 490 010
housekeeping	315:21 316:3	465:11,18,20	413:2,11 438:13	improve 448:19
409:2	334:7,10,13,15	466:21 467:9,15	438:22	450:12
Houston 416:15	335:1 346:25	467:18,22 468:4	identifying 326:18	improved 447:10
Howard 241:13	350:25 352:21	468:15,19 470:24	341:20 367:22	474:6
242:3 247:4,22	356:5 358:9,14,25	476:12,19 477:13	412:15 452:2	improving 474:21
248:17,19,23	359:8,12,17,20,25	485:10 486:24	iDot 452:10	imprudent 489:19
249:5,11,18,23	360:12,15,19	488:18 489:2,23	ignored 475:2	inadequately
250:5,11,15,20	361:21,25 362:3	490:5 491:15	immediate 433:21	483:24
251:3,9,15,20	362:10,22 363:1,4	492:22 493:18,23	immediately	inadmissible 262:3
252:2 254:4,13	363:15 365:11	494:7,14 495:12	253:18 435:19	inappropriate
255:3,8,14,25	366:17 367:2,12	495:20,24 496:3	impact 393:7	311:25
256:2,14 257:10	368:1,8 369:7,17	496:21 497:19,21	424:10 433:21	incent 344:19
258:9,16 259:5,19	370:19 371:6,11	498:23	435:4 449:24	incentive 323:17
260:14,21,25	371:14 372:17	hundreds 389:5,5	453:17 474:2	324:17,21,23
261:11 263:3,25	374:7,22,24	hydro 448:8	484:14	325:17 327:1
264:2,19 265:10	375:19 376:4,17	hydrocarbons	impacted 355:24	329:5,22 330:16
265:24 266:21	378:12,15,20,22	421:17 422:7,11	357:12 433:12	330:23,24 331:1,2
267:14 268:7	378:24 379:8,11	422:13 423:2,3	452:6,17 453:17	331:15,19 332:2
269:5,13,18,23	379:20,25 380:5,8	hydroelectric 448:7	454:8 458:2	345:8 349:17
270:2,7,9,12,24	380:11,15,18,23	Hylebos 474:14,16	490:18	455:20
271:3,5,9,16,23	381:1,2,11 384:14	475:9,12	impacts 318:22	incentives 325:6,25
272:4,9,15 273:2	384:17 385:4,9,10		320:17 357:7	326:15 351:5
273:6,10,18,24	385:20 386:10		383:14 403:6,13	352:12 457:16
274:3,10,19 275:1	388:10 389:1,9	I-5 388:5	403:17 421:23	incident 419:13,16
275:8 276:2,7,11	390:10 391:11	ideal 436:16	434:13 435:21	incidents 418:10
276:15,20,22	392:19 398:22	ideas 465:3	488:14 490:13,15	419:6
277:8,19 278:3,7	399:2,7,17,23	identification	implement 330:6	inclined 412:9
278:10,13,24	401:3 403:21	297:13,19 300:16	330:11 455:13	include 253:3 264:6
287:5,9 288:6,13	406:3,8 408:14,18	307:10 365:4	implementation	321:23 324:25
288:17,19 289:17	409:8,19,25 410:6	366:13 386:17 389:15	317:12 332:14,16	325:6,17 333:22
289:24 290:3,7,11	410:11 411:14		451:25	334:1 335:7 338:1
290:15,21 291:1,5	412:5 413:18,22	identified 266:10 281:23 296:22	implicitly 454:10	339:16,18 341:4,5
291:10,15,24	414:1,4,6,13	317:9 357:5 404:8	implying 445:13	358:1 396:19
292:3,8,17 293:12	415:3 417:11	407:5 411:25	important 284:4,5	404:7,7 412:24
294:8,15,21 296:7	418:13,19 426:9	482:19,22 489:9	395:16 446:5,19	438:21 439:4,6
296:11 298:5,9,14	426:12,18 436:12	identifies 294:2	448:10,11,25	456:1 472:19
299:3 300:21	436:21 437:12	299:9 302:8 306:1	449:13 451:19	477:17 479:4
301:13,16 303:12	439:21,25 440:19	308:15 311:17	462:5 471:6,14,15	490:12 included 265:13
303:14 304:14	441:1,22 442:2,7	364:5 370:1	473:17,22 475:14	
305:1,11,15,19 308:1,3,8 309:4	443:11 444:13 445:10,19 450:20	387:19 452:16	486:5,20 Importantly	306:15 317:4,16 317:22,25 318:1,2
309:25 310:4	443:10,19 430:20	identify 275:13	466:10 469:17	317:22,25 318:1,2
311:1,4 312:2	455:2,5 456:6	277:22 288:2,22	impose 453:5	319:24 320:6,10
313:3,6,14,21,25	458:18 459:6	289:3 317:9	improper 433:8	319.24 320.0,10 320:21 321:15
314:7,9,13 315:18	461:17 462:13	362:16 369:23	461:11	320.21 321.13
517.7,7,15 515.10	FU1.17 TU2.13	395:10 403:11	10111	J <u>4</u> T.J JT1.11
			l	

				1 age 520
342:15 348:13	increase 318:22	industry 446:9	intensive 344:19	400:21 428:2
352:15 353:7,10	339:24 340:1,12	inefficiency 461:3	intent 335:18 344:4	447:21 452:8
357:9,12,13	340:17 349:6	inequitable 485:1	345:9 349:14	470:7 472:20
372:11 373:4	447:16 448:14	inferring 445:13	intention 266:4,12	480:21 482:10
377:20,25 392:10	450:13 455:19	inflation 350:23	328:7,20 343:22	investments 318:21
396:12 400:22	increased 450:14	351:2 352:10	355:4,18 357:15	337:14 446:24
403:1,1 406:21	480:24 481:16	481:9,10	357:24	447:25 448:1,3
407:11 408:10	increases 481:7	inform 257:3	intentionally 405:7	469:22
437:17,24 438:9	increasing 480:2	274:11 324:13	interest 370:16	investors 480:20
438:23,24,25	incremental 331:8	information 307:17	379:8 380:2 411:3	481:10
469:22 482:11	331:14,18 332:5	324:11 336:2	446:8 454:16,17	invite 433:14
409.22 482.11 492:10	340:15		459:13 461:1,24	invited 348:16
		342:2,15 373:9	,	
includes 265:14	incur 381:24	388:1 402:8	462:12 473:22	involve 477:1
266:19 325:16	incurred 383:20	412:22 418:9	480:24 481:2,6,7	involved 348:7
351:5 457:9	430:6 472:21	419:6 434:14	483:4 484:11	382:25 393:7
469:20 483:5	473:16	469:5 475:6	485:4 487:23	418:4 434:6 466:2
495:3	independent 331:1	informs 498:9	490:9,11,21	involvement
including 351:5	393:21 405:13	infrastructure	491:13	482:24
356:12 358:4	INDEX 246:2	338:15 377:17	interested 342:18	involves 410:24
405:1 434:12	Indian 487:12	378:8 448:2,4	411:5 451:23	IRA 351:9,16
435:4 448:1	Indians 257:5	inherent 262:18	interests 447:2,12	Irene 257:22
450:14 460:3	274:9 484:16	initial 310:18 341:9	461:6 469:5 483:2	258:19 291:12
inclusion 262:24	indicate 321:22	353:6 354:12	interject 276:25	358:17,19
402:24	371:15 415:15	391:3 422:19	internet 294:18	irk 259:9
inclusive 324:3	indicated 252:22	469:20	interpret 496:25	IRP 452:24
325:21 329:8	257:15,18 266:3	injected 423:15	interpretation	irrelevant 484:19
income 339:22	266:24 267:7	428:4	279:16 325:22	isolation 472:14
340:13 348:13	268:14 270:13	injustice 491:12	337:5	issue 252:13 256:19
353:1,3,10 354:14	277:12 278:4,6,17	innovative 456:19	interrupt 291:19	258:22 263:18,19
354:25 355:5,6,7	292:25 304:4	457:24	intervene 466:15	266:6,9,19 267:16
355:8,12,20,24	314:20 361:9	input 400:11	intervened 471:20	275:3 277:18
356:11 444:9	363:18 414:14,16	inquiring 357:10	intervener 471:21	284:25 286:23
446:3 447:14	426:13 440:6,13	insecurity 455:16	intervening 285:22	294:18 311:11
455:7,12,17,21,24	440:20	installed 474:12	intimately 338:8	315:23 329:21
456:1,3 479:6	indicating 261:12	integrate 457:17	introduced 434:19	330:21 335:25
incomes 447:3	267:14 279:19	integrated 435:9	invented 383:12	345:15 349:23
incorporate 452:12	468:5 481:15	integrity 396:21	403:4	367:8 375:3
incorporated	indicium 262:18	intend 252:8 293:9	inventory 427:15	385:15 386:3
318:10 319:6	indifference 464:6	298:6 301:19	invest 447:22	389:25 404:22,23
394:7 406:12,15	indifferent 463:24	341:6	invested 447:18	409:12 412:21
incorporation	individual 440:5	intended 284:18,20	investigate 471:23	421:24 424:19
446:7	individuals 399:19	323:14,20 357:13	investigation	460:1 461:4,7,22
incorrect 371:3	499:11	478:17	347:12	463:15,16 465:6
372:1,5 390:18	industrial 430:8	intends 445:8	investment 349:18	478:7 482:7
392:6 450:7	474:14	477:19	372:10,19 373:4	485:20,21 491:10
				-, -,0
		Ι	Ι	l

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					Page 521
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	105.1 17 106.9 12	255.25	270.2 7 8 0 12 24	270.20 25 280.5 8	420.2
393:25 453:22 Joel 24:69 253:3 273:6,10,18,24 381:14 384:14,17 432:1 436:13 497:25 259:13 361:22 274:3,10,19 275:1 386:10 388:10 June 420:10,15 235:20 256:21.25 396:12 407:15 276:8,276:27,11 386:10 388:10 June 420:10,15 235:20 267:22 267:8 John 291:20,22 277:8,19 278:37 391:11 392:19,24 justice 250:25 304:57 7315:8 292:5 433:15 278:0,13,24 398:22 399:2,7,17 273:14 453:25 412:4 434:11 joined 247:24 290:11,15,21 4003:14 06:3,8 justifice 440:2 446:3,4 459:13 joined 247:24 290:11,15,21 4001:19,25 410:6 justified 480:2 490:61,61 497:14 251:7 258:14 291:1,51,01,52.4 410:11 411:14 justified 480:2 490:61,61 497:14 251:7 258:14 291:1,28:5,17 412:5 413:18,22 489:10 490:61,61 497:14 210:17 258:0,14 291:1,152.1 410:13 141:14 justified 480:2 317:3 320:25 443:15 444:3,9 301:3,16 303:12 412:5 413:18,22 489:10 314:4 51:45 46:3 46:13 46:0,17	<i>,</i>	0			0 1
		0			
issues 247:18 362:14 363:2 275:8 276:2,7,11 386:10 388:10 June 420:10,15 253:22 056:21,25 396:12 407:15 276:15,20,22 389:1,9 390:10 jury 412:22 304:5,7 315:8 292:5 433:15 278:10,73:7 391:11 392:19,24 justice 250:25 304:5,7 315:8 292:5 433:15 278:10,13,24 398:22 399:2,7,17 273:14 453:25 412:4 434:11 join 252:19 258:11 287:5,9 288:68 399:23 401:3 454:2,6 491:10 435:20 442:17 209:15,369:2 288:13,17,19 403:21 406:3.8 justification 463:23 446:3,4 459:13 joined 247:24 290:11,15,21 409:10,24 406:14 justified 480:2 470:6 495:15 joint 244:7 250:21 294:8,15,21 296:7 414:1,46,13 Justin 246:5 291:3 317:3 320:25 443:15 444:3,9 301:13,16 303:12 2426:12,18 436:12 juvenile 474:18 317:3 320:25 443:15 444:3,9 301:13,16 303:12 245:12 440:19 K-o-c-h253:7 K241:10 280:23 289:9 308:1,3,8 309:4 441:1,22 447:12 X6:12 4437:12 Jaton 275:22 279:15 305:1,11,15,19 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>,</td><td></td></t<>				,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,		, ,	· ·	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		-	, ,	,	0
435:20 442:17 269:15 369:2 288:13,17,19 403:21 406:3.8 justification 432:23 446:3,4 442:10 406:19 289:17,24 290:3,7 408:14,18 justified 480:2 460:3 464:20 251:7 258:14 291:1,5,10,15,24 410:11 411:14 justified 480:10 479:6 495:15 joint 244:7 206:11 294:8,15,21 296:17 289:10 Justified 489:10 479:6 495:15 joint 244:7 206:11 296:13 206:12 414:14,63:13 293:11 314:3 496:16 18 441:9 442:11 299:3 300:21 418:13,19 426:9 justified 489:10 317:3 20:25 73:11,16 381:14,24 436:14 431:14 431:22 446:14 436:14 437:12 446:14 436:14 441:122 442:12 273:21 Kochne@bkllaw 273:21 Justified 440:2 313:3,6,14,21.25	<i>'</i>		, ,		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		0			· ·
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			· · ·	,	0
460:3 464:20 251:7 258:14 291:1,5,10,15,24 410:11 411:14 justify 300:10 471:8 478:25 267:5,9 443:17 292:3,8,17 293:12 412:5 413:18,22 489:10 479:6 495:15 joint 244:7 250:21 294:8,15,21 296:11 296:3,14 412:5 413:1,46,13 489:10 496:16,18 497:14 243:11,16 284:12 296:11 296:13 317:3 317:3 317:3 300:12 418:13,19 426:12,18 436:12 juvenile 474:18 317:3 320:25 443:15 446:3 456:10,17 303:14 306:1,13,16 303:12 426:12,18 436:12 K-o-c-h 253:7 IV 241:10 280:23 289:9 308:1,3,8 309:4 441:1,22 442:10 273:21 K&L 244:14 273:21 Jacob 289:14,14 Josh 256:10 313:3,6,14.21,25 450:25 456:14 440:3 487:1 Jamuary 426:24 judge 241:13 242:13 242:13 242:	,			,	0
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,	0	, ,	,	0
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					•
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $, ,	,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		0			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,	,	· · ·		
341:4 351:5 486:3 446:3 456:10,17 303:14 304:14,24 436:21 437:12 K 489:4 Jon 275:22 279:15 305:1,11,15,19 439:21,25 440:19 K-o-c-h_253:7 J 280:23 289:9 308:1,3,8 309:4 441:1,22 442:2,7 K&L 244:14 251:6 J 343:20 347:7 309:25 310:4 443:11 444:13 Z73:21 Jacob 289:14,14 Josh 256:10 289:14 314:7,9,13 315:18 455:2,5 456:6 kboehm@bkllaw January 426:24 Juge 241:13 242:2 334:13,15,25 465:11,18,20 keep 248:3,8 Jason 254:15 244:19,23 249:5 350:25 352:21 465:11,820 keeping 411:3 JBN-9X 259:22 250:5,11,15,20 359:8,12,17,20,25 476:12,18 477:13 keeping 38:12 JBN-9X 259:22 250:5,11,15,20 360:12,15,19 488:16 486:24 key 446:13 454:13 267:23 268:12 255:3,8,14,24,25 366:17 367:2,12 490:5 491:15 332:17 347:12 367:14 380:12 255:3,8,14,24,25 366:17 367:2,12 490:5 491:15 s32:17 347:12 JBN-9X 259:22 255:3,8,14,24,25 366:17 367:2,12 490:5	,			,	Juvenne 474.18
448:4Jon 275:22 279:15305:1,11,15,19439:21,25 440:19K-o-c-h 253:7IV 241:10280:23 289:9308:1,3,8 309:4441:1,22 442:2,7K&L 244:14 251:6J343:20 347:7309:25 310:4443:11 444:13273:21J 245:16 440:9413:16 430:2311:1,4 312:2445:10,19 450:20kboehm@bkllawJacob 289:14,14Josh 256:10 289:14314:7,9,13 315:18455:2,5 456:6keep 248:3,8Jamuary 426:24Juge 241:13 242:2334:13,15,25465:11,18,20keeping 411:3247:17247:4,23 248:17335:1 346:25466:21 467:9,15keeping 411:3JBN 260:2249:11,18,23350:25 352:21466:11,822 468:4Kerinewick 419:12JBN 260:2249:11,18,23350:25 352:3468:15,18 470:24Keyin 246:6 291:8JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20350:12,15,19485:10 486:24Keyin 246:6 291:8JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20360:12,25 362:3488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10379:3,14 380:12257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12385:12 434:9271:6259:22257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12Kind 304:14 321:8271:6259:24260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21Kinds 435:20242:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17498:23322:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:10377:19 376:4,17324:12376:12,14 285:24271:6269:2,19 266:10377:19 376:4,17324:12376:12,		· · · · ·	,	,	K
IV 241:10280:23 289:9308:1,3,8 309:4441:1,22 44:2,2,7K&L 244:14 251:6JJ343:20 347:7309:25 310:4443:11 444:13273:21J 245:16 440:9348:15 351:13311:1,4 312:2445:10,19 450:20kboehm@bkllawJ acob 289:14,14Josh 256:10 289:14314:7,9,13 315:18455:2,5 456:6keep 248:3,8Jamuary 426:24Jogh 256:10 289:14314:7,9,13 315:18455:2,5 456:6keep 248:3,8January 426:24Juge 241:13 242:2334:13,15,25466:11,7 462:13440:3 487:1471:17247:4,23 248:17335:1 346:25466:21 467:9,15keeps 338:12Jason 254:15248:19,23 249:5350:25 352:21467:18,22 468:4Kemewick 419:12JBN 260:2249:11,18,23356:5 358:9,14,25466:12,18 477:13413:24JBN 260:2259:22250:5,11,15,20360:12,15,19488:10 486:24Keyin 246:6 291:8JBN 260:2249:11,18,23366:5 358:9,14,25466:11,18,20Key 446:13 454:13JBN 260:2259:3,8,14,24,25360:12,25 362:3488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10JBN 260:2250:5,11,15,20350:8,12,17,20,25476:12,18 477:13413:24Jeff 242:8 248:0257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12490:5 491:15435:12 434:9Jeff roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21Kind 304:14 321:8Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:57,14 495:12385:12 434:9Jeff roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370		,	,		
JJobi 2000Jobi				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
J348:15 351:13311:1,4 312:2445:10,19 450:20kboehm@bkllawJacob 289:14,14Josh 256:10 289:14314:7,9,13 315:18455:2,5 456:6kboehm@bkllawJaimini 244:8Josh 256:10 289:14314:7,9,13 315:18455:2,5 456:6keep 248:3,8January 426:24judge 241:13 242:2334:13,15,25465:11,18,20keeping 411:3Jason 254:15248:19,23 249:5350:25 352:21466:21 467:9,15keeping 411:3JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20350:83.91,2,17,20,25466:11,18,20keeping 411:3JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20350:12,15,19488:10 486:24Kein 246:6 291:8JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20360:12,15,19488:10 486:24Killing 256:10379:3,14 380:12255:3,8,14,24,25362:10,22 363:1,4490:5 491:15Killing 256:10380:17 410:1256:2,14 257:10363:15,22 365:11492:22 493:18,23332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12Kind 304:14 321:8380:17 410:1260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21Kinds 435:20Jeff roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21Kinds 435:20JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12304:12 35:3394:25 395:7,24267:12 1262:24267:14 268:7378:12,15,20,22374:7,22,42304:26:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5267:23 269:12265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17394:25 395:7,24396:16,25 397:5	1 V 241:10		, ,	, , ,	
J 245:16 440:9413:16 430:2313:3,6,14,21,25450:25 454:19245:18Jacob 289:14,14Josh 256:10 289:14314:7,9,13 315:18455:2,5 456:6keep 248:3,8Jaimin 244:8jparekh@earthj315:21 316:3458:18 459:6269:11 411:10250:25 273:14244:11323:23 334:7,10461:17 462:13440:3 487:1January 426:24judge 241:13 242:2334:13,15,25465:11,18,20keep 338:12Jason 254:15248:19,23 249:5350:25 352:21467:18,22 468:4Keenewick 419:12JBN 260:2249:11,18,23356:5 358:9,14,25468:15,18 470:24Kevin 246:6 291:8JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20350:12,15,19488:10 486:24Key 446:13 454:13271:14,17 376:7,9252:2 25:4,4,13361:21,25 362:3488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10380:17 410:1256:2,14 257:10363:15,22 365:11490:5 491:15s332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12s332:17 347:12371:16259:4,5,19 260:14370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21s35:12 434:942:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17498:23s51:2 434:9321:12265:24 266:21377:19 376:4,17324:12251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:12375:19 376:4,17394:25 395:7,2439:11,12 292:11266:21 4268:7378:12,15,20,22394:25 395:7,2439:11,12 292:11265:24 266:21378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5 <td>J</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	J				
Jacob 289:14,14Josh 256:10 289:14314:7,9,13 315:18455:2,5 456:6keep 248:3,8Jaimini 244:8jparekh@earthj314:7,9,13 315:18455:2,5 456:6269:11 411:10250:25 273:14244:11323:23 334:7,10461:17 462:13440:3 487:1January 426:24judge 241:13 242:2334:13,15,25465:11,18,20440:3 487:1471:17247:4,23 248:17335:1 346:25466:21 467:9,15keeping 411:3Jason 254:15248:19,23 249:5350:25 352:21467:18,22 468:4Kennewick 419:12JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20359:8,12,17,20,25476:12,18 477:13413:24267:23 268:12251:3,9,15,20360:12,15,19488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10379:3,14 380:12255:3,8,14,24,25362:10,22 363:1,4490:5 491:15kind 304:14 321:8380:17 410:1256:2,14 257:10363:15,22 365:11492:22 493:18,23332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12385:12 434:9271:6259:4,5,19 260:14370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21454:9jeff.roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21kinds 435:20242:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17498:23454:9jeff.roberson@ut265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12251:4,6 273:19,22Jacot 243:19264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24324:12276:12,1			,	,	
Jaimini 244:8 250:25 273:14jparekh@earthj 244:11315:21 316:3 323:23 334:7,10458:18 459:6 461:17 462:13269:11 411:10 440:3 487:1January 426:24 471:17judge 241:13 242:2 247:4,23 248:17335:1 346:25 350:25 352:21465:11,18,20 466:21 467:9,15keeping 411:3 keeps 338:12Jason 254:15 JBN 260:2249:11,18,23 249:11,18,23356:5 358:9,14,25 350:25 352:21466:21 467:9,15 468:15,18 470:24keeping 411:3 keeps 338:12JBN-9X 259:22 267:23 268:12250:5,11,15,20 251:3,9,15,20350:25 352:21 360:12,15,19468:15,18 470:24 488:10 486:24Kennewick 419:12 key 446:13 454:13 413:24Jeff 242:8 248:20 271:6257:24 258:9,16 259:4,5,19 260:14366:17 367:2,12 360:12,25 361:11490:5 491:15 492:22 493:18,23 332:17 347:12Killing 256:10 kind 304:14 321:8 380:17 410:1Jeff 242:8 248:20 271:6257:24 258:9,16 269:2,14 257:10366:17 367:2,12 360:12,25 261:10 370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,211 496:21 497:19,211Jeff roberson@ut 242:11260:21,25 261:10 269:4,5,19 260:14370:19 371:6,11 371:6,11496:21 497:19,211 498:23kinds 435:20 King 244:12,17Jefferson 243:19 264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24 378:12,15,20,22judgment 312:18 324:12251:4,6 273:19,222 394:25 395:7,24 394:25 395:7,24Javeri 275:24,25 289:11,12 292:11267:14 268:7 269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5					
250:25 273:142pin citil of citil citil of citil of citil of citil of citil of				· ·	- · ·
January 426:24 471:17Judge 241:13 242:2 247:4,23 248:17334:13,15,25 334:13,15,25Hof 105:11,18,20 465:11,18,20keeping 411:3 keeps 338:12Jason 254:15248:19,23 249:5 249:11,18,23350:25 352:21 350:25 352:21467:18,22 468:4 468:15,18 470:24Kennewick 419:12 468:15,18 470:24JBN 260:2249:11,18,23 250:5,11,15,20350:25 352:21 250:5,11,15,20466:21 467:9,15 468:15,18 470:24Keyin 246:6 291:8 413:24JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20 252:2 254:4,13360:12,15,19 361:21,25 362:3488:18 489:2,23 488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10 kind 304:14 321:8379:3,14 380:12 380:17 410:1255:3,8,14,24,25 256:2,14 257:10366:17 367:2,12 366:15,22 365:11490:5 491:15 490:5 491:15Kind 304:14 321:8 332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20 271:6257:24 258:9,16 259:4,5,19 260:14 260:21,25 261:10366:17 367:2,12 370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21 495:20,24 496:3 454:9Kinds 435:20 King 244:12,17Jeff roberson@ut 242:11261:11 263:3,25 265:24 266:21377:19 376:4,17 378:12,15,20,22Judgment 312:18 324:12S1:14 273:19,22 251:4,6 273:19,22 251:4,6 273:19,22 265:24 266:21 378:12,15,20,22Judgment 312:18 324:12394:25 395:7,24 396:16,25 397:5		°1			
471:17247:4,23 248:17335:1 346:25466:21 467:9,15keeps 338:12Jason 254:15248:19,23 249:5350:25 352:21466:21 467:9,15keeps 338:12JBN 260:2249:11,18,23356:5 358:9,14,25468:15,18 470:24Kernewick 419:12JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20350:89;8,12,17,20,25476:12,18 477:13Key 446:13 454:13267:23 268:12251:3,9,15,20360:12,15,19485:10 486:24Key 446:13 454:13274:14,17 376:7,9252:2 254:4,13361:21,25 362:3488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10379:3,14 380:12255:3,8,14,24,25362:10,22 363:1,4490:5 491:15sind 304:14 321:8380:17 410:1256:2,14 257:10363:15,22 365:11492:22 493:18,23332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12sind 304:14 321:8271:6259:4,5,19 260:14368:1,8 369:7,17495:20,24 496:3454:9jeff.roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21kinds 435:20242:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17498:23521:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12394:25 395:7,24Javeri 275:24,25267:14 268:7378:12,15,20,22judicial 351:3394:25 395:7,24289:11,12 292:11269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5			,		
Jason 254:15248:19,23 249:5350:1540:25460:21 407.9,15Kennewick 419:12JBN 260:2249:11,18,23350:25 352:21467:18,22 468:4Kennewick 419:12JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20359:8,12,17,20,25476:12,18 477:13413:24267:23 268:12251:3,9,15,20360:12,15,19485:10 486:24key 446:13 454:13274:14,17 376:7,9252:2 254:4,13361:21,25 362:3488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10379:3,14 380:12255:3,8,14,24,25362:10,22 363:1,4490:5 491:15kind 304:14 321:8380:17 410:1256:2,14 257:10363:15,22 365:11492:22 493:18,23332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12385:12 434:9271:6259:4,5,19 260:14368:1,8 369:7,17495:20,24 496:3454:9jeff.roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21kind s435:20242:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17498:23454:9kinds 435:20Jefferson 243:19264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24judgment 312:18251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12394:25 395:7,24Jayseri 275:24,25267:14 268:7378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5	•	• •	, ,	<i>, ,</i>	i 0
JBN 260:2249:11,18,23356:5 358:9,14,25468:15,18 470:24Kevin 246:6 291:8JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20359:8,12,17,20,25476:12,18 477:13413:24267:23 268:12251:3,9,15,20360:12,15,19488:10 486:24key 446:13 454:13274:14,17 376:7,9252:2 254:4,13361:21,25 362:3488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10379:3,14 380:12255:3,8,14,24,25362:10,22 363:1,4490:5 491:15sidd 304:14 321:8380:17 410:1256:2,14 257:10363:15,22 365:11492:22 493:18,23332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12385:12 434:9271:6259:4,5,19 260:14368:1,8 369:7,17495:20,24 496:3454:9jeff.roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21kinds 435:20Jefferson 243:19264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24judgment 312:18251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12276:12,14 285:24Jhaveri 275:24,25267:14 268:7378:12,15,20,22judicial 351:3394:25 395:7,24289:11,12 292:11269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5					-
JBN-9X 259:22250:5,11,15,20359:8,12,17,20,25476:12,18 477:13413:24267:23 268:12251:3,9,15,20360:12,15,19485:10 486:24key 446:13 454:13274:14,17 376:7,9252:2 254:4,13361:21,25 362:3488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10379:3,14 380:12255:3,8,14,24,25362:10,22 363:1,4490:5 491:15Kind 304:14 321:8380:17 410:1256:2,14 257:10363:15,22 365:11492:22 493:18,23332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12385:12 434:9271:6259:4,5,19 260:14368:1,8 369:7,17495:20,24 496:3454:9jeff.roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21kinds 435:20242:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17498:23King 244:12,17Jefferson 243:19264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24judgment 312:18251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12276:12,14 285:24Jhaveri 275:24,25267:14 268:7378:12,15,20,22judicial 351:3394:25 395:7,24289:11,12 292:11269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5		,		,	
267:23 268:12251:3,9,15,20360:12,15,19485:10 486:24key 446:13 454:13274:14,17 376:7,9252:2 254:4,13361:21,25 362:3488:18 489:2,23Killing 256:10379:3,14 380:12255:3,8,14,24,25362:10,22 363:1,4490:5 491:15332:17 347:12380:17 410:1256:2,14 257:10363:15,22 365:11492:22 493:18,23332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12385:12 434:9271:6259:4,5,19 260:14368:1,8 369:7,17495:20,24 496:3454:9jeff.roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21454:9242:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17498:23454:9jefferson 243:19264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24judgment 312:18251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12251:4,6 273:19,22289:11,12 292:11269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5		, ,			
274:14,17 376:7,9 379:3,14 380:12 380:17 410:1252:2 254:4,13 255:3,8,14,24,25 256:2,14 257:10361:21,25 362:3 362:10,22 363:1,4 362:10,22 363:1,4488:18 489:2,23 490:5 491:15Killing 256:10 kind 304:14 321:8 332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20 271:6257:24 258:9,16 259:4,5,19 260:14366:17 367:2,12 368:1,8 369:7,17492:22 493:18,23 494:5,7,14 495:12332:17 347:12 385:12 434:9jeff.roberson@ut 242:11260:21,25 261:10 261:11 263:3,25370:19 371:6,11 371:14 372:17496:21 497:19,21 498:23kinds 435:20 King 244:12,17Jefferson 243:19 JGN-9X 259:22264:2,19 265:10 265:24 266:21374:7,22,24 375:19 376:4,17judgment 312:18 324:12251:4,6 273:19,22 394:25 395:7,24Jhaveri 275:24,25 289:11,12 292:11267:14 268:7 269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5		, , ,		,	
379:3,14 380:12 380:17 410:1255:3,8,14,24,25 256:2,14 257:10362:10,22 363:1,4 362:10,22 365:11490:5 491:15 492:22 493:18,23kind 304:14 321:8 332:17 347:12Jeff 242:8 248:20 271:6257:24 258:9,16 259:4,5,19 260:14366:17 367:2,12 368:1,8 369:7,17494:5,7,14 495:12 494:5,7,14 495:12kind 304:14 321:8 332:17 347:12jeff.roberson@ut 242:11260:21,25 261:10 261:11 263:3,25370:19 371:6,11 371:14 372:17496:21 497:19,21 498:23kinds 435:20 King 244:12,17Jefferson 243:19 JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21 265:24 266:21374:7,22,24 375:19 376:4,17judgment 312:18 324:12251:4,6 273:19,22 394:25 395:7,24Jhaveri 275:24,25 289:11,12 292:11267:14 268:7 269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5			, ,		v
380:17 410:1255:3,6,14,24,25362:16,22305:11490:571115Jeff 242:8 248:20256:2,14 257:10363:15,22 365:11492:22 493:18,23332:17 347:12271:6259:4,5,19 260:14366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12385:12 434:9jeff.roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21kinds 435:20242:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17498:23kinds 435:20Jefferson 243:19264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24judgment 312:18251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12276:12,14 285:24Jhaveri 275:24,25267:14 268:7378:12,15,20,22judicial 351:3394:25 395:7,24289:11,12 292:11269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5		· ·	,		0
Jeff 242:8 248:20257:24 258:9,16365:15,22 305:11492:22 493:10,25271:6257:24 258:9,16366:17 367:2,12494:5,7,14 495:12385:12 434:9jeff.roberson@ut259:4,5,19 260:14368:1,8 369:7,17495:20,24 496:3454:9242:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17496:21 497:19,21kinds 435:20Jefferson 243:19264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24judgment 312:18251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12276:12,14 285:24Jhaveri 275:24,25267:14 268:7378:12,15,20,22judicial 351:3394:25 395:7,24289:11,12 292:11269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5	,		· · · ·		
271:6259:4,5,19 260:14368:1,8 369:7,17495:20,24 496:3454:9jeff.roberson@ut260:21,25 261:10370:19 371:6,11496:21 497:19,21kinds 435:20242:11261:11 263:3,25371:14 372:17498:23251:4,6 273:19,22Jefferson 243:19264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24judgment 312:18251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12394:25 395:7,24Jhaveri 275:24,25267:14 268:7378:12,15,20,22judicial 351:3394:25 395:7,24289:11,12 292:11269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5		,	,	· · · · ·	
jeff.roberson@ut 242:11260:21,25 261:10 261:11 263:3,25370:19 371:6,11 371:14 372:17496:21 497:19,21 498:23kinds 435:20 King 244:12,17Jefferson 243:19 JGN-9X 259:22264:2,19 265:10 265:24 266:21374:7,22,24 375:19 376:4,17judgment 312:18 324:12251:4,6 273:19,22 251:4,6 273:19,22Jhaveri 275:24,25 289:11,12 292:11267:14 268:7 269:5,13,18,23378:12,15,20,22 378:24 379:8,11judgcial 351:3 July 262:6 405:15394:25 395:7,24 396:16,25 397:5			· · · · ·	, ,	
242:11 260:21,25 201:10 370:19 371:0,11 190:21 197:19,21 Jefferson 243:19 264:2,19 265:10 371:14 372:17 498:23 King 244:12,17 JGN-9X 259:22 265:24 266:21 374:7,22,24 judgment 312:18 251:4,6 273:19,22 Jhaveri 275:24,25 267:14 268:7 378:12,15,20,22 judicial 351:3 394:25 395:7,24 289:11,12 292:11 269:5,13,18,23 378:24 379:8,11 July 262:6 405:15 396:16,25 397:5		, ,		,	
Jefferson 243:19264:2,19 265:10374:7,22,24judgment 312:18251:4,6 273:19,22JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12276:12,14 285:24Jhaveri 275:24,25267:14 268:7378:12,15,20,22judicial 351:3394:25 395:7,24289:11,12 292:11269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5	0		,	,	
JGN-9X 259:22265:24 266:21375:19 376:4,17324:12276:12,14 285:24Jhaveri 275:24,25267:14 268:7378:12,15,20,22judicial 351:3394:25 395:7,24289:11,12 292:11269:5,13,18,23378:24 379:8,11July 262:6 405:15396:16,25 397:5					U I
Jhaveri 275:24,25 267:14 268:7 378:12,15,20,22 judicial 351:3 394:25 395:7,24 289:11,12 292:11 269:5,13,18,23 378:24 379:8,11 July 262:6 405:15 396:16,25 397:5		,	, ,	• •	, , ,
289:11,12 292:11 269:5,13,18,23 378:24 379:8,11 July 262:6 405:15 396:16,25 397:5			,		,
209/10,10,20 070121 079/10,11 041 202/0 100/10	,			0	,
		207.3,13,10,23	510.24 517.0,11	JULY 202.0 403.13	,
		l		<u> </u>	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

F				1 dgc 022
444:25 445:1	385:21,24 389:13	Lauckhart 261:9	leak 419:9	370:10 397:18
459:21 465:16,22	390:12 391:9	294:2 295:14	leave 362:5 409:16	398:2 469:5
Kirkland 244:24	399:11 401:8	297:10 299:9,16	488:16	480:18
KITSAP 500:6	404:1 406:17	300:13 302:8,17	leaves 409:22	Likewise 283:23
knew 482:15	409:22 450:2	303:11 306:1,10	left 373:12 421:10	limine 372:16
know 256:11 263:9	Koch's 390:8	307:7 308:15	429:9	limit 266:17 296:8
264:16,23 266:2	Kroger 245:15	311:17 364:5,25	legal 311:22,24	330:14 336:4,12
267:4 269:2 278:8	250:16,18 273:6,9	365:9 366:10,24	312:7,8 401:1,5,7	427:21,21 441:8
280:20 286:8	291:2,4 359:22	367:25 369:25	433:8 436:23	441:10 495:2
303:4 306:6	414:23	387:19 390:15	499:11	496:3,8,25 497:5
307:12,13 324:17	Kronauer 246:6	399:16 400:3,7,8	legislature 283:14	497:9
326:25 327:14	276:17,18 290:23	400:14 401:11	451:2	limited 258:20
347:20 349:16	290:24 292:12,20	405:10,19 406:1	legitimate 490:25	279:10 288:10
352:5 357:7	298:8,15,21 299:2	440:21 450:3	length 342:9	293:3 358:18
368:23 373:16	299:5 300:6,9,23	489:5,9,13,14	412:17	442:19 443:20
374:14,24 375:4,6	301:10,14 414:2,2	489.5,9,15,14 Lauckhart's	lengthy 336:13	442.19 443.20 495:14 496:5
378:24 398:22	414:24	293:20 297:3,13	lens 451:7	497:8
410:15 418:19	Kurt 245:16 250:18	295.20 297.5,15	let's 248:9 269:13	limits 494:3,16
427:16 428:22	Kurtz 245:16	300:2,16 301:25	275:16 288:1,21	495:6,18
427.10 428.22 432:3,4,9,12,19	kV 449:4,5	305:23 307:4,10	288:24 294:22	line 261:13 296:19
432:23 434:20	KV 449.4,J	308:11 310:15	313:7 314:15	297:2 299:23
432:23 434:20	L	311:12,13 364:1	348:24 362:5,10	303:18,25 306:21
454:25 477:9	labeled 260:2	364:24 365:4	,	,
	LACEY 247:1		362:16,18 369:7	306:25 307:16
478:7,9 486:1	lag 269:7	366:12,25 376:21	370:19,19,19	309:16 315:9
knowing 382:15	laid 300:25 365:7	384:11 385:25	408:22 410:6,11	329:3 331:10
knowledge 263:14	371:5	389:15 390:20	413:2,5 430:9	334:11 338:11
300:24 301:4	Lake 244:5 370:5	394:2 405:15	442:2,7 458:21	352:17 356:4
308:22 368:6	370:11 449:3	Lauckhart-Schif	466:25 467:22,24	364:16 376:22
382:7 386:7	450:13	390:17 489:16	letter 412:15,16	384:6,12,16,17
399:21 419:24	land 385:15 484:16	laundry 328:6	letting 265:5	385:2 387:8,12
500:12	484:22	Laura 250:3	level 354:25 404:20	409:4,9 430:13
known 296:19	landscape 446:9	272:14 275:6	405:2 423:23	449:4,16 456:24
299:23 303:25	-	Lauren 246:8	448:15 464:17	479:7 480:4
306:21 319:4	language 374:2 473:13	290:6 327:9	475:2,4	lines 338:4,12
387:9 417:7,18		332:25 349:11	levels 355:5,6,8	339:19 412:21
459:17 477:5,7	large 253:20	law 241:13 242:2	422:1 423:10	426:21 427:19
482:16	412:22 416:9	243:13 247:23	481:8	429:23 487:1
knows 399:9	420:12 430:8,9	264:15 351:3,5	liability 450:12	Liotta 243:12
Koch 246:10,11	431:8,10,12,20	462:5 465:1	Libicki 411:1	249:20,21 272:6,7
253:6 267:17	largely 461:21	lawful 469:3	Libicki's 411:12	311:3 359:3,4,4
274:20 307:12	474:13	lead 267:3 347:11	lieu 411:20	359:10
361:12 362:14,18	larger 428:11	347:24 434:23	life-extending	liquefaction 421:12
362:20,20 363:7	lastly 355:22	467:14	458:15	421:16,24 422:6
363:13,16 370:13	440:20	lead-up 474:23	lifetime 329:7,10	422:11,17,21
370:21 381:7	Latimer 244:3	leading 347:20	light 266:2 370:4	423:3,6 424:14
	250:8 273:1			
	-	-	-	·

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 age 525
429:25	429:14,17,25	loads 404:23	412:3 416:10,15	451:13 455:14
Lisa 242:20 248:25	430:5,6,7,9,10,19	located 419:11	434:14 479:13	482:15 484:4
271:12 418:15	430:25 431:13,13	484:13 488:1,14	low 339:22 340:13	manager 275:25
lisa.gafken@atg	431:24 432:15	490:17	348:12 353:1,3,10	276:18 289:12
242:23	436:24 437:18,21	locating 484:21	354:13 355:7,12	290:24 475:2
list 265:12 267:15	438:3 439:2,9	logistical 409:12	355:20,24 356:11	managing 292:6
268:12,15 317:9	443:4 445:5 456:9	long 428:23 430:19	444:9 446:2	mandated 464:6
320:5 328:6 341:4	458:23 466:25	451:4 453:23	447:14 455:7,12	manner 252:20
376:11 388:15	468:6,22,23 469:3	long-standing	455:17,21,24	456:21 458:8
399:14	469:8,19 470:10	432:24	456:1,2 479:6	marine 474:20
listed 302:13 317:3	470:12,17,21	long-term 457:12	480:12,13 481:1,7	484:18,19
317:14 343:17	471:4,10 472:13	459:15 481:10	low-income 458:2	marked 259:22
listen 391:14 465:2	472:14,16,19,24	longer 284:23	lower 261:5 423:19	385:25 391:9
listening 406:25	473:11,19,24	404:22 407:21	448:23 481:11,24	market 456:25
418:20	474:2,24 475:15	look 259:22 264:16	lowest 435:11	480:18 481:13
lists 316:12	475:18 476:1,2,3	295:9 298:24	Lowry 245:16	marking 498:25
litigation 372:15	476:9,16 477:19	313:16 321:20	323:18 329:5	Martinez 244:17
485:20	478:11 482:7,10	324:7,10 329:25	331:7 332:6	251:8 273:23
little 251:16 293:15	483:8,10,12,14	333:18 342:13	Lowry's 329:2,24	materialized
294:11,12,13,16	484:5,7,9,14,18	365:22 370:12	333:21	483:19
328:18,19 344:2	484:19,21 485:3,6	385:16 386:15	lunch 253:18,21	materials 484:2,2
349:7 355:16	485:7,17,24 486:8	415:19 428:17,22	360:4 361:8,16,18	matter 247:10
365:16 405:11	488:1,5 490:1,7	433:25 434:10,22	362:6	271:8 277:6
425:15 444:21	490:16,16,20,24	435:15 471:5		329:25 409:3
454:25 487:19	491:11 492:3,6,9	472:13 473:11	M	410:15 420:1
492:5	492:11 493:2	486:12	M 293:13 298:16	mattered 486:7,7
live 447:3	494:9,24	looked 383:19,21	301:23 305:20	matters 277:11
LNG 247:21	load 296:19,23	411:4 429:4	308:9 310:9 311:8	367:24 383:24
261:24 315:8	297:11 299:23	looking 284:11	363:23 381:15	486:6 487:23,24
317:21 321:22	300:14 303:25	296:25 297:4,5,7	385:13 386:13	493:24 497:22
322:2,6 408:21	306:21 307:2,8,15	300:3 307:5 330:1	403:24 415:10	498:3 499:5
409:18 410:13	333:22,23,24	333:7 353:6 357:8		Mattheis 243:18
413:1 416:22	364:16,21 365:1	364:25 381:23,25	438:5 439:8 444:5	250:1 272:12
417:3,7,19 418:2	366:11 368:17,19	384:1 385:2	maintain 396:20	275:4
418:8,11 419:3,7	370:3,11 373:18	398:25 432:4,6,18	448:13 480:5	MaxETA/Synapse
419:9,11,20,22	387:9,20 390:15	434:21	maintenance 339:8	370:25 371:3,23
420:11,15,24	391:20,25 392:16	looks 294:3,6 295:7	major 339:8 448:2	372:1 393:17,20
421:1,4,5,24	393:13,14 394:1,4	299:10,12 302:9	475:9	394:1,3,12,24
423:1,13,14,14	394:13,17 400:4	302:11 306:2,4	majority 252:18	395:5
424:3,3,22,23	400:11 404:11,20	308:16,18 311:18	385:23	Mayer 244:13
425:3,4,5,9,10,11	404:24 405:1,5,6	311:20 312:15	making 262:14	246:16 251:5,6
425:16,17 426:1,2	405:7 424:10	353:8 364:6,8	333:4 469:12	273:20,21 288:5,6
426:15,22 427:2,6	430:8,17 431:10	482:14 489:7	471:11 477:1	288:7,17 445:1
427:7,11,19,23	431:14,20 450:7	lot 323:13 336:24	MALE 353:17	465:15,15,19,20
428:1,3 429:2,9	489:10,16	352:5 411:22	366:3	McAULIFFE
			management	
1	-	-	-	-

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 490 02 1
241:25 500:8,20	meetings 405:19	335:7 453:16	minutes 253:12	moments 257:17
McCloy 246:8	462:22	Michael 241:13	292:18 361:11,12	Monday 247:5
290:5,6 292:21	meets 295:23	242:3 247:22	361:13 362:1	264:22 400:4
311:6,23 313:4	megawatt 280:2,2	microphone 294:16	363:17,18 414:15	money 352:1
314:2 327:9,10	281:7,12	389:8	414:16 415:8	months 346:1
332:25 333:1	megawatts 331:11	microphones 248:8	418:17 441:11,15	405:16 473:10
345:2,3 349:11,12	331:12,15,16,17	Microsoft 245:9	442:19 443:3,4,5	morning 247:4
350:11 359:14,17	331:19,24 333:8	250:12,14 252:12	443:10,20,22	248:12,19,21,25
McGuire 276:4,6	405:3 452:24	257:13,21 258:11	444:16 476:17,17	249:3,8,13,20,25
279:21,21 281:14	member 277:1	258:14 273:2,5	485:16	250:7,13,17,24
281:15 282:8,24	members 452:17	291:14	mirrors 342:10	251:5,12,22 256:5
mean 279:11	453:19 454:7	Microsoft's 258:10	misrepresents	260:22 270:11,12
299:18 323:5	memo 393:5		390:7	,
		258:18 259:10	missed 408:8	270:22 271:5,11
330:23 405:6	mentioned 267:25	291:11 292:22		271:18,22,24
406:15 442:12	437:1	358:18	mistaken 371:17	272:6,11,24 273:3
means 252:21	met 372:9 373:10	mid-morning	mitigation 474:15	273:4,7,13,21
293:18 318:16	400:20 402:10	253:16 313:7	474:16	274:6,7 275:21,24
349:8 441:12	425:20 449:9	midday 253:17	MNL-1T 331:7	276:4,5,9,13,17
meant 331:8	476:5	Mihaly 243:8	MNL-IT 329:3	279:1 286:7,9
measurable 477:5	metering 448:4	249:14 272:1	Mobil 416:8	289:5,14,22 290:1
477:7	methane 421:6	miles 493:1	modeling 416:6,11	290:5,9,13,17,23
measure 326:19	422:1 423:4,8,14	million 340:13,15	modernization	291:3,7,12 292:5
356:15 455:20	423:19 424:2,6,9	340:17 427:22	448:3,4	410:20
measures 322:23	425:4,7,9,12,17	428:1 429:7	modification	Moser 243:3
323:5,6,7,16,17	426:2	MILT 242:6	424:25	246:16 249:8,9
324:8 325:2,6,11	method 284:13	mind 295:12	modifications	271:18,20 308:2
325:18,24 326:16	285:2 357:11	299:14 302:15	423:24 425:22	445:5 467:4,6,7
327:4,16,25 328:4	358:2 459:24	303:9 306:8	molecule 416:21	467:12,14 468:5
336:22 337:2	460:7 461:2	328:16 334:17	417:2,21	468:11,13,15,17
351:7 357:25	methodologies	367:11 418:14	molecules 421:13	468:18,20
measuring 327:5	333:5	mine 416:9	moment 257:10	motion 255:10,12
mechanics 331:21	methodology 282:8	mineral 415:23,24	259:24 260:1	255:15,19 372:15
332:1 438:8	284:18 353:1	Mines 415:16,21	263:4 269:14	mouth 428:10
mechanism 285:20	459:25 460:4,9	minimum 349:3,19	270:14 276:20	move 303:18
324:21,23 327:1	461:8,23 463:5	411:4 421:6 424:2	293:22 294:22	339:13 376:4,5,9
330:17 354:13	485:25	424:6,8 425:12	302:4 320:2	379:3,5 386:7
383:13 403:5	methods 349:4,19	mining 415:16,20	366:20 367:10	446:17 447:9
446:24 470:17	451:12 452:21,23	415:22,24	369:16 375:25	456:9 473:18
mechanisms	453:7,9,11	minor 415:17	376:14 379:7	484:7 498:19
323:17 325:1,17	metric 335:20	minute 269:17	384:19 388:19	moved 434:3
325:25	metrics 322:19	280:16 291:19	389:7 390:14	498:13
meet 325:1 423:4	323:3,10,13,14	322:3 340:4 370:8	391:2 393:10	movement 327:19
426:2,4,6 430:17	324:1,11,18 325:5	370:14 384:13	396:22 397:23	476:24
435:11 458:6	326:25 327:4	431:22 455:1	398:19 400:15	moving 252:9
489:6	328:7,23 335:5,6	476:18	467:22,24 499:13	256:24 452:10
107.0	520.1,25 555.5,0	T/0.10	107.22,27 777.13	
	I	l	I	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

[1 uge 020
477:3	363:23,23 381:15	352:13 364:14,15	NERC 377:9,13	non-Puget 431:12
muffled 294:13	381:15 385:13,13	365:14 368:18,24	378:3 392:2	non-regulated
334:8	386:13,13 403:24	369:23 377:10,15	395:24 396:1	484:20
Mullins 246:7	403:24 415:10,10	378:5,7 382:5	neutral 432:16	non-settling 335:19
290:1,1 292:20	name 247:22	386:17 387:7,8	never 263:13 277:5	non-subscriber
305:17 308:1	271:20,25 448:5	389:22 390:19	427:16 483:18	463:14 465:7
314:2,4 352:8	467:19 468:20	392:5,8,15 393:2	new 263:7 296:6	non-subscribers
361:2 414:5,5	499:12	393:18,21,24	297:2 306:25	463:10,12,24
432:1	named 399:3 456:3	394:6,11,13,16,19	324:21 328:13	non-utility 344:9
multi-party 247:17	names 248:11	395:17 403:12	341:5,6,11 342:3	nonlegal 303:5
265:14 441:14	narrow 389:6	404:3,14 409:18	342:13 346:12,16	Norm 251:13 274:1
477:15	narrowed 405:22	412:3 418:21	430:9 431:10	371:20 440:21
multiple 403:15	Nash 248:21 271:8	447:17 449:8,20	448:7 471:18	normal 255:17
443:22 455:6	nation 457:25	449:22,23 459:24	486:14	normally 347:9
496:16	nationally 481:4	460:6 462:7,7	Newcastle 389:19	430:12
multiyear 321:16	natural 304:5	466:14 473:7,14	390:4,8 393:21	NORMAN 244:22
321:17 322:22,24	318:6 321:15	476:18 482:17,23	398:6,8,13,16,21	Northeast 242:15
323:2,10,24 324:9	388:2 418:10	483:23 486:15	449:25	NorthernGrid
324:13,19 325:13	419:7 421:16	489:18 491:2	Newcastle's 393:23	397:1
326:17,20 327:7	422:7 423:11	493:10	newer 328:13	Northwest 243:19
327:17 336:17	479:4	needed 387:12	NICHOLAS 245:4	250:23,25 251:1
351:10 387:3	nature 268:22	405:21 420:19,20	Nick 277:17	273:15 290:6
403:9 407:21	403:18	430:10 463:18	Nicolas 251:25	note 315:21 316:4
434:20 446:21	near 488:1,14	needing 405:4	274:9	324:24 328:6
471:17	nearby 388:7	needn't 409:13	Nightingale 246:9	330:12 331:22
Murphy 245:5	nearly 256:18	needs 260:11	253:3,3 259:13,15	346:6 385:22
251:23 252:1	403:11	296:22 404:8,18	260:2,7,8 361:12	431:16 448:11
274:8 277:2	necessarily 260:19	423:20 426:3	361:22 362:15	458:10 470:11
mute 248:3 252:7	281:24 282:3	428:11 429:3	363:2,2,7,14,17	492:5 496:12
259:1 272:17	295:25 306:7,25	472:25 483:18	363:19 366:19	noted 259:21 309:5
322:16 367:13,14	307:13 336:13	484:3	367:17,21 369:9	389:8 451:3
369:17 372:2	382:10 383:16	negatively 484:14	371:8,9,11,13,19	460:22
384:22 391:13	432:6 478:8	negotiated 471:9	372:13,18 375:4,6	notes 332:15
409:8 418:18	necessary 396:20	472:11	375:20 376:5,6,10	notice 263:10 351:3
486:23	405:20 421:13	negotiations	376:13,16 379:1	389:9
muted 248:8	449:14 482:3	462:21 472:2	379:13,14,16,22	notify 257:7
316:21 334:11	need 253:20 269:9	neighborhood	380:4,6,10,19,22	November 437:2
486:25 487:2	278:14 280:11,25	277:5 449:15	380:24 386:25	438:6
	287:21 296:17,18	neighborhoods	401:12	nthomas@omwl
<u> </u>	297:2 299:21,22	244:21 251:10	Nightingale's	245:8
N 242:1 243:1	303:23,24 304:17	473:24	366:15 376:11	nuanced 478:5
244:1 245:1	306:20,20,25	neighboring 397:9	396:13	Nucor 243:17
293:13,13 298:16	307:16 315:4	397:16,19	nods 279:17	249:24 250:2
298:16 301:23,23	316:22 336:13	neither 285:23	non-Green 459:20	272:10,13,22
305:20,20 308:9,9	339:6 349:18	353:12 368:16	461:12	275:5 291:8 304:3
310:9,9 311:8,8				
	1	1	l de la constante de	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 490 020
413:23,25 414:24	259:12 261:18	253:25 488:23	333:13 335:10	453:2,10
Nucor's 291:6	385:23 399:6	494:1 498:13,13	336:15 337:7,8	ones 328:13,14
number 252:3,6	objection 257:4,6	498:17 500:11,15	338:18 339:11,20	344:18 410:4
253:20 280:12,15	257:17,23 258:19	Odgen 274:7 277:2	340:16,22 341:19	419:25 498:11
293:24 296:24	259:10,16,20	Off-record 391:6	341:22 342:14,17	ongoing 475:24
316:12 322:4	260:4,6 263:7,10	393:11 418:12	343:8 345:14	online 291:21
354:7 370:3,4,4	264:13,25 265:2,8	off-site 474:16	347:25 350:3,15	open 336:1,6
379:18 384:21	268:14 292:22	offer 287:3 411:9	350:20 357:18	347:11 357:22
385:2 386:16,18	300:18,22 303:17	445:8	358:6 359:20	opening 299:5
387:23 398:23	304:17 311:21	offered 374:11	363:21 364:4,24	operate 472:23
399:1 418:20	312:3 365:6,12	410:4 411:15	366:8,10,16	operated 427:20
421:6 423:14	367:20 368:2	offering 443:1	367:10,14,16	475:16
421.0 423.14 424:2,7 425:4,7,9	369:5 372:13	offers 465:5		
			369:4,14,20 370:23 371:19	operating 322:24 325:13 339:16
425:12,18 426:2,5	374:18 375:17,20	Office 242:9,21		
426:6 453:16	388:8,11 390:7	244:17	372:6,25 374:12	operation 463:25
489:9 497:13	399:24 401:1	offset 339:5	374:20,24 375:8	operations 362:21
498:24	410:19 411:13	Ogden 245:5	375:25 376:18	415:24 451:4,7
numbering 274:21	objections 252:11	251:23 252:1	378:2,9,14,21	454:4,17 475:25
379:17	252:14 253:5	oh 296:10 345:2	379:6 382:2,20	480:5
numbers 331:22	257:13,20 261:1	371:13	383:2 387:13	opinion 287:3
387:16	261:13,16 263:9	Ohio 245:17	390:15 391:16,22	299:19 311:22
numerous 474:25	267:1,12 268:8	Oil 416:8	392:24 393:10	367:4 383:23
NWEC 273:12	277:14 288:13	okay 269:11 270:25	394:12,23 397:24	opinions 458:22
333:4	292:25 312:4	275:2 278:5,13	399:22 400:17	OPL 398:13,16
NWEC's 290:4	380:11	279:23 281:2	401:22 406:18,24	opportunities
	objects 459:23	282:1,22 284:10	407:8,24 408:3	344:15 351:16
$\frac{0}{0}$	obligation 435:14	286:5 293:12,15	409:19 410:18	opportunity 253:24
O 293:13,13 298:16	observation 353:7	293:23 294:1,19	415:3,19 417:1,5	257:19 262:20
298:16 301:23,23	354:6	294:23 295:12	417:24 419:15,19	263:1 264:16
305:20,20 308:9,9	observe 264:24	296:10,13 297:7	420:5,9,14,17,24	335:20 344:20
310:9,9 311:8,8	observers 248:7	297:17,22 298:1,9	421:9 422:22	378:16 410:25
363:23,23 381:15	observing 487:1	298:18 299:2,7,14	424:1,21 426:7	411:11 437:5
381:15 385:13	obtain 310:19	299:20 300:2,6,9	429:11 431:21	441:5 445:23
386:13,13 403:24	obviously 256:25	300:10 301:1,7,25	434:17 435:22	456:15 469:25
415:10,10	351:22 438:21	302:5,7,14 303:20	436:21 438:7,12	471:22 489:20
o'clock 442:1	occur 287:1 346:10	305:3,9,22,25	439:12,19 441:1	oppose 267:7
O&M 477:2	404:19 409:18	307:6,19,24 308:8	441:19 443:23	449:16 477:19
o0o- 247:3	occurred 264:7	308:14 309:12	467:6,18 468:4	478:14 491:16
oath 292:12 363:6	382:24 404:24	310:21 311:13,16	486:24,25 496:10	opposed 345:21
object 257:15 266:4	405:20 419:10,16	312:14,21 313:21	499:4	437:21 443:18
266:12,25 308:19	419:22 420:11,14	316:3,8,22 317:8	Olympia 242:10	477:16 478:16
309:1 347:19	473:19	318:12,25 319:14	Olympic 398:8	488:7,8
366:14 388:24	occurs 346:8	320:3,5,19 322:8	on-site 474:7,15	opposes 449:13
392:17 417:9	October 241:24	325:3 329:17	once 329:18 332:21	478:11 479:16
436:7	246:3 247:1,5	330:18 332:3	357:24 383:17	488:9 490:7
objected 257:21				

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 age 621
opposite 484:25	overall 322:11	495:11,16 496:1,7	256:4,5 273:13,14	328:22 336:3
opposition 246:18	overburden 484:23	496:9,14,17 497:3	311:21 313:5	428:3 433:12
442:15 470:12	overburdened	497:18	359:12,13,19	particulates 433:20
478:1,2 483:16	484:23	paid 283:18	456:10,14,15	parties 252:3,20
485:12 490:1,6	oversight 418:7	Paisner 249:4	Parsons 244:3	253:1,10,11
494:11,22,24,25	419:2	271:14	250:8 272:25	254:18 255:1
497:12	overwater 474:17	Palms 243:13	part 268:16 312:16	256:17 257:14,18
opt-in 354:21	0ver water 4/4.1/	pandemic 447:5	315:11 319:9	262:9 265:18
optimal 429:5	Р	panel 252:22 253:4	333:25 341:2	266:3,20,23
optimization 452:9	P 242:1,1 243:1,1	254:9,10,23 260:8	392:15 393:2,6,18	267:25 277:13
option 279:5,12	244:1,1 245:1,1	260:16,20,22	401:23 402:2	279:3 280:1 281:9
370:10 441:13	P-19087 418:1	266:5,16,18,24	407:21 408:8	283:10 284:17,21
	p.m 362:6,9,11	269:17 270:15	418:8 419:4,8	285:6 287:15
options 429:5 oral 253:10 257:16	408:23,24 410:8		418:8 419:4,8 422:13,15 432:9	283:14 292:24
	410:10,10,12	274:23 275:11,17	,	
441:6,13 442:12	441:4 442:6,6,8	275:19 277:21	434:1 475:20	306:13 315:3,4,10
442:17 443:15,19	499:18	278:18,21 287:6	477:5 478:15	315:20 316:9,19
489:25	P.O 242:9	287:25 288:1,11	479:23 482:12	316:23 323:1
order 247:11	page 246:4 284:12	288:21,21 289:2	partial 421:19	327:24 328:3,15
252:20 253:1	293:21,24,25	289:19 292:19	422:9	328:16 332:4
258:20 262:6,6	297:7 298:20	293:1,6 298:7	partially 423:6	333:14 335:19
283:20 293:4	302:1 305:23	311:6 313:17	participant 418:3	338:3 339:24
445:17 451:23	308:12 310:16	314:18,21,23,25	participants	342:3,4,8,18
453:23 460:11		322:6 340:24	241:14 353:1,4	343:3,16 344:13
466:2 467:7	311:14 315:8	347:6 358:15	354:8	344:25 345:10,22
orderly 347:10	318:6 321:7 322:4	359:7,16 360:5,6	participate 258:2	346:16 347:3,17
Oregon 243:5	326:10 329:3	360:8,9,10,20,21	260:15 296:24	347:21 349:8
245:12	331:6,11 353:7	360:22,25 361:2,5	348:17 417:25	350:18 351:8
orientation 388:14	357:4 364:2	361:6,10 362:13	453:2,19 460:14	380:12 400:18
original 258:7	369:21,25 384:15	406:5 408:15,21	participated	406:14 414:17
293:16 318:20	384:17,18 385:2	408:22,22 409:18	302:21 460:18	429:12,18 431:23
319:13 320:13	387:16,17,22	410:13 413:1,7,7	462:24	432:14 436:1,3,7
412:10	397:22 406:10	426:13,15 439:22	participation	437:6 441:5,8,13
originally 404:18	426:20 427:18	panelists 271:2	258:21 277:15	442:10,10,14,20
407:17,19 423:24	438:3 489:6 494:3	309:17	293:2 354:22	444:6 448:14
425:19 428:19	494:16 495:6,18	paragraph 279:4	494:20 495:13,15	449:6,11 459:19
outcomes 327:5	496:8	281:5,5 284:16	496:5 497:8	460:2,8,16 463:3
451:13 483:20	pages 241:11 297:4	322:21 326:10	particles 423:7	463:17 464:21
outline 364:10	297:5 300:3 307:5	337:16 339:23	particular 296:5	468:16 469:24
outlines 374:5	316:11 317:4	347:2 349:3	328:23 330:12	470:9 471:20,22
outperformed	319:22 364:25	352:23,24 429:14	335:25 343:23	472:1,7,17 473:6
481:15	365:23 366:1,2	436:2 492:7	344:5,17 346:15	477:16 480:1,17
outreach 475:1,3	367:4 387:14	Parcell 481:19	348:5 399:24	487:9 490:8
outset 302:18	389:5 411:7,25	Parcell's 481:23	401:5 411:16	491:16 494:21
outside 399:20	412:17 462:8	Parekh 244:8	467:11	499:7
402:6 419:23	484:1 494:7,9,9	246:14 250:24,25	particularly 265:1	parties' 444:14
	494:10,21,23,25		- •	=
1	I	I	I	1

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

1				1 490 020
partner 292:6	460:18 462:23	335:13 479:10	picturing 443:14	pipes 493:12
393:6,7	463:15 466:2	performed 368:17	piece 333:4 353:21	place 284:6
parts 432:17	479:9	368:19 393:3	422:22	places 433:4
448:17 487:16	peak 331:13 333:15	period 286:20	pieces 326:8 328:15	plan 253:3 255:16
party 248:11	334:2 346:2	318:18 412:12	419:16	256:16 259:14
252:14,22 261:15	419:11,20 424:5	428:15 472:2	Piliaris 275:21,22	261:10 278:6,17
268:8 270:19	427:11 429:3,6	Perkins 242:15	279:15,15 280:23	286:16 317:12,13
275:13 278:3,5,17	448:9 493:4	248:13 271:1	286:17 289:8,9	321:11,16,17
284:25 285:6		467:21	292:11 323:11	322:22,25 323:2
286:3 288:2,22	peaker 370:3	permit 261:23	324:20 325:4,15	323:10,25 324:9
314:20 347:4	peaking 472:25 493:9	-	,	,
		393:25 398:7,11	326:9 328:5	324:13,19 325:13
360:7 361:9	penalties 325:7,18	403:16 418:2	329:12,20 330:22	326:17,20 327:2,7
362:17 413:3	326:15	475:22 486:15	331:21 332:7	332:14,16 336:18
440:6,13,20 443:6	penalty 325:1,25	permits 385:16	333:10,17 334:3	341:23 348:14,25
443:18 449:13	pendency 351:9	449:25	334:14,17,20	351:10 361:9
454:21 456:7	peninsula 474:14	permitted 469:13	335:3,9,24 336:19	383:13 387:3
459:23 465:13	people 259:8	permitting 253:9	337:5 343:20,21	403:5,9 407:22
466:22 467:2,13	278:11 280:10	434:6 436:15	343:25 344:3	434:20 446:21
469:18 470:14	418:20	450:10 486:10,10	346:5 347:7,7	447:23,25 451:25
476:15 494:18	Pepple 245:10	perpetuates 484:22	348:3,15,16	452:2 497:25
495:12,15 496:13	250:13,14 258:13	491:12	351:13,14 355:3	498:25
496:15,21 497:11	259:25 260:9,10	person 411:1	355:18 356:20	planned 257:22
party's 336:12	260:18,24 261:4	486:23,24	357:22 413:16,16	259:12 314:19
435:23	273:3,4	personal 399:21	429:13 430:2,3	360:7 395:20
path 460:6 478:8	percent 429:19	personally 393:4	431:5,8 432:21	446:25
Paul 398:21 399:3	447:7 448:13,15	399:15 417:23	434:23 451:3	planner 394:6
pause 258:5 367:15	448:15 479:19,20	persons 451:23	Piliaris' 333:2	planning 260:20
paves 455:11	479:25,25 480:3	perspective 283:2	345:5	313:15 342:18
pay 283:23 430:20	480:11,22,23	285:12 432:20	pilings 474:10,10	358:19 373:18
430:22,22,25	481:5,10,12,24	460:25 461:23	PILLARIS 280:23	377:9,14 378:4
431:1	percentage 329:6	476:24 486:4	285:4	392:1 394:16
payer 423:16 424:5	429:17	perspectives	pilot 352:23 353:8	395:12,25 396:9
paying 431:17	percolating 459:14	459:19 464:24	353:14,25 354:5	396:11,18 397:9
payment 330:24	perfectly 258:24	persuaded 497:11	354:14 355:1,7,7	397:17,20 404:2
348:25 349:3,19	359:9 367:12	petition 247:11,15	355:23,24 357:12	404:23 449:22
PC 342:9	436:19	PGA 321:24 436:25	357:20 455:25	451:9,14,20,24
PCA 341:14 342:15	perform 327:19	469:21	457:4,6,8 479:7	452:1,13 453:12
343:4 346:9	368:21 451:23	phase 403:13	pilots 353:2	453:12 457:18
PCH 417:25	performance	422:19 423:7	PIM 326:11 329:5	plans 266:23
PCHB 261:23	322:19,23 323:24	phases 456:23	330:12,14,16	292:18 327:17
475:21	324:8,12 325:11	phone 272:15	333:4,23,24,25	363:16 388:15
PCORC 280:8,19	325:20 327:16,25	278:14	335:4,21 336:22	396:20 435:10
281:6,13,17,20,24	330:16,24 335:6	phrase 428:5	pipeline 398:8	471:17
282:3,6,10 284:13	336:22 337:2	pick 361:17	448:3 493:2	plant 339:3 370:3
460:1,9,10,12,16	performance-bas	picture 471:5	pipelines 475:23	419:11,20 426:23
10011,2,10,12,10	F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F	Freedore 1/11.0	F F C 1100 170.20	120.23
	l	l	I	l

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 490 020
436:10 437:21	419:20,25	392:21,23 436:17	464:8,12,14,14,15	presents 351:16
438:23 439:2,8	point 264:3 265:4,8	posed 492:1	466:8	435:20 463:20
446:24 447:19	283:1,4,5,12	position 258:5	PPR 326:23	482:1 485:17,24
470:14 477:2,2	286:21 304:20	330:5,10 343:16	practice 347:14	486:17 487:11
490:16,17 491:2	319:25 322:9	367:8 478:4,13	401:5	488:13 496:12
plants 438:14,15,24	334:4 370:17	positions 443:8	practiced 277:4	preserves 469:12
438:25	381:8 383:21	465:24 478:6	practices 483:3	president 251:14
platefin 421:15	395:21 422:25	positive 474:2	pre-file 268:1	289:15 351:2
platform 248:2	425:6 433:3,17	possibility 285:10	pre-filed 252:18	362:21 413:14
play 446:13	437:5 469:19	possible 286:12	256:18 265:13	416:14 418:6,25
please 248:2,8	472:6 493:15	328:8 389:2	268:11 274:12	419:1
257:11 259:5	pointed 464:23	441:25 492:12	310:17 377:20,25	press 408:10
269:13 272:18,19	489:5	post-hearing	389:24 392:7	pressing 260:17
275:1 277:23	points 481:2,3,5,18	253:25 327:24	395:10 412:23	presume 347:21
292:15 293:20	policies 446:12	411:3 493:25	464:3	pretreatment
297:3,18 298:18	policy 287:25	494:15,16 495:5	pre-review 336:13	421:13,16 422:6
300:2 301:25	288:21 312:5,7	497:9	precisely 282:19	422:12,13,15,16
302:4 304:22	314:18 327:14	posted 267:19	443:13	422:12,13,13,10
305:22 307:4	373:25 374:4	posted 207.19 potential 330:15	- · -	pretrial 265:11
308:11 310:15	382:23 387:4	338:10,13 343:14	predictable 462:6 466:11	pretty 341:23,25
311:13 315:5		343:18 412:2		- · ·
	401:4,13,20	469:23	predominantly 325:1 488:12	411:21 414:20,21
345:2 346:24,25	456:25 457:24			488:3
350:18,24 351:12	pollutants 433:19	potentially 306:23	preface 388:13	previously 389:18
354:18 359:15	474:5	323:17 488:13	prefer 254:8	Pricing 276:1
363:8,20,25	pollutes 487:11	495:11	361:16 410:16	289:12
364:24 369:17	pollution 263:17,20	pound 419:16	468:8,11	primarily 323:14
371:20 376:1,21	486:8,9,14	power 280:4,6	preference 468:13	prime 435:16
384:11,23,25	population 484:24	281:6 282:2,5,15	prejudice 265:5	principle 429:20
388:19 389:7	populations 355:24	283:16 296:20	prepare 496:2	464:6 469:15
390:14 391:2	447:14 452:5,18	297:1 299:24	prepared 467:8	principles 284:5
397:23 398:19	453:18 454:8	304:1 306:22,23	468:6	415:22 446:8
400:15 406:8	455:8 490:18	340:23 341:1,4,6	prescribed 325:2	prior 257:12
414:7 417:14	Port 433:21 474:3,8	341:8,16,24 343:9	presence 431:13	334:21 335:21
426:17 427:10,25	portion 269:10	344:7 345:15,20	present 264:11	394:20 401:9
429:18 430:1	280:3 339:9	345:21,25 346:16	389:4 394:19	421:16 422:6,11
445:19 456:13	376:11 472:18,24	364:17 387:9	404:14 442:22	423:2 424:14
465:18 476:20	475:12	397:14 405:8	445:12,23 450:16	491:25
487:1 489:2 490:5	portions 403:2	446:15 448:10	453:8 478:18	prioritize 456:2
491:22	411:12 412:15	power-cost-only	484:4 489:20	458:2
Plenefisch 257:22	474:19 478:12,13	342:11	presented 264:9	prioritizes 456:21
258:19 260:11,15	Portland 243:5	PowerPoint 365:24	307:14 318:3	PRK-29X 274:15
291:12,13 292:21	245:12	PPA 464:18	389:17 471:6	pro 477:2
292:23 358:17,19	pose 252:15 261:8	PPAs 283:17,18,24	473:9 480:7	probably 257:25
plus 282:20	368:9 374:8	284:23 343:12,14	481:19,22 484:1	286:18 324:12
Plymouth 419:11	375:23 381:5	343:17 448:8	487:7	330:2 374:6 391:3

				1 uge 000
409:3 411:7	345:21,24 346:9	451:18 453:20	promote 455:9	prove 373:10
478:24	347:3,5,12,20	455:14,21	456:24	402:10
problem 295:3	348:6,9 351:23	progress 460:19	prongs 476:5	provide 253:24
375:15 378:22	356:10 357:24	471:11	pronounced 421:14	257:4 268:15
383:9 402:22	358:2 382:24	prohibit 284:25	propane 423:10	283:7,15 320:12
417:16 418:24	392:2 393:22	prohibited 263:14	proper 375:12	335:20 345:24
424:16	405:13 421:12	263:14 286:13,15	383:6 402:19	352:25 353:3
problematic 261:25	422:13 449:24	286:17 463:13	432:19	355:19,23 373:9
problems 269:1,2	451:14,25 452:13	project 243:7	properly 374:10	378:11,19 402:8
400:10 423:18	453:4,6,8,15	249:12,15 251:1	422:14 463:10	425:9 439:10,14
450:3	457:18 458:1,5	257:14 266:3,8	proponents 328:23	441:5,13 442:11
procedural 454:6	465:25 469:25	267:4,7,9 271:23	proposal 266:14	442:17 443:19
460:21	490:23 499:8	272:2,3 290:12,14	268:8,9 329:9	444:1 446:16
procedure 374:16	processed 405:17	293:4 302:23	482:5	447:13 455:21
374:25 382:21	processees 357:25	308:25 312:19,20	proposals 351:17	461:1 463:3 464:8
402:4	processes 451:12	326:7 353:19	358:3	466:12 484:12
proceed 254:2	452:21,23 453:9	369:4 382:6 388:5	propose 266:16	488:16
293:8,12 294:22	453:11 454:9,11	388:6 393:25	480:17	provided 266:5,8
298:9,11,15	processing 415:24	394:11 395:20	proposed 252:20	266:18 297:22
301:17 305:15,19	produce 396:18	401:14 402:25	253:1 260:3,5	301:7 304:12
308:4 309:10	425:11,17 426:2	403:2,10,12,12,14	279:25 281:11	305:5 307:20
310:5 351:12	produced 392:9	403:17 404:6	285:20 323:3,19	308:24 309:19
363:19,20 381:13	423:14	407:10 431:3	324:21 328:4,14	310:22 312:22
386:11 414:17	produces 404:12	433:1,10,18 434:1	332:4 333:16,22	315:10,11 332:5
418:21 445:18,19	producing 427:6	434:2,16 435:8	335:4,21 338:1	335:7 336:2 342:2
456:13 467:12	product 462:20	442:17 444:8	339:15 340:12	342:7 358:4
468:16 476:20	production 339:5	446:2 449:2,9,14	356:11,14 376:7	368:23 373:20
proceeding 248:1	professionalism	449:20 450:11	388:4 469:7	389:21 393:5
263:24 265:14	499:8	451:17 454:24	470:18 479:1	396:10 397:11
287:17 293:2,5	profile 448:20	456:4 468:25	481:17	400:3,7 404:9
297:23 301:8	profound 474:2	469:8 470:10	proposes 259:21	405:10 406:1
304:12 305:6	program 283:14	474:20 475:13	proposing 323:1,8	429:6 464:12
307:21 309:20	284:5 327:2 329:8	477:10,18,18,23	323:9 332:19	475:5 491:4
310:22 312:23	329:11 331:12	482:11 483:8,12	333:14	provides 262:11
326:23 346:11	340:13,14 353:23	483:14 484:5,7,8	prosecuting 251:8	322:2 338:20
348:17 367:15	354:21,22 415:20	484:9 485:3,8	273:23	339:7 340:25
412:7 436:9 473:8	416:1 451:17	489:24 490:3	Prosecutor's	341:3,13,23
473:11 489:15	456:1 458:12	491:7	244:17	343:11 421:6
499:7	461:12 463:12,25	project's 475:7	prospectively	429:15 435:25
proceedings 324:14	464:2,16 466:9	projected 351:22	330:9	438:3,22 448:6
342:13 411:16,23	programming	484:3	protect 488:11	462:4 464:5 465:7
417:25 450:10	457:19	projects 366:22	protection 353:3,11	469:18
466:16 485:22	programs 318:23	383:10 448:2	355:13,16,19	providing 324:17
process 262:10	329:13 331:1	prolonged 472:1	476:1	403:2 447:19
306:17 336:14	351:19 446:23	promise 455:15	protections 456:2	provision 343:23
		-	-	• • •
I			I	1

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				Tage 551
344:5 446:14	311:25 312:15,17	362:18 370:2,6	489:6,13 490:16	462:12,14,18,25
451:20	312:20,23 341:13	372:9 373:2,9,19	490:23 492:18	465:4 469:4
provisional 303:7	364:6,8,9 367:18	377:2 385:21,22	496:15	473:21,21 477:21
306:12 318:17	367:23 369:22	389:21 391:20,22	PSE's 252:14 253:5	477:24,25 478:4,9
319:18 402:24	372:7 373:1,10	392:6,12 393:3,3	255:15 261:1,13	478:10,18,23,25
436:4 469:22	374:3 375:12	393:24 394:24	323:2 331:14,18	479:3,16,22 480:3
provisionally 303:1	382:4 383:6,12	395:6,10,23 396:8	332:4 338:25	480:13,21 481:25
306:15 372:11	386:16 400:19	396:15,24 397:4	357:19 361:12	482:4 483:2,4,13
373:4 381:21	401:10,15 402:10	397:13,25 398:7	371:1,24 376:24	483:15 484:11
382:16 400:21	402:19 403:4	398:12 399:6	377:9,13 378:3	485:4,5 487:23
provisions 279:9	436:8 489:8 491:1	400:3,9,20 402:8	399:23 404:2	490:9,11,21,22,25
349:1 432:8	492:3 496:6	405:4,10,12,16,17	415:5 420:20	491:5,9,13 498:8
448:18 455:6	prudent 306:14	406:20 411:14,23	421:23 423:16	498:18
proxy 282:13	375:14 383:7	412:8 413:4,13,15	428:2 436:1 447:7	publicly 349:4
284:24 480:7,8,9	384:5 402:20	413:17 418:7	448:14,21,25	487:10
480:15,15	428:2 436:2	419:1,1,5 420:25	449:21 451:7	published 391:4
prudence 293:17	469:13 470:2,15	421:1,5 424:4,7	454:17 455:23	PUD 397:18
293:18 294:6	472:19 473:1	425:8,8,9,16,25	456:20 457:13	Puget 241:7 242:13
295:7,13,18,21,23	476:6 477:8	425:25 427:11,24	459:15,16 460:1,3	247:10,11,13
299:15 302:16,20	482:10 483:1	428:2 429:15	460:25 462:1,5,23	271:1 275:23
302:20,25 303:6	484:10 487:10,15	431:6 436:3 438:2	462:24 469:20	280:3 289:15
303:10 306:9,13	491:7	438:22 440:3	470:7,13 472:25	292:7 307:14
308:24 345:19,24	prudently 472:21	444:7,23 445:20	473:4,18 479:19	353:22 354:3,8,21
346:8,10 372:10	473:16 484:6	446:5,12,15,21	479:24 480:2,4	354:24 362:21
373:3,12,23	PSE 247:14 248:10	447:1,2,8,11,12	483:3,17 484:4	418:8 419:2 429:9
374:17 381:18,19	248:14,15 252:14	447:18,20,20,22	491:1 493:2	429:17,25 430:4,7
381:20 382:1,10	253:6 255:10	447:24 448:10,11	PSE/Quanta	430:9,19,25
382:11,14,14,17	257:6,14 261:1,19	448:16,18 450:2	297:11 300:14	431:13 486:13
382:22 384:1	261:22 263:5,10	450:17 451:10,15	307:8 365:1	pull 293:22 320:2
387:2,5 400:20,24	264:20 268:4	451:22 452:4,7,20	366:11 387:20	370:15 379:19
402:5 428:12	270:13,16 271:2	453:15 454:2,7	400:11	391:1 398:20
432:24,25 437:2,6	275:15,20 276:1	455:11 457:13,22	PSE/TOTE 421:5	pulled 309:15
449:7,11 470:13	279:15 282:16,21	458:1,6 459:9,14	public 242:19,21	311:15 328:8
482:13,21 487:20	283:17 288:24	459:23 460:13,20	248:24 249:2	pulling 486:8
prudency 258:21	289:3,7,10,13,18	461:10,14 462:25	255:10 268:17,18	pumps 457:10,11
293:3,7 294:3,24	291:20 300:10	463:2 464:15	268:18,20 271:10	purchase 341:7
295:14,21,22	313:22 315:4	467:24 468:8	271:13 276:8,10	343:9 344:7
296:3 297:23	317:1 333:16,22	470:25 471:16,19	283:1,4,8,12	459:16
299:10,12,16	334:1,9,10 337:13	471:24 472:15,19	342:19,21 345:17	purchased 283:17
301:8 302:9,11,16	337:19,23 339:13	473:12 474:9,12	345:23 414:14,22	425:5 436:9
303:10 304:13	341:1,3,6,10	474:15,19,22,25	440:6,11 442:15	purchases 346:16
305:6 306:2,4,10	342:2,17 349:3,16	475:2,3,5,8,11,16	443:6,16 444:22	purely 312:7,7,8
307:21,23 308:16	351:14 352:25	475:19 476:5,8	446:8 454:15,16	401:7
308:18 309:20	353:3,15 354:25	480:4,9 483:21,24	459:3,12,20	purported 390:1
310:23 311:18,20	356:8 357:19	484:1,6 487:20	460:11 461:1	purposes 247:16
510.25 511.10,20	550.0 557.17	10111,0 107.20	100.11 101.1	raip0000 217.10
	I		l	

				1 age 302
254:17 471:11	312:7,7,9,10,11	310:19 376:6	quo 346:7	282:9,10,12,20,20
pursuant 343:15	312:21 316:22	385:8	quote 262:16 279:6	283:2,9,10 286:16
470:18	319:15 321:12	questions 246:5,12	329:6 338:20	286:25 317:20,25
pursue 452:25	323:12 324:16	252:15,24 254:1	412:17 420:18	318:22 320:8
460:6	334:18 335:17	254:14 255:4,4	421:10 422:5	321:7,11,11,16,17
pursuing 491:25	336:20 338:19	256:12,15 267:3	451:7 464:5,6	322:22,24 323:2
purview 443:21	339:11,22 345:14	278:20 279:2		323:10,24 324:9
push 347:8	348:11,21 350:4	286:7 287:6	R	324:13,19 325:13
put 315:22 323:3	350:23,23 353:5	293:10,19 296:9	R 241:25 242:1	326:17,20 327:7
323:20 331:1,2	354:11,17,24	298:2 305:10	243:1 244:1 245:1	327:17 336:17
375:11 379:9	355:11 356:20,22	307:25 309:2,8,16	265:7 293:13	339:13,16,18
380:12 382:9	359:24 363:25	309:23 310:25	298:16 301:23	342:11 345:9,20
383:4 402:17	364:20 366:8	312:6 313:1	305:20 308:9	351:10 352:23
409:3 438:6,17	367:6 368:15	314:22,24 321:20	310:9 311:8	353:2 372:11
456:19	369:1,14,15,20	322:7,10,13,18	363:23 381:15	382:16 383:17
Puyallup 245:3	370:23 371:5,7,20	335:12,15 336:24	385:13,13 386:13	384:2 387:3
251:21,24 257:5	372:3,6,18,22	337:10,11 339:21	403:24,24 415:10	401:24 403:9
274:4,8 277:1,15	374:14,21 375:1,9	340:23 343:4	500:2,8,20	406:20 407:11,11
414:15 415:5	376:20 377:7	346:19,20,23	Rachel 276:14	407:16,18,21,22
440:13 442:16	378:1,2,17,21	348:23 350:17,20	285:14 288:9	407:23 423:16
474:22 477:22	379:23 383:22	352:18,18 356:4	rain 474:12	424:5 434:20
484:15,22 485:11	384:10 386:22	358:8,10,11,12	raise 268:8 277:3,7	435:4 446:21
	387:13,24 388:17	359:14 360:10,14	277:13,23 292:15	447:23,25 462:21
<u>Q</u>	388:20,25 389:2	360:16 361:23	363:8 409:15	462:23 463:2,3
qualified 373:19	389:13 390:3	368:9 371:12	411:21 414:8	464:21 466:15
quality 263:19,22	392:3,13,18,23	374:8 375:24	raised 252:13 256:4	469:12 471:17
420:19,20,23	393:9,16 395:2,19	376:2,3,12,15	257:1 259:25	477:1,4 479:5,5,7
421:1,3 423:15,21	395:22 396:5,14	379:9 381:6 386:8	261:1,4 263:19	481:6 485:4
434:10,10 474:21	396:24 397:3,7,12	392:21 401:4,6	359:2 388:16	490:10
quantity 423:19	397:24 398:3,5,5	403:19,23 405:18	470:1 487:19	rate-making
424:9	400:2,17 401:7,9	406:2,4,7,25	491:9	468:24 469:7
question 255:9	401:10,17 402:11	408:5,15 415:13	raises 490:25	470:15 479:10
256:6 258:10	402:14,15 405:9	426:8,14 436:13	raising 255:14	ratepayers 424:7
261:6 263:4	408:8 416:24	437:9,13,16	284:25	424:24 429:3
266:16 270:1	417:1,3,6,8,9,12	439:22 440:16,22	ran 390:15 393:14	458:16 462:1,5
279:25 280:7,11	417:13,17 418:14	441:2 490:22	489:10	rates 303:2 330:8
280:18,21,24	418:22 425:24,25	491:1,19 493:17	Ranajit 420:2	338:22,25 339:6
284:15 287:13	428:8 430:1	493:19 495:5,20	440:14	373:5 375:11
294:24 295:5,20	436:23 437:20,23	quick 409:2	Randall 440:9	381:21 382:16
296:14 297:17	440:10 442:24	quickly 352:9	randomized 355:21	383:4,18 400:22
301:2,12 303:8,15	443:12 473:2	409:5 414:21	range 352:12	402:17,24 403:1,1
303:19 304:16,21	491:25 492:1,8,20	415:9	480:12	407:22 429:16
304:25 305:2,22	495:7,22	quite 296:24 330:2	rarely 262:7 263:14	430:15 431:1
306:18 307:19	questioning 267:10	361:23 405:23	rate 280:4,6 281:7	446:15 447:21
308:20 309:18	293:6 298:15	425:13 446:9	281:13,19,20,22	448:7 449:9
310:11,21 311:25			281:22,24,25	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 490 000
455:25 469:8	321:3 325:24	475:14 499:13	339:10 470:3	referring 247:19
472:20 479:22	327:12 347:13	recognized 434:6	492:6	296:1 310:14,17
480:24 481:1,2,7	429:5 433:18	499:12	recovering 303:1	316:10 371:10
481:9 482:12	498:20	recognizes 447:2	447:21	390:12,20,25
483:3 485:8 492:6	reason 297:12,18	454:10 466:7	recovery 303:7	395:3 467:10
492:10,14	300:15 302:12	486:13	316:17 317:20	refers 296:4 337:18
rating 480:6	307:9 365:3	recollection 334:24	319:19 321:24,24	350:5,5 376:23
8				,
ratio 479:20,25	366:12 389:14	recommend 280:24	330:20,25 331:4	refill 428:17,20,21
480:14	401:4	327:24 470:21	341:1 448:6	refine 453:6
ratios 480:10	reasonable 283:9	recommendation	469:11,14,14,19	reflect 282:14
Raul 244:17 251:8	284:23 294:25	353:23 373:12	479:6 485:7	reflected 318:14,17
273:23	330:7 345:8	480:13 481:23,25	recruit 354:13	406:22 407:6
raul.martinez@k	383:18 394:7,7	recommendations	355:4	480:25
244:19	435:11 464:17	357:20 372:19	recruited 355:1	reflects 282:13
RC 397:5	465:23 469:9	recommended	redirect 246:10,11	refrigeration
RCW 322:20	482:5,14 498:24	480:3	298:11 301:13,15	421:19 422:9
325:14 327:23	reasonably 436:20	recommends	305:12,13 308:1	refund 330:9
339:25 343:15	482:16	375:10 383:3	310:2 311:1 313:4	375:11,14 381:22
462:2 463:7 483:4	reasons 307:15	402:15,16 479:23	380:24 385:10	383:5,8 402:18,21
re-address 378:2	450:17 461:14	485:5	403:22 426:9,11	446:24 449:10
re-evaluated	466:17,17 470:20	reconciliation	reduce 318:22	469:23 472:21
473:20	472:10	320:13	455:15 457:21	492:12,17
re-labeled 267:18	rebates 457:16	reconnect 467:17	462:9	regard 308:24
267:20	rebut 489:13	record 268:6,16	reduces 474:5	330:17 346:15
re-litigating 461:4	recall 323:18 326:2	272:20 274:14	reducing 458:8	473:2
re-open 286:12	334:19 354:2	277:3,7 279:19	reduction 317:24	regarding 261:23
re-opened 285:11	370:9 372:19	284:6 289:8 300:8	321:6,8 331:12,18	262:4 294:24
286:21,23,24	477:19	313:9,10 314:15	332:10 350:23	311:24 337:11
re-wording 367:6	recalling 366:20	315:22 317:16	351:2 352:10	369:15 372:18
reach 336:10	receipt 287:16	326:24 340:11	356:13 424:25	374:17 376:24
459:24 464:25	receive 287:20	362:7,10 379:10	433:13	382:22 387:24
reached 459:18	355:12,15,15	380:2 388:17	reductions 333:15	402:5,12 416:6
460:2,20,23	received 257:13	389:4 390:23	334:1 483:6	417:2 418:10
485:25	398:8,13 399:14	391:15 401:23	484:17	419:6 420:25
read 278:16 294:7	400:11,13 405:15	409:3,24 410:8,11	Reeves 256:7	457:10 459:15
419:18 489:4	424:21 463:5	413:12 414:25	refer 297:3 347:3	468:21 470:4
reading 326:2,14	receiving 294:17	427:1,10 429:24	374:4 401:19	485:16
331:20 388:15	371:18 411:10	442:4,7 449:18	reference 320:21	regardless 384:9
ready 269:17 459:7	reception 334:11	467:19 469:2,4	357:3 384:25	region 433:14
493:8,11,11,12	recognition 460:6	472:22 473:6	402:1,12	regional 397:9
	recognitional 454:6	474:1,9 499:10	referenced 284:12	regular 346:11
readving 270:14		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
readying 270:14 realize 277:1	6	recover 429.15	317:4 390.4	regulated 435.9
realize 277:1	recognize 253:19	recover 429:15 436:3 447:24	317:4 390:4 391:24	regulated 435:9 472:18.24
realize 277:1 446:19	recognize 253:19 365:15 419:2	436:3 447:24	391:24	472:18,24
realize 277:1 446:19 realized 484:18	recognize 253:19 365:15 419:2 443:16 471:6,14	436:3 447:24 recoverable 458:16	391:24 references 387:13	472:18,24 regulating 427:3,24
realize 277:1 446:19	recognize 253:19 365:15 419:2	436:3 447:24	391:24	472:18,24

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

r				
regulatory 275:23	remain 256:12	336:21 337:7	453:16 489:17	requesting 265:25
276:6 289:7,10	338:5 339:4 361:3	340:22 341:16,19	reported 241:25	439:16 442:18
317:1 327:5	416:22 417:21	341:22 342:14,17	337:3 390:24	488:10
reinforced 492:2	424:23	342:22 343:1,8,25	395:23 396:15,24	requests 315:19,22
Reinforcement	remainder 358:20	344:24 345:4,11	397:4,13,25	316:5 376:23
388:5	360:1,24 361:3	346:17 348:22	reporter 259:2,7	379:21 386:1
reiterate 301:1	remaining 401:15	349:12 350:3,15	268:16 294:9,14	450:17 459:10
reject 479:23	remarks 269:10	356:3,6,22 357:1	389:8 391:14	471:25 472:15
483:10	488:16	357:4,18 358:6,12	500:9	473:12 476:8
rejected 389:19	remediation 338:25	358:22 360:11,13	reporting 335:5,7	487:14
399:25 410:2	remedy 375:15	360:14 406:6,7,9	reports 328:11	require 253:11
rejects 485:6	383:8,13 402:21	406:24 407:4,8,24	373:19 389:22	268:21 325:24
relate 327:17 412:4	403:5	408:3,7,12 437:15	represent 459:22	330:1 345:19
related 277:6,15	remember 467:9	437:16 438:7,12	471:7	384:5 421:5
322:10 324:22	remind 287:12	438:19 439:12,19	representation	451:16 454:2,7
325:19,20 333:24	293:2 494:5	440:18,25 493:20	421:20,22	required 311:24
335:12 338:4	reminding 275:9	494:4 497:23	representative	320:17 325:13
339:3 343:9	removal 384:5	renewable 318:6	248:10 252:15	326:14 332:15
385:25 389:5	422:10,12,19,20	321:14 453:20	261:2,14,16	377:9,14 378:4
418:1,10 419:7	422:23 423:1,3	459:15	270:18	423:1 450:5,7
453:16 470:12	remove 345:10	repeat 272:18,19	representatives	462:2
relates 279:25	421:13 424:14	274:17,25 278:9	248:6 268:25	requirement
280:18 284:15	removed 318:6	293:24 295:3,5	454:9 499:9	247:20 254:10,23
336:20 367:18	320:17,25 421:18	297:17 303:8	representing	258:15 260:16
410:19	422:9 424:13	304:25 305:1	248:14,15 251:13	266:7,15,24
relating 334:2	438:4	312:11 316:22	271:1 272:7	267:10 287:25
460:3	removes 338:23	371:20 372:22	273:15 275:5	288:20 306:16
relatively 415:9	removing 433:22	377:11,22 384:23	represents 282:11	314:18 315:7,9,14
445:17	474:17 477:10	395:2 413:8	459:20 461:6	316:17 317:5,16
relaxed 263:12	Rendahl 242:5	417:13 418:22	request 288:9,12	317:23 318:1,4,8
released 349:23	247:25 270:3,4,5	422:4 486:10	315:3,12,13,16	318:11 319:2,7
417:2	270:8 271:6,12,19	repeatedly 451:3	319:10,18 320:12	321:1 322:11,13
relevant 364:9	274:16 278:7,22	repeating 334:18	321:24 329:8	323:7 326:21
369:6 370:18	278:24 279:1,17	418:14	369:16 380:7,12	337:13,25 339:12
411:22,24 412:1	279:23 280:14	repetitive 401:8	396:11 405:15,17	340:25 345:17
reliability 262:18	281:2,14 282:1,22	rephrase 378:17	405:22,25 407:25	347:2 349:2 350:1
316:14 318:9	284:8 285:5,14	388:20 425:13	411:6 437:25	352:24 357:1
435:8 447:10	286:1 287:13	replace 307:16	438:18,20 439:4	372:10 373:3,23
reliable 446:16	314:14 315:1,17	replaced 474:9	439:15 443:20	381:18 383:12
447:19	316:8,24 317:8	report 335:22,22	497:22 498:24	400:20 402:5
relied 392:4,6	318:12,25 319:14	370:25 371:3,23	499:2	403:4 406:10,13
393:3	319:21 320:3,19	372:1 391:3,8,9	requested 263:8	406:21,23 407:1
rely 324:11 325:7	320:24 321:14,19	391:17 392:9,14	265:17 317:7	421:3 423:4 424:2
392:14 393:1,17	322:5,9 334:7	393:1,17 394:12	321:22 400:4	424:7 425:4,7
420:23	335:14,16 336:15	394:24 395:5	405:21 448:12,16	432:9,10 435:12

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				1 490 000
437:18,21 438:4	respect 259:18	469:8	439:1 443:5 444:5	496:23
439:1 443:5 444:5	478:12 479:1	resulted 465:25	444:7,16 445:11	Reynolds 254:7
444:7,16 445:11	482:13 483:3	resulting 265:5	445:15 446:1,14	Reynolds' 254:15
445:16 446:1,14	489:25	448:22 470:1	448:25 450:18	255:5
449:1 450:18	respectfully 450:17	results 329:22,23	454:22 455:6	Richard 440:21
454:22 455:6	459:9 466:18	355:23,24 356:15	456:4,8,18 458:20	right 247:13 251:18
456:5,8,18 458:20	472:15 473:4,12	388:23 404:11	471:9 478:12,15	251:20 252:2,6,9
464:1 471:9 494:9	476:8 488:2	479:22	478:23 479:3,18	255:3,7 256:9,24
494:23 495:3	respectively 247:8	resume 361:17	479:24 481:22	257:12 259:10,19
496:4,14,16 497:3	respond 257:19,23	362:6,12 442:4	494:9,22 495:3	260:21,25 261:11
497:5,13	259:15 261:9	retail 420:21	496:4,14,16 497:3	261:18 263:3
requirements	263:5,7,11 264:1	retain 455:16	497:5,13	264:9 265:10
289:7 316:25	282:23 284:9	retains 345:7	revenues 430:14,19	268:10 269:5,13
332:14 393:25	285:16 315:20	retirement 338:6	review 294:4,6,24	270:2,13 272:16
400:25 481:16	345:22	retrospective	295:7,14,21,22	274:22 277:20,23
requires 296:16	responded 471:24	492:15	296:3,24 299:10	283:13 287:2,4,5
299:20 303:22	Respondent 241:8	return 260:1	299:12,16,18	287:9 288:20
306:19 325:23	responding 356:8	265:21 272:22	302:9,11,17	289:17 292:4,15
352:25 353:2	481:17	345:9 408:23	303:11 306:2,4,10	292:17 296:13
364:13 387:6	response 255:18	410:8 442:3	308:16,18 311:10	297:10 298:5
398:7 425:8	256:2 260:5	448:12 478:14	311:18,20 312:15	301:13,21 303:20
451:10,15,20,22	294:23 315:11	479:19,24 481:16	312:17 335:20	305:19 309:25
451:10,15,20,22	323:12 324:22	returned 424:4	336:1,4 346:8,9	310:4 311:1 313:3
reservation 487:13	326:11 331:25	returning 314:16	346:10,16 351:23	313:6,10,25
reserved 257:15	332:15 343:13	revegetated 474:19	364:6,8,22 369:22	314:13,15 315:13
292:24	344:10 356:16	revenue 247:20	386:16 403:9	321:19 324:15
residential 355:7	380:6 390:8	254:10,22 258:15	420:1 436:5 437:2	325:9 326:4 327:8
457:5,21 461:9	400:12 408:11	260:16 266:6,15	449:11 469:23,25	327:21 329:1,15
residents 285:24	430:24 437:24	266:24 267:9	473:6 477:4,9,11	331:5,20 332:24
433:21	458:14 472:4,5	287:25 288:20	489:8 491:5	333:20 334:10,23
resolutely 488:4	473:4 481:18	289:7 306:16	492:12,15	335:2,10 340:19
resolution 460:20	responses 278:12	314:17 315:7,9,14	,	340:19 355:18
471:8	278:19 292:16	316:17,25 317:5	297:21 307:3	358:14 359:21
471.8 resolved 463:16	342:4 379:20	317:23 318:1,3,7	310:12,18,20	360:15,19 361:21
resolves 459:13	444:15	318:11 319:2,7	311:12 345:20	361:25 362:3
465:6		320:17,25 322:11	400:8 420:5	363:8 371:10
resource 279:5,12	responsibilities 435:16	322:13 323:6	450:10	374:6 376:4,13,17
346:13 427:12	responsibility	337:13,25 339:12	reviewing 294:8	378:23 379:11
435:9 482:23	405:14 419:8	340:25 345:17	307:12 342:1	
				380:15,18,23
493:5,9,13,14,15 resources 282:17	responsible 416:9 418:7 419:2	347:1 349:2	345:24 491:2	381:2,11,13
		352:24 406:9,13	reviews 295:16,25	385:10,20 391:16
341:5 342:1,3	rest 427:5 444:19	406:21,22 407:1	364:10 472:9	403:21 406:3
343:13,13 344:18	restate 304:22	431:11,14 432:9	475:24,25	410:6,16 412:25
346:13 452:3	result 282:11,17	432:10 435:3	revised 457:8,9	414:7,8,13,14
458:14	405:5 463:2,11	437:18,21 438:4	revisit 375:22	426:12 430:14
		l	l	

				. age eee
437:12 439:21,25	RL-5 390:21 391:9	486:5,20	386:13 415:10,10	schedule 279:7
440:19 445:10,21	roadmap 252:10	roll 313:15 457:4	S&P 481:15	402:25 431:1
454:19 458:18,21	254:3	rolling 351:19	safe 446:16 447:19	459:16 460:21
459:9 461:17	Roberson 242:8	Ron 246:11 337:19	safeguards 446:20	494:1
463:8 464:9	246:10,13,15,17	413:14 433:15	safely 475:16	scheduling 405:20
465:11 466:21,25	248:19 254:4,24	435:7	safety 383:13	School 415:15,21
467:9 469:18	255:1 271:5,7	Ronald 413:9	385:17 403:5	Science 415:16
470:24 476:12	365:6 366:14,19	room 243:14 440:4	416:14 435:20	scope 258:20 266:1
477:13 485:10	366:23 367:20	roughly 343:5	475:6,16,19,23	309:2 365:8
486:25 487:8	369:5 371:4	405:16 444:16	476:1 483:6	366:15 369:11
488:18 489:23	372:13 374:18	round 494:15	486:17 487:6	374:10,19 375:18
491:15,18 492:19	375:17 380:14,25	RPR 241:25 500:20	490:15	403:8,16 405:22
493:18,23 494:14	385:12,14,19	rule 252:17 253:2	Sahu 420:2 440:14	405:24 468:25
497:19,21 499:6	445:8 450:23,24	255:18 262:3	441:20 485:2	403.24 408.23
	454:20 461:18,19			
rights 262:10	454:20 461:18,19 461:20 463:7	350:2,12,13 ruled 262:2	487:22 Sahu's 420:5	scoped 329:16
riming 421:14				scorecard 323:19
risk 330:19 382:6	476:18,21,22	rulemaking 349:22	sake 371:14 381:5	323:19,23 324:1,2
480:19,20 487:12	492:3,13,24	350:9 374:16	Saleba 440:15	324:5,10,25
risks 486:18 487:7	Robert 276:10	375:2 382:21	441:20 487:23	325:16,18
Rita 243:12 249:21	279:20 440:8	402:4	sales 470:5,10	Scott 256:7
272:7 359:4	Roberts 246:11	rules 248:5 263:12	salmon 474:18,20	screen 285:15
rita.m.liotta.civ	248:20 261:19	264:24 287:14	Salt 244:5	seal 500:15
243:15	337:19 413:9,10	349:23	San 243:9,14	season 428:21
RJR 257:7 261:19	413:14,14 414:7	ruling 304:18	satellite 427:7	Seattle 242:22
261:20	414:12 415:5,12	412:10	satisfied 401:15	244:10,15,18
RJR-1CT 337:20	416:17 417:13	rulings 266:2	satisfies 326:20	245:6 249:24
426:20	418:25 423:13	run 269:2 391:20	satisfy 423:6	250:2 272:10,13
RJR-30T 427:18	425:23 426:7,10	391:25 392:16	save 412:2 436:13	275:5 291:9 370:4
RJR-31 264:21	427:1,4,13 428:5	393:13 394:1	saved 379:16	370:9 397:18
265:4 268:14	428:8,13 429:4,12	running 297:15	saw 354:14	398:2
410:20 411:2	432:22 433:14,15	runs 391:22 434:8	saying 259:8	second 244:18
RJR-33 475:11	433:16 434:24	RXS-1T 420:3	294:10 296:9	320:7 359:18
RL 385:4	435:6,7 474:4	RXS-24 265:2	371:16 388:13	388:4 392:23
RL-1 369:21,25	488:2 498:9	RXS-26 265:2	440:15 442:9	403:13 422:22
RL-1T 293:21,25	Roberts's 261:25	RXS-30T 420:7	497:17	423:9 424:17
298:19 302:1	426:19	Ryan 316:21,21	says 315:9 318:15	451:15,19 452:7
305:23 308:12	robust 327:14	467:20	322:21 349:3	455:19 473:8
310:16 311:14	354:5		392:22 424:8	486:16
364:2 489:6	ROE 448:13	S	486:11	second-to-the-last
RL-3 489:12	479:18 480:17,19	S 242:1 243:1 244:1	SB 490:10	318:5
RL-35T 385:5	480:22,23,25	245:1 293:13,13	scale 344:10	section 293:24
RL-4 297:3 300:3	481:24,25 482:2,5	298:16,16 301:23	scales 344:7	333:3
307:4 364:25	ROEs 481:3	301:23 305:20,20	scarson@perkin	sections 352:19
365:21 387:14,16	role 418:6,8,25	308:9,9 310:9,9	242:17	secure 351:17,19
489:17	419:5 446:13	311:8,8 363:23,23	scenarios 394:8	securing 351:20
		381:15,15 386:13		Ŭ
	I	I	I	·

				Fage 557
security 447:13	separately 438:1	302:25 315:6,15	457:23 458:14,20	429:12,18 431:23
sediment 474:11	443:3	316:10 317:4,15	458:23 459:2,11	435:23,25 436:3,7
see 256:4 259:25	September 265:16	317:17,23 318:1,4	459:12,18,23	441:8,12 442:10
261:4 267:2,11	268:19 343:7	318:7,11 319:7,12	460:2,12,22,24,25	442:20 449:6
269:19,20 270:2,9	369:3 400:4,9	319:17,17 320:1	461:10,15 462:11	454:21 463:17
277:18 280:24	420:6 488:1	322:1,6 323:7,13	462:19,20 463:17	480:1,17 487:9
285:14 288:5	serious 371:1,24	324:4,4,22 325:6	463:19,20 464:4,4	490:8
292:18 313:16,22	411:21 486:18	326:9 327:13,18	465:5,14,23 466:5	seven 264:21 297:8
314:11 319:13	serve 431:15	328:14 331:23	466:10,19,23	297:11,13,20
320:15,16 326:5	435:14 455:22	332:20 334:1	467:1,3,11 468:7	300:13,16 307:7
326:19 333:3	493:4,9	335:8,18,24	468:22 469:3,17	307:10 316:1,4
357:16 360:3	served 429:3	336:18 337:4,6,13	470:4,12,22 471:1	365:1,4 366:10,13
			, ,	, , ,
361:11 365:7	serves 284:23 447:1	337:16,18,25	471:4,10,10 472:1	367:18,21 387:19 389:16 394:2
369:8 386:6	470:16	338:20,23 339:12	472:5,14,16,17	
392:22 441:16	service 276:1 279:7	339:23 340:23,25	473:13 476:9,16	412:14 489:9,14
486:25 489:12	279:10 289:12	341:13,23 343:11	476:23 478:10,11	489:18
seeing 258:22	406:11 436:10	343:18 344:5,12	478:12,16,20,23	seven-day 315:24
279:17 345:1	446:17 447:20	344:23 345:18,23	479:1,4,18,24	412:12
seek 321:23	455:17 456:20	346:6,14 347:2	480:16 481:17,22	Seventh 245:17
seeking 478:6	457:7,13,22	349:2 350:1,5,8	482:1 483:11,16	severe 427:16
seen 367:5 389:17	services 276:18	352:11,15,19,23	485:6 490:1,8,21	share 397:8,17
399:14 457:24	290:24 466:14	352:24,25 356:18	491:12 492:7	428:18 431:18
segment 447:3	483:3	357:10,13,14,17	494:17,19,23,24	446:23
selection 355:21	serving 338:14	359:7 372:7,14,21	495:1,3 496:4,7	sharing 309:5
self-authenticating	456:2	372:25 373:14,16	496:14,16 497:3,5	shaving 419:11,20
263:16	set 256:21 267:15	375:9,21 382:12	497:13 500:11	424:5 427:12
sells 421:1	274:18 293:4	383:3,11 400:18	settlements 247:17	429:3,6 493:5
Senate 433:6	315:9,14 322:22	402:9,9,14,16	265:15 281:10	Shay 440:7
454:14	323:14 325:5,11	406:10,21 407:2	441:10,15 442:11	shed 405:5,6,7
send 298:23	421:4 460:12	408:21 413:1	442:14,15 443:2	shelf 328:9
sending 315:18	476:7 479:24	429:14,16 431:24	443:16,22 445:24	Sheree 242:14
senior 251:7 273:23	482:20 500:14	432:4,6,7,10,10	471:6,13 472:11	248:13 270:23,25
276:18 290:24	sets 479:19 483:13	432:13 435:25	472:13 476:14	shift 319:3
291:13 451:12	settlement 241:9	436:6 438:3,5	477:15,17 478:1	shifted 318:15,23
sense 255:21	246:1,14 247:6,20	439:1,9 443:4,4,5	491:17 494:8,11	Shorelines 475:10
353:24 409:4	247:20,21 258:12	443:7,19 444:6,16	495:17	short 253:15 313:8
sensible 244:21	258:14,15 259:18	445:2,5,11 446:20	settling 280:1 281:9	314:17 332:2
251:11 367:22	266:7,8 267:6,10	447:15,24 448:6	284:17,21,25	336:3 341:25
sent 299:1 300:5	275:14 278:18	448:17,22 450:19	286:3 316:9 323:1	342:23 343:12
sentence 296:11	279:3,5,9,14	450:22 451:1,5	328:3 332:4	430:24 445:17
422:4	280:9,19 281:6,12	452:15 453:3,15	333:14 335:19	465:9 484:6
separate 317:10,15	281:17,23 282:3,6	453:21,24 454:13	338:3 343:16	shortcomings
317:22 321:25	282:11,13 283:3,9	454:14,22 455:7	344:25 345:9,22	371:1,24
336:17 339:14	284:13,16,17,24	455:11,19,23	347:2,21 349:8	shortcut 414:20
470:18	285:4,18 293:1	456:5,8,19 457:15	350:17 406:14	shorter 316:2
	,	, - ,		
	I		l	l

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

1		1	1	1 490 000
shortly 247:24	321:1 372:20	403:6	412:22 432:19	353:21 394:16
385:3 497:25	383:10 464:15	socioeconomic	434:18,21	404:8
show 319:10	480:9	434:13	sought 469:20	specifically 254:15
320:10,18 372:4	Similarly 480:17	SOCs/NOX 433:19	sound 241:7 242:13	267:6 293:3 319:1
390:24 404:11	481:8	software 368:21	247:10,11,14	355:5 365:23
447:6 471:24	Simon 249:16	452:9	254:25 255:20,22	397:10 439:2
showed 370:25	272:3	solar 344:11 464:14	271:1 275:23	452:16 455:7
371:23	simple 478:8	solely 337:4,6	280:3 289:15	478:14,16
showing 449:8	simplicity 316:7	solicit 354:22	292:7 294:11,18	specifications
451:11	simply 256:20	451:22	303:15 362:21	420:25 421:4
shown 268:12	275:12 302:21	solid 434:16 463:3	436:18 444:13	specificity 329:14
449:23	326:16 375:2	solution 269:3	486:13	355:16
shows 371:2,25	single 482:20	463:18,21 464:25	sounds 388:9 408:9	specifics 341:20
388:22 455:15	sir 310:17 427:4	465:5	445:12 455:2	specifies 406:11
474:1,9 475:11	sit 294:16 428:16	somebody 297:15	source 433:23	spelled 253:7
Shute 243:8 249:14	site 370:24 421:24	298:23	486:14	spend 478:24
271:25	434:11	somewhat 334:8	South 244:4	spending 316:14
shutting 388:2	sits 254:9	Sommer 243:3	Southwest 243:4	318:10 319:3
shy 340:14	sitting 258:25	249:9 271:20	245:11	451:16
side 258:25 371:22	situation 496:13	445:5 467:7	space 269:15	spent 285:24
429:9 433:24	six 331:16 346:1	468:20	speak 248:3 252:8	splitting 432:12,13
435:9 449:3	388:2 395:18	soon 256:23 260:22	260:18 268:17	spoke 269:23 356:7
450:13	404:15 405:16	428:17	347:18 349:13	360:13 460:10
sides 405:20	450:16	sorry 251:1,16	357:1 368:24	488:3
Sierra 250:22	six-month 343:5	258:5 267:7	378:6 384:7 394:3	sponsoring 287:15
251:2 273:11,16	size 428:24	269:23 270:20	395:8,9 397:10	sponsors 451:17
290:8,10	sizes 435:21	274:16 278:4	444:7,23,23,24	spread 479:5
sign 259:17 354:8	sjm@dvclaw.com	288:4 292:4	445:2,6,6 450:25	spreading 435:2
signals 344:12	243:6	298:10,10,14	454:21 456:7	SQI 323:5 335:6
456:25	skill 285:23 500:12	310:13 322:16	459:1,4 462:14	SQIs 324:25 325:10
signatories 285:6	skip 360:21	340:8,11 354:16	465:13 466:22	ss 500:5
signed 258:7	slide 387:23	354:19 356:25	467:2,8 468:6	stab 317:1 436:22
293:16 351:2	slides 489:12	360:12 366:8	470:25 476:16	stable 462:6
372:8 373:1 466:4	slight 269:7 448:14	371:13 372:2	488:2,3 497:15	staff 242:7 248:18
476:22	slightly 294:21	374:23 375:5	SPEAKER 353:17	248:20 252:12
signers 402:9,10	356:4 364:11	377:22 384:22	366:3	253:2 254:5,6
significant 419:21	slow 344:1	385:6 409:10	speaking 259:6	257:13 259:12
419:24 420:18	small 457:5,22	421:15 424:17	270:21 278:4	266:20 271:4,7
428:23 434:25	smaller 429:2	425:15 428:9	295:8 328:7	276:6 279:22
447:21 473:5,7	Smith 290:9,9	467:4,20 468:2	333:17 344:16	283:1 284:2
significantly	314:2,3 359:14,19	481:11,20 487:3	357:2 467:10	289:23 347:4,8,10
448:12,21 457:21	418:17	sort 306:16 320:12	497:11	347:11,23 348:1,3
481:11	Snohomish 397:18	344:19 348:11	specialized 416:5	362:23,25 363:3
silent 335:25	socialized 431:19	352:11,13 353:7	specific 253:5	364:11 368:16,19
similar 248:5 307:3	societal 383:14	355:11 357:5	307:23 335:4	369:2 372:8,8,14
				, ,
			l	l

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				Page 539
272.1 2 22 274.11	200.9 406.19 22	status 216:7	stop 262.4 444.10	202.16 202.12 15
373:1,2,22 374:11	399:8 406:18,22	status 346:7	stop 362:4 444:10	392:16 393:13,15
375:10 379:20	410:13 415:12	statute 325:8,23,23	storage 427:23 428:1	394:1 415:22
380:14 381:17	423:18 430:4	326:2,14 328:1		450:9 457:9 479:9
382:9,13 383:4	432:21 459:6	343:15,19,24	stored 428:1	489:17
386:24,25 396:12	479:17 485:15	344:6,9 433:5	stormwater 474:12	sub 333:3
396:12 401:12,12	started 309:16	463:13 464:6	straightforward	subdivision 475:23
402:17 413:21	starting 274:23	465:6 471:18	464:13 478:5	subject 279:12
444:8 445:6,8	316:13 318:12	statute's 464:1	strategy 289:15	280:11,21,25
446:2 450:21	326:16 375:11	stay 260:12 418:9	455:15 457:13	281:3,4 287:14
459:5,19 461:10	376:22 383:5	419:5	Street 242:15 243:9	306:16 330:9
461:21 462:10	384:12 395:1,7	staying 432:16	243:19 244:4	371:16 372:15
463:1 476:22	402:18 474:25	486:16	245:17	381:21 436:4
477:3,5,9 499:11	starts 385:2	steel 243:17 249:24	strengthen 448:19	446:24 449:10
staff's 259:20 260:4	state 291:14 339:24	250:2 272:10,13	stress 450:4	469:23 472:20
260:6 276:3	349:21 350:9	275:5 291:8	strictly 264:23	492:11,15,16
289:20 413:19	389:4 406:22	413:25 419:17	strike 255:10 312:8	subjects 403:15
461:23 476:24	446:11 485:21	474:10	Strom 242:14	submissions 411:4
481:18	500:5,9	Steele 242:14	248:13	submit 268:20
staff-led 347:3	stated 280:1 373:17	248:16	strong 286:18,19	341:6 346:14
453:3,6	390:23 391:23	step 300:25 320:12	458:22	396:19 412:8,14
Staffs' 380:6	394:24 395:5	320:12 327:19	strongly 488:6	486:6 494:21
stages 422:18	396:8 404:4	418:16	structure 353:22	495:16
stakeholders	415:21 422:5	Stephanie 418:16	478:14 479:18	submitted 265:1
328:22 348:8	statement 281:10	440:7	481:22 482:1,5	366:23 392:1
358:1 464:20	284:15 296:12	steps 320:15 461:11	structures 474:17	396:1,8,17 411:23
standard 268:23	345:5 346:1	stick 412:9	students 415:22	415:14 420:2
350:6,7 424:8	371:17 374:1,5	stipulate 254:18	studied 370:2,6	487:21,22
433:8,8 446:8	382:24 393:8	255:2 256:17	450:6,7	submitting 411:20
473:21,22 476:6	420:22 442:11	267:25 268:5	studies 296:23,25	subscribers 463:9
483:1 484:10,11	445:20 459:8	308:23	297:11 300:14	465:8
485:4 490:11	465:17 468:17	stipulated 414:25	307:2,3,8 364:21	subsection 463:7
standards 349:20	471:2 490:4	475:11	365:2 366:11	483:4
349:24 350:6	statements 246:13	stipulating 254:24	373:18 387:20	subsequent 419:10
450:5 476:2 483:9	253:10 262:17	470:9	389:3,21 390:16	426:24 449:12
standpoint 324:6	443:1 444:4	stipulation 265:23	391:22,25 392:2,4	subsidies 456:23
343:23 344:22	445:15,24 450:23	315:6 316:10	394:4 404:2 447:6	subsidization
432:23 436:23	455:3 456:14	321:9 326:10	449:22,22 450:1	463:16 465:7
stands 327:3	458:19 461:19	456:18 459:11,12	475:6 489:10	subsidizing 461:12
Stantec 392:14,16	462:16 465:19	468:22 470:8,18	study 296:20	463:12
393:1,5,13,14	476:14,21 477:14	470:22 472:14	299:24 304:1	substantial 405:2
start 248:9 252:21	479:13 485:12	476:9	306:22,23 307:15	472:3
	100 01			

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

stipulations 432:17

Stone 243:18 250:1

272:12 275:4

stock 481:13,14

364:17 368:17,19

369:23 371:9

372:4 387:9

390:17 391:21

substantially

substantive 367:8

substitute 452:25

331:23

254:11 269:17

315:2,3 323:11

328:5 343:21

357:24 384:20

488:24

states 281:6 284:16

339:12 486:17

stations 349:15

				Fage 540
au agaga 207.7	429.10 11 441.14	201.16 202.10 14	425.10 426.1 15	talk 335:5 478:21
success 327:7	438:10,11 441:14	291:16 292:10,14	425:10 426:1,15	
successful 351:20	442:13 443:15 445:15 450:21	360:9 363:8,10 413:6 414:9	426:22 427:2,11 431:24 432:6,15	talked 498:7
successfully 480:5			,	talking 319:22
successor 284:4	454:22 456:8	swearing 413:9	434:8,15 436:24	323:15,21 330:23
sufficient 254:18	458:19 459:1	Switch 431:21	445:5 456:9	337:21 389:4
254:25 262:18	465:13 466:4	switching 484:18	458:23 466:25	412:6 443:2 478:7
268:20,24 315:24	467:10 468:6	swore 363:5	468:6,22,23 469:3	478:24 487:6
342:12 345:24	476:14 477:14	sworn 263:17	469:8 470:10,12	495:9,10
346:2 449:9	478:12,23 479:12	278:18	470:17,21 472:16	tank 427:15,17
suggest 303:18	494:10,22,23,25	system 282:18	472:19,24 473:11	428:11,13,16,24
399:7 412:13	499:11	283:7,25 337:15	473:19,24 474:1,3	target 326:25
436:13	supported 349:5,8	337:17,19 379:17	474:8,23 475:14	331:11,16 333:8
suggested 356:9	349:16 469:3	394:25 395:6,24	475:17,20,25	333:11,12 458:13
suggestion 381:4	supporting 315:15	396:16,21,25	476:1,9,16 477:19	targeted 456:1
suitable 423:15	438:11,13 464:4	397:5,14 398:1,9	478:11 482:7,10	targets 323:16
424:23	supports 465:4,22	398:13 404:5	483:8,10,14 485:6	324:2 326:12,15
Suite 242:16,22	478:10 479:3	423:16,20,20	485:17,24 486:8	331:22
243:4,14 244:4,9	481:24	424:4,12,20,24	488:1,5 490:1,7	tariff 430:15
244:14,18,24	supposed 480:19	425:20 428:4	490:20 491:11	459:16 462:8
245:6,11,17	sure 269:22 294:17	430:8,10,17 431:9	493:2 494:9,24	task 463:4
summarize 293:15	326:8 327:22	431:18 450:5	Tacoma's 433:22	tax 339:5 351:6
summary 445:16	331:9 336:11,19	452:1 453:12	take 284:1 298:24	Taylor 291:20,24
454:12 476:3	337:20 340:5,10	464:8 472:25	313:7,8 317:1	291:25 292:1,4,5
summer 333:15	350:6 353:20	493:3	320:4 340:3	tcp@dvclaw.com
394:18,20,22,24	359:2 369:5 371:4	systemic 484:22	343:16 347:22	245:13
395:6,14,23	377:23 378:1	systems 427:5	351:3,18 353:16	team 276:19 290:25
396:15,24 397:4	384:7,8 408:10	476:2	358:3 362:1	400:10
397:13,25 404:19	425:13 435:16		367:10 370:8,14	tech 356:12
404:20 405:1	444:24 445:7	<u> </u>	375:25 376:2,14	technical 275:3
448:9	447:12 461:11	T 293:13 298:16	379:6 382:13	296:25
summers 395:18	471:3 485:13	301:23 305:20	384:13 389:25	technically 433:7
404:14,15,17	486:2 495:8	308:9 310:9 311:8	408:22 409:6,17	technique 357:21
450:16	surface 415:24	363:23 381:15	428:19 430:2	techniques 357:23
supplemental	416:9	385:13,13 386:13	436:22 441:25	415:23
438:20 497:24	surprise 264:18	403:24,24 415:10	442:2 461:11	technologies
499:1	surrounding	431:1 500:2,2	478:13 480:20	415:25
supplementing	419:14 473:24	table 438:3,8,11	483:21 492:13	technology 355:13
264:13	474:3	tables 464:24	499:13	355:15,19 356:12
supply 348:24,25	Susan 289:6 316:25	Tacoma 247:21	taken 241:24	448:1
349:5 413:15	337:22 341:10	261:24 315:8	313:12 352:3	tell 417:20
418:6 419:1	413:13 437:19	317:21 321:22	362:8 365:22	temperatures
420:24 423:11	438:2	408:21 409:18	382:12 410:9	421:18 422:8
support 266:8	swath 447:1	410:13 413:1	442:5	428:24
327:18 348:6	swear 275:17	416:22 417:3,7,19	takes 471:13	ten 411:7,25 441:10
373:15 430:6	277:21,24 289:1	418:2 423:1,13	472:12	442:19 443:4,10
		424:3,22 425:3,5		
	I	I	I	1

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				Faye 541
443:20,22 444:16	261:21,22,25	412:23,24 414:9	292:8,8,17 293:23	439:23 440:1
444:20 494:25	262:9,22 263:1,17	415:14 420:1,6,17	298:1,2,4,5,14	441:18,23 443:24
ten-minute 361:15	263:23 264:4,5,9	421:10,21 422:5	299:3,7 301:11,16	445:21,22,22
488:21	264:13,21 265:11	422:10 426:20,25	302:5,6,7,14	450:20 454:18,19
tend 259:9 401:5	265:13 266:5,9,18	427:18 440:1	304:9 305:3,10,11	455:4 456:5,6,15
tender 275:12	267:5 268:1,11	450:4,9 464:4,10	305:14 307:19	458:17,18 461:16
tends 431:10	274:13 275:19	468:23 471:19,21	308:2,3,14 309:4	461:17 462:13
tenets 454:1	277:24 284:12	472:4,4,5,5,14	309:24,25 310:3,8	465:10,11,20
TEP 317:13 490:7	287:11,18,20,22	476:7 480:22	311:3,4,16 312:2	465:10,11,20
491:8	289:1 293:20	481:19 483:15,15	313:3,10,21,25	470:24 476:11,12
term 296:5 451:9,9	294:5 295:6	483:16 484:1	316:3,8,21 326:4	477:12,13 478:3
451:19 452:19,20	294.3 293.0	485:4 487:21,22	326:6 327:8,10,21	485:9,10,13 487:5
451:19 452:19,20	297.22 298.19,22 298.19,22	489:6,14,21	329:1 331:5	488:15,17,18
terms 264:15	301:5,7,25 302:10	490:14,22,25	332:24 333:1,13	489:20,22,23
336:21 346:15	302:13 304:12	490.14,22,25	333:20 335:2	489.20,22,23
368:9,9 412:20	305:5,23 306:3	491:0 tests 401:10	337:24 338:18	490:2 491:14,13
,	,	Texas 420:12	339:20 340:19,21	,
428:12 443:1	307:12,16,20	textbook 262:1	343:8 344:24	493:22 495:19 496:10 497:19.20
451:1,4,5 453:24	308:11,17,22,24			/
454:1,5,16 477:1	309:3,8,10,14,19	thank 248:17,23	345:3,11 346:18	498:6 499:6,16
478:15 479:2,2,5	310:12,13,15,18	249:5,11,23 250:4	347:25 348:10	thanks 314:4 337:8
479:5,8,9,10,14	310:22 311:11,12	250:5,10,11,15,20	350:15 352:7,16	349:12 355:9
479:15,18 497:21	311:13,19 312:14	251:3,9,14,15,15	356:2 358:6,8,14	433:15 437:11
territory 457:14,23	312:18,22 323:18	251:18 252:2	359:10,11,13,23	theoretically
test 320:7 401:15	328:15,17 329:3	255:14,24,25	360:2,19 362:22	444:18
427:4 482:17	333:22 335:3	256:6,24 257:10	363:1,4,15,21	thing 321:4 337:23
tester 477:2	341:9 342:23	258:16 259:3	364:4,12 368:12	346:12 404:24
testified 300:19	353:6,9 354:12	260:10,24 261:11	369:17 371:19	447:12 451:15
304:4 365:9,10	356:9 357:2,5,21	263:3,25 264:19	374:20 375:8	452:7 458:10
372:18 404:13	358:5,15 363:10	265:9 266:21	376:18 380:20	things 300:20
420:18 421:10	364:1,7,10,23	267:13 269:5	381:14 382:20	320:16,20 328:10
426:21 427:18,19	365:7,8 366:15,20	270:8 271:3,9,16	383:2 385:9,19	337:21 344:10
450:2 464:3 474:4	366:24,25 368:6	272:4,9 273:2,6	386:9,12,23	352:12 369:10
testifies 297:10	368:10,23 369:11	273:10,18,20,24	393:16 394:23	412:21 433:17,20
300:13 307:7	369:16 372:20	274:3,10 275:1,2	398:18 401:22	451:9,21 453:16
365:1,10 366:10	373:7,11,12,14,24	275:7,8,9 276:2,7	402:3 403:20	453:20 466:13
367:21,23,25	374:10,19 375:18	276:11,15,20,24	407:8 408:3,7,12	477:3 479:12
testify 311:23 365:9	376:21,23 377:21	277:7,8,19 278:3	408:18 409:1	think 254:12
366:25 367:24	377:25 384:11	279:23 280:13	410:5 413:18,22	260:19 269:4
373:15	387:1 388:9	284:7,8 285:17	414:4,6,13 415:3	277:4 281:19
testifying 248:5	389:24 392:7	286:1,9 287:2,4,8	416:17 417:24	283:1 284:3
368:16 388:17	395:3,10 396:13	287:9,10,22 288:7	418:5 419:19	285:11 286:19
testimony 252:18	402:2,6,12 404:9	288:17,18,19	420:9 422:3 426:7	288:9 306:5,6
252:21 254:6,15	408:19 410:24,25	289:17,24 290:3,7	427:9 435:22	307:14 319:5
254:19,22,25	411:1,8,11,13,16	290:11,15,21	436:20 437:8,12	321:3,6,12 322:5
255:5 256:7,9,19	412:1,4,7,11,16	291:1,5,10,15	439:12,18,19,21	325:8 326:10,16
L				•

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

327:1 330:10,13	467:20 485:13	292:11,15 313:7	288:10 315:22	438:6,24,25
330:21 332:1,7	486:22 487:3,5	314:16 319:4	358:18 363:11	439:10 469:11
333:4,11 334:15	488:19	326:12 329:13,19	413:8 414:10	470:2,19 472:20
334:23 336:9	thought 257:2	336:5 341:25	441:6 447:19	473:15 476:25
342:12,22 343:5	258:17 351:11	342:9,12,24 343:6	449:18 471:7	477:3 482:11
347:9,17 348:7	thoughtful 465:3	346:2,15 351:18	473:23 478:17	492:4,16,18
350:10 351:8	thousand 354:13	352:22 362:11	486:6 488:12	trackers 316:18
352:13 354:11	498:10	370:17 379:8	489:21 493:14	Tradition 370:5,11
356:6,7,16 359:8	thousands 450:6	383:21 384:3,21	499:12	traditional 469:12
359:20,21 361:25	three 247:17	391:20 394:18,21	today's 252:10	Trails 244:23
362:3,4 364:9	265:14 331:15,17	409:7,17 410:12	tomorrow 253:22	transcript 264:7
365:14 367:2,3	334:21 370:1,5,7	412:9,12 414:15	498:2	287:17,20 371:18
372:3 373:7,15,21	386:18 398:6	415:1,1 417:14	tools 387:11	500:10
374:9 375:22	403:11 404:25	426:23 427:3	top 326:3 331:2,2	transformation
374.9 373.22	407:21 414:22,24	428:6,15,21	498:7	446:6,18
382:25 383:17	407.21 414.22,24 428:14,23 441:10	432:25 433:2,2,9	topic 266:11,13	transformer 388:7
386:24 387:1	,		L /	transition 457:7
389:1 391:3 401:8	441:14 442:1,3,11 442:12,13 443:14	436:15,16 437:9	346:19 348:20,22	
404:14 405:16	442:12,13 443:14 443:14	438:18 441:7,21	350:17,21 374:10	transmission 295:4
		442:8 444:15	385:12 495:21	296:18,22,25 297:2 299:22
408:22 414:20	477:15 489:3,16	447:6 454:25	topics 322:14 323:6	
418:16 425:23	491:17 494:8	455:25 460:20	346:21 389:6	303:24 304:7
428:22 430:7	495:9,17	462:22,23 472:8	443:21 446:5	306:20,25 338:4
432:13,18 433:7	threshold 293:17	473:6 477:10	total 340:12 441:15	339:19 364:15
433:17 434:5	293:18 295:13,18	478:24 479:6	444:15	373:18 376:24
436:16 437:18	295:21,23 296:3	482:16 483:18	totally 277:6	377:2,9,14,17
443:12 462:2	299:15 302:16,20	485:9 487:4	468:14	378:4,7 384:6
471:5,13 473:17	302:25 303:6,10	492:17 493:15	TOTE 420:25	387:8,12 392:1
492:1 494:7	306:9,12 372:9	time-bearing 353:2	421:1,6 423:4,12	394:6 395:11,12
498:19,23,23	373:3,10,23 374:3	timeline 255:17	425:3,7,8 488:13	395:25 396:9,11
thinking 432:3	374:17 381:18,19	434:18	TOTE's 420:19	396:18 397:8,17
thinks 367:9,17	381:20 382:3,10	timely 446:14	426:2	397:19 404:2
412:1	382:14,22 383:12	448:9	touch 498:8	449:2,2,4,16,19
third 244:9 317:18	400:20,24 402:5	times 401:6 428:14	touched 386:3	449:21 450:15
452:19	402:10 403:4	447:4	Tower 243:19	transmission-rel
third-party 449:22	449:6	timing 342:19,21	toxics 416:16	338:1
Thirty-seven 366:3	threw 419:16	352:10	toxins 433:13	transparency
366:5	ties 258:23 293:6	title 297:7	TPAs 283:7	469:24
Thomas 243:19	time 247:5 253:7,9	today 247:4,6,16	TPL 377:5,20,25	transparent 469:15
245:4 246:18	253:16 254:13	249:16 251:7	TPLs 404:1	transportation
251:25 274:9	256:11,14 257:3,5	252:22 253:12,14	track 326:18	241:2,4 247:9
277:17,17,19	257:8 259:8	253:22 254:2,16	tracker 303:2,6	317:13 429:9
408:25 409:1,10	263:11 267:12	255:6 257:12,20	317:10,15,22	transported 427:7
409:13 410:14,18	268:21 269:1,3	261:18 263:9	337:12 338:2,20	treating 422:16
411:19 441:16,18	275:18 285:9,24	268:20 272:1,2	339:1,14,15	treatment 247:12
441:23 467:15,20	286:22 291:17	277:25 281:21	436:25 437:22	468:24 469:7

Г				1 490 010
470:7,15	275:17 287:23	Tyler 245:10	377:16 378:1	upgrading 430:17
tribe 245:3 251:21	288:25 291:22	250:14 273:4	385:5 388:12	449:4
251:24 257:5	293:20 297:18	type 300:20 302:20	390:11 399:22	urge 456:17
261:18 265:1	298:6,18 300:2	374:25 385:16	410:20 416:4	urges 456:4 476:23
274:5,8 277:1,18	301:25 305:22	types 295:16,25	453:4 475:8 495:8	491:8
410:23,24 411:5,6	307:4 308:11	300:20 344:17	understanding	use 261:24 323:23
411:9,11,24	310:15 311:13	typically 410:22	277:11 279:13	324:7 327:6,16
412:13,13,14	322:16 340:6	482:20	302:24 303:5,5	328:8 343:12
414:16 415:2,5	358:16 362:18		319:2 326:13	353:24 373:25
442:16 474:22	363:25 364:24	U	329:24 344:4	385:16 392:4,9
475:1,5,9 477:22	376:21 381:12	U-210590 326:24	345:16,18 352:14	398:7,10 403:16
484:15 485:11	384:11 408:19	327:15	353:22 357:19	420:20 423:16
487:14,22 488:10	413:5 440:2,5	U.S 419:23,23	373:6 381:19	424:5 427:22
491:10	441:3 458:21,23	UE-200980 466:2	390:3 400:23	449:24 453:18
Tribe's 257:16	466:25 477:16,24	UE-220066 241:3	405:24 407:16	457:22
268:14 277:15	479:15 482:7	UG-151663 470:9	424:1 444:2,12,14	useful 338:5,12
410:19 412:19,23	485:11 486:3	UG-210918 241:4	444:22 445:4	373:25 374:4
440:14 484:22	493:24 498:1	247:7	492:9,23 493:8	382:23 387:4
485:2 486:4	turnaround 315:24	UG-220066 247:7	understands	401:13,19 406:19
490:14,17	336:3	UG-220067 241:4	486:19	427:3 469:13
trouble 367:3	turned 314:22	247:7	undertake 347:22	470:2,16 477:8
troubled 412:20	424:22	ultimately 303:3	unfair 463:14	493:3,12
true 262:12 294:13	turning 316:11	460:23 471:12,21	unique 383:11	users' 424:12
377:6 383:10	357:19 369:14,21	482:12	unit 242:21 328:12	uses 282:13 338:10
394:12,15,23	405:7	unable 417:7	Units 338:6 339:4	450:7 452:9
395:5 407:18	turns 493:13	425:17 426:1,4	universe 443:9	UT 262:4
420:22 425:2	TVR 355:23	uncalled 262:25	unreasonable	Utah 244:5
482:16 500:12	Twenty 366:6	uncertainty 332:9	295:10 306:5	UTC 312:17 364:8
true-up 306:16	two 253:12 259:7	382:6	unrebutted 489:15	369:2 380:6
437:3	266:20 295:16,25	uncommon 347:11	unrelated 277:6,11	396:12 403:16
trues-up 492:18	299:19 317:14	undeniable 484:14	untreated 421:11	486:19,19
truth 277:25,25	353:13 370:4	undergirds 481:20	474:13	utilities 241:2,3
278:1 363:11,11	374:8 386:17	481:20	up-front 330:6,8	247:9 348:7 349:9
363:12 414:10,10	392:20 399:19	undergraduate	upcoming 462:9	446:12 481:4,14
414:11	407:11,18 422:18	415:20	update 341:1,5	utility 323:24
try 296:8 336:10	428:14,14,23,23	underground	462:7	324:18 344:7
391:14 445:16	429:8 443:7 451:9	415:23	updated 274:21	349:6 397:16
493:6	451:20 462:3	underlying 367:7	329:18 341:5	446:9 451:4
trying 293:17	466:3 472:11	376:8	updates 279:5	455:17 456:20
295:17,19 296:2	488:13	underscore 470:16	446:15 448:10	457:5,7 481:16
322:16 353:24	two-minute 489:1	understand 263:8	462:7	482:15
367:17 398:20	two-month 472:2	283:13 293:18	upgrade 387:12	utilize 394:6 428:15
467:16	two-phased 403:10	295:17,19 296:2	449:17	utilizing 394:18
turn 248:3,4 258:9	two-year 286:20	315:18 356:16	upgrades 430:11	
265:10 268:3	333:11	358:17 364:18	431:17,19	<u> </u>
		367:17 368:7		vacuum 297:15
	•	•	•	•

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				5
validity 297:21	viable 483:23	Walmart 244:2	449:3 450:13	348:7 351:20
value 283:6,21,24	vice 289:15 362:21	250:6,9 272:23	455:18 485:22	361:19 362:12
284:22 320:15	413:14 416:13	273:1 276:19	500:5,9	367:3,7,16,17
425:1 452:3 464:7	418:6,25 419:1	290:25 414:1,3,24	Washingtonians	370:17,20 381:23
464:9,11 466:7	Vicki 244:3 250:8	459:21 466:4	488:10	381:24 382:18
Van 243:3 245:10	272:25 298:25	Walmart's 276:16	wasn't 326:8 345:9	383:18 385:1
249:9	300:7	290:22	354:1 391:4 433:4	388:13,15 389:4
vaporization	video 269:7 468:2	want 251:17 252:7	434:1 496:1	391:1,5 395:20
428:14	videoconference	252:9 254:10	waste 337:18	398:20,24,25
vaporized 423:15	241:14 246:1	255:13 278:9	water 422:19	412:6 454:25
424:3 428:3,18	500:11	283:15 286:11	434:10,10 474:10	478:6,7
vaporizer 426:23	view 283:4,12	304:24 326:18,18	474:13,21	we've 258:20
427:5,20	325:10 329:24	331:8 337:20	Waterway 474:11	300:25 318:2,23
variable 280:3	views 411:24	344:18 346:4	474:14 475:9	321:22 369:15
281:6,19,20,24,25	virtual 241:9 248:1	348:4 367:13	waterways 474:7	386:2 396:10
282:12,15,15,20	269:15	376:6 379:24	475:12	427:6,6 445:25
282:20	voices 348:12,17	382:9 406:16	Watkins 440:9	473:10 489:3
variant 352:23	volume 241:10	409:6,23 430:4	way 243:4 245:11	weather 493:9,13
variety 369:10	431:10	435:18 446:4	282:7 283:13	weatherization
429:4	volumetric 431:11	447:8 464:19	294:16 312:4	455:20,21,24
various 323:6	voluntarily 495:14	468:12 470:11	329:19 330:7	website 415:19,21
328:11,14,15	voluntary 459:15	471:5 479:15,17	332:12 333:5	WECC 327:11
356:10 357:23	vs 241:6	485:19 492:5	334:4 336:11	394:5 396:2,7,9
433:4 454:9	vulnerability	495:7 499:6	356:14 357:5	396:19
465:24 480:7	394:25 395:7,24	wanted 257:7	432:14,19 455:11	Wednesday 263:8
varying 355:8	396:16,25 397:5	260:11 277:7	458:4 461:24	week 255:11
447:2 455:25	397:14 398:1	285:25 304:19	468:10	268:19,23 269:4
479:6	vulnerable 447:14	322:18 335:5,11	ways 357:6,8	398:16 498:13,17
vast 429:24	452:5,18 453:17	337:7 347:21	429:23 452:2,4	498:18
vbaldwin@parso	454:7 455:8 458:3	350:6 408:6	we'll 247:23 252:11	weigh 432:23
244:6	490:18	409:15,21 411:9	252:13 253:13	weight 490:19
vehicle 333:23		439:15 444:23	269:8 288:25	weighted 448:21
348:24,25 349:5	W	486:2 499:13	315:23 321:10	482:2
349:15	W 242:20	wants 327:15	336:10 392:22	Weinberger 243:8
vehicles 334:2	wade 412:3	444:24 459:4	409:12,19 440:5	249:14 272:1
vein 464:22	wait 304:17 366:17	warrant 427:14	442:4 445:14,16	weirdly 475:1
venue 286:23	366:17,17 374:22	warranted 428:25	468:16	went 262:10 283:17
verge 401:5	409:6 437:10	Washington 241:1	we're 247:5 252:10	weren't 257:4
verify 279:18	467:22,24 486:22	241:3 242:10,16	255:16 256:10	352:15 432:5,6
281:16 379:24	waive 415:1	242:21,22 243:20	293:17 295:17,19	West 243:19 397:5
version 264:21	waives 469:18	244:10,15,18,24	296:2 306:11	Western 243:2
265:6	walk-throughs	245:6 247:1,9	314:16 319:22	249:6 271:21
versus 247:10	343:3	291:14 338:5	330:19,23 331:24	whatnot 325:20
319:12 450:6	Wallace 245:5	349:21 350:8	332:19 333:7	WHEREOF
vetted 332:21	251:23 252:1	419:12,21 446:11	336:11 337:20	500:14
	274:8 277:2			
	•	•	•	•

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				5
white 286:18	370:13 371:5	Woolridge 440:9	295:7,9 299:10,12	year-over-year
398:21 399:3,16	372:14,15 379:4	480:21 481:1,18	302:9,11 306:2,4	481:9
wide 369:9 435:21	385:21 386:3,6,25	481:20	308:16,18 311:18	years 277:5 394:20
447:1	388:14,16 392:22	Woolridge's	311:20 312:15	394:22 395:14
willing 262:19	396:12 399:8,17	481:21	364:6 375:10,12	403:11 405:1
267:25 268:4	401:12,12 403:22	word 320:4	383:4,6 386:15	423:22 425:21
308:23 370:17	411:21 413:24	words 328:10 449:7	402:16,19 489:7	435:10 451:2
382:13	415:5 437:19	451:6	Wynn 250:3 272:14	459:14 481:1,3
wind 448:8 464:14	450:2 479:21	work 327:2 328:22	275:6	years' 341:14
winter 333:15,16	480:21 481:19,23	333:4 342:18		YOCHANAN
334:1 394:13	483:13 500:14	346:2 369:9	X	243:8
395:14	witness' 412:11	392:11 393:3	X 293:13 298:16	Yochi 249:14
wish 261:5 266:15	witness's 262:8,25	433:22 447:13	301:23 305:20	271:25 454:23
277:13 282:23	witnessed 386:24	454:7 463:18	308:9 310:9 311:8	490:3
284:9 285:16	witnesses 248:4	487:20 499:9	363:23 381:15	yzakai@smwlaw
286:3 287:3 345:1	252:19,23 253:1	worked 416:7	385:13 386:13	243:10
363:18 376:9	254:6 256:16	421:25 465:2	403:24 415:10	
379:3 381:3	257:16 261:3	workers 433:22	Xenopoulos 243:18	Z
454:21 456:7	266:5,17 270:15	working 351:17	243:18 249:25	Zakai 243:8 246:13
462:14 465:13	274:12,23 275:10	workpapers 315:10	250:1,2 272:11,12	246:19 249:13,14
467:13	275:15,16,18,19	315:15 319:9,16	272:12,15,19	271:24,25 454:23
wishes 346:3	275:20 277:21,22	320:11,18 321:21	274:24,25 275:2,4	454:24 455:3,4
350:18 375:23	278:19,21 279:18	407:2,5,7,13,14	275:5,8 304:2,3	490:2,3,7
412:8,14	287:11,12,15,24	408:1 437:25	305:13	Zoom 248:2 467:16
witness 253:2,6,8	288:2,21,24 289:1	438:9,10,11,13,22	Y	0
254:5 257:22	289:3,18,21	439:4 497:23		
258:1,19,23	292:10,11,19	499:2	yards 419:17 yeah 258:4 260:10	03 258:20 293:4 06 262:6
259:13 260:12	293:1,6 310:20	works 447:11	294:15 295:17	06 202:0 0656 252:7
261:15,17,19,22	313:17,22 334:9	498:21	294.13 295.17 297:6,10 300:9,13	0030 232.7
262:22 264:4,10	358:15 359:17	wouldn't 299:18	353:17 354:19	1
266:7 275:12,13	360:5,22,23	437:2 492:15	365:22 378:6	1 243:13 340:15
276:3,8,12,16	361:10 362:12,14	-	380:10 387:18	437:2 483:5
282:23 284:9	362:16,18,23	write 259:7	400:6 405:7	10 361:12,13 362:1
286:3 288:15	408:19 413:1,2,4	writer 459:16	417:16 428:7	426:21 441:15
290:4,22 291:6,11	413:5,7,11,19	writing 315:23	433:15 443:11	443:3,4 494:10
291:21 293:9	436:14 440:1,5,7	438:21	444:20 492:13	10,000 457:4
298:7 300:18	440:11,14,17,21	written 255:18	year 320:7,8	10:30 253:16
301:18 303:15	440:23 471:19,21	257:13 260:4	321:25 336:4	10:32 313:13
304:23 305:16	485:2 499:10	261:21 262:22	340:13,14 343:7	10:40 313:8,9,13,14
308:5 310:6 311:5	wondered 353:13	264:5 439:14	346:8 382:16	10:42 314:16
312:1 329:2 331:7	wonderful 498:22	453:6 479:11	383:17 384:2	100 429:19
332:5 337:19	wondering 256:10	wrong 407:15	406:20,23 407:11	1025 243:19
358:18,25 359:24	337:1 417:17	421:14 444:3,11	407:11,16,18,21	10885 242:15
361:12 365:7,17	419:4 441:19	486:24	427:21 428:15	10th 498:13,17
367:3,9 368:4	443:9	WUTC 294:3,6	437:3,4 477:4	500:15
	l		,	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

r				1 490 010
11(A)(1)(b) 281:5,5	2.5 481:11	476:5 480:25	488:1	381 246:9
11:00 253:17	2:02 410:10	481:14 500:11,15	29 277:5,5 329:3	385 246:10
11:51 362:9	2:10 408:23,24	2023 318:15,21,22	331:11	386 246:10
1100 471:25	2:12 410:8,10	331:10,14 333:8	2900 244:14	39.346 281:7
115 449:4	2:13 410:12	333:11 341:2,7,17	293 246:5	396 243:9
1191 244:18	2:55 441:4	341:18,24 436:9	298 246:6	3rd 247:5
12:35 362:6	2:57 442:6	436:25 437:2		
12:36 362:9	20 284:16 297:4,5,6	438:6 449:1,10	3	4
12:39 362:11	297:7 300:3 307:5	469:21 473:3	3 241:24 246:3	4 338:7 339:4
120 428:20	364:25 365:23	2023/2024 340:13	247:1 331:12,19	4:20 499:18
132nd 244:23	366:2 387:14,23	2024 318:15,17,24	338:6 339:4 499:1	40 331:24 333:7
133 244:24	444:17 481:5,5	320:8 331:16,18	500:11	40-year 481:8
139 279:8 459:16	485:16 489:12	331:25 333:8	3:01 442:6	40128 242:9
14 426:21	2000 242:22	340:14 341:16	3:02 442:8	403 246:11 411:21
15 363:18 414:15	20007 243:20	449:1,10	30 412:16 414:16	412:20
427:19 444:17,21	2008 395:1,7,11	2025 338:21,25	415:8 471:20	40s 480:13
497:3,17	2009 395:13	339:4,6,9,9	494:7,8,9,21,23	41 352:23,24
15-page 497:9	200980 280:15	206-343-7340	496:7,9,14,17	415 246:11
150 481:3	201 244:4	244:10	30-page 495:2	415-552-7272
1510 245:17	2014 419:10 474:25	206-447-7000	496:3,24 497:5	243:10
16 351:1	2016 390:24 391:4	245:7	300 419:17	415-743-4718
161 243:14	391:10,18 433:2	206-464-6595	301 246:6	243:15
17 279:4 293:21,25	434:2 473:19	242:23	305 246:7	425-635-1400
298:20 302:1	486:7 488:7	206.623.7580	308 246:7	242:17
305:24 308:12	2017 388:6 390:16	244:15	30s 480:12	426 246:12
310:16 311:14	390:23 391:4,20	206.909.8728	30X 385:25	445 246:12
323:5 329:3 364:2	404:20	244:19	31 257:7 261:19,20	45-minute 361:18
369:21 391:18	2018 404:19,24	2121 241:25 500:20	338:25	362:6
489:6	433:2 434:2	22 262:6	310 246:8	450 243:4 245:11
1700 244:18	473:20 486:7	23(j) 337:16	311 246:8	246:13
1750 243:4 245:11	488:8	230 449:5	31st 253:25 488:23	45202 245:17
17th 498:13,20	2019 382:25 404:25	230/115 388:7	494:1	455 246:13
18 391:10 492:7	202-342-0800	24 340:18	35 253:12 427:19	456 246:14
18(A)(4) 429:15	243:20	240 427:20	3500 245:6	459 246:14
18(B) 436:3	2020 280:6,8,19	241 241:11	35T 376:22 384:12	461 246:15
1800 244:4 484:1	281:6,13 405:1,4	250 419:16	384:16 385:1	462 246:15
181051 262:4	420:6 460:1,9,10	25th 262:6	36 245:17 326:10	465 246:16
19 284:12 329:4	460:11,16 462:23	26th 265:16 400:4	360-664-1186	468 246:16
427:19	463:15	420:17 421:9	242:10	47.8 280:2
19.29A.090 463:7	2021 369:3 452:24	27 297:5 366:2	363 246:9	471 246:17
19.29A.0905 462:2	453:22	369:25	37 297:4 300:3	476 246:17
1T 389:24	2022 241:24 246:3	279 246:5	307:5 364:25	478 246:18
	247:1 262:6 351:1	27th 400:9	365:23 366:6	48.5 448:15 479:25
2	420:2,10,15,17	28 277:5	387:14 471:19	480:3,11
2 280:2 281:12,24	421:9 471:17	28th 268:19 420:2	489:12	485 246:18
447:18,22 489:9			38 339:23	488 246:19
	I	I	I	1

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

49 323:7 448:15	80.28.410 343:15		
479:20	80.28.425 322:20		
490 246:19	327:23 483:4		
	80.28.425(2)		
5	339:25		
5 315:8,9 331:10,11	800 242:22		
397:22 463:7	801 262:3		
481:11	801-536-6918		
50-foot 474:19	244:5		
500 241:11 354:12	810 244:9		
481:15	84111 244:5		
51 347:2	86 447:7		
513.421.2255	87 431:1		
245:18	8F 243:14		
5295 433:6 454:15	8th 243:19		
490:10			
57 349:3	9		
	9 247:5 376:22		
6	384:12,16,17		
6 429:7 438:3	385:2 406:10		
6.3 340:13 427:22	9.0 481:9		
428:1	9.25 481:24		
60 326:10 361:11	9.4 448:13 479:19		
363:16	480:18,22		
61 353:7	9:00 247:2 253:23		
610 244:9	901 245:5		
62 357:4	925 244:14		
6619 244:23	94102 243:9		
69 426:20	94130 243:14		
	971-710-1150		
7	245:12		
7 316:11 319:22	971-710-1154		
321:7 322:21	243:5		
7-day 498:1	97201 243:5 245:12		
70 495:11,16	98004 242:16		
700 242:16	98033 244:24		
71 323:3 335:7	98101 244:18		
78 423:14	98104 242:22		
8	244:10,15		
8 316:11 318:6	98164 245:6		
319:23 429:8	98504 242:10		
8.8 479:25 480:23	9th 420:6		
80 421:7 425:9,12	9X 260:3		
425:18,20 426:2			
423:18,20 420:2			
432.24			

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC