

Docket No. A-130355 - Vol. I

Rulemaking to Make Corrections and Changes in  
Rules in WAC 480-07

January 30, 2017



1325 Fourth Avenue • Suite 1840 • Seattle, Washington 98101

**206.287.9066**

[www.buellrealtime.com](http://www.buellrealtime.com)

Olympia | **360.534.9066** Spokane | **509.624.3261** National | **800.846.6989**

email: [info@buellrealtime.com](mailto:info@buellrealtime.com)



Page 1

1 BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE  
 2 UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
 3 \_\_\_\_\_  
 4 In the Matter of )  
 5 )  
 6 Analysis of Staff Proposed ) Docket No. A-130355  
 7 Revisions to WAC 480-07 )  
 8 Governing Information Designated)  
 9 as Confidential )  
 10 )  
 11 \_\_\_\_\_  
 12 RULE ADOPTION HEARING  
 13 Pages 1-85  
 14 \_\_\_\_\_  
 15 1:31 p.m.  
 16 January 30, 2017  
 17  
 18 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission  
 19 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest  
 20 Olympia, Washington 98504-7250  
 21 REPORTED BY: ANITA W. SELF, RPR, CCR #3032  
 22 Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC,  
 23 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840  
 24 Seattle, Washington 98101  
 25 206.287.9066 | Seattle  
 360.534.9066 | Olympia  
 800.846.6989 | National  
 www.buellrealtime.com

Page 2

1 APPEARANCES  
 2 COMMISSIONERS:  
 3 CHAIRMAN DAVID DANNER  
 4 COMMISSIONER ANN E. RENDAHL  
 5 COMMISSIONER PHILIP B. JONES  
 6  
 7 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:  
 8 GREGORY J. KOPTA  
 9 Washington Utilities and  
 10 Transportation Commission  
 11 1300 So. Evergreen Park Drive SW  
 12 P.O. Box 47250  
 Olympia, Washington 98504  
 360.664.1355  
 gkopta@utc.wa.gov  
 13 FOR WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND  
 14 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:  
 15 CHRISTOPHER CASEY  
 16 Assistant Attorney General  
 17 1400 So. Evergreen Park Drive SW  
 18 P.O. Box 40128  
 Olympia, Washington 98504  
 360.664.1189  
 ccasey@utc.wa.gov  
 19 ADDITIONAL SPEAKERS:  
 20 LISA GAFKEN, Public Counsel  
 21 LISA ANDERL, CenturyLink  
 22 DONNA BARNETT, Puget Sound Energy  
 23 ZACH KRAVITZ, NW Natural  
 24 DUSTIN TILL, PacifiCorp  
 25 LAUREN RUSSELL, Union Pacific Railroad Co.  
 JESSE COWELL, Industrial Customers of Northwest  
 Utilities  
 \* \* \* \* \*

Page 3

1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; JANUARY 30, 2017  
 2 1:31 P.M.  
 3  
 4 CHAIR DANNER: Good afternoon. This is the  
 5 meeting of the Utilities and Transportation Commission,  
 6 and we are here for a hearing on proposed changes to the  
 7 procedural rules that are contained in Washington  
 8 Administrative Code, Chapter 480-07, and this is Docket  
 9 A-130355.  
 10 I'm Dave Danner, Chair of the Commission,  
 11 and I'm joined by my colleagues, Commissioner Ann  
 12 Rendahl and Commissioner Philip Jones.  
 13 We have a sign-in sheet that has not been  
 14 signed in by anybody, so it will be a very short hearing  
 15 this afternoon.  
 16 And so what I'd like to do, we basically  
 17 have -- I would group things into two groups:  
 18 Confidentiality and other stuff. And so what I'd like  
 19 to do this afternoon, Mr. Kopta, is I'd like you to give  
 20 us kind of a summary of the proposal for both groups,  
 21 and then we'll focus on -- I think we'll -- let's do the  
 22 issues other than confidentiality first, and then we  
 23 will save the best for last and have that discussion  
 24 later on.  
 25 So why don't you proceed.

Page 4

1 MR. KOPTA: All right. Thank you,  
 2 Mr. Chairman, good afternoon, and Commissioners.  
 3 I'm Greg Kopta, the Director of  
 4 Administrative Law for the Commission presenting Staff's  
 5 recommendation on these rules. As you mentioned,  
 6 Mr. Chairman, these are the procedural rules in WAC  
 7 480-07, only a portion of those at this point.  
 8 We have before you Parts I, II and IIIA.  
 9 Part I are the general procedural rules for filing and  
 10 those kinds of things with the Commission; Part II are  
 11 the rules that address rulemaking; and Part III are the  
 12 rules that address adjudications; IIIA are just the  
 13 general rules for adjudications.  
 14 So we've been at this for a while, and the  
 15 objective has been to streamline, clarify and better  
 16 organize our procedural rules and to reflect the  
 17 Commission's current practice. The last time that the  
 18 rules were updated was 2004, I believe, so it's been a  
 19 while.  
 20 And we've had five rounds of comments on the  
 21 rules that are before you today, and three workshops.  
 22 And I think that the rules are better for having had  
 23 this much public interaction. We've had really positive  
 24 and helpful suggestions from stakeholders. As a result,  
 25 I think most people that have been involved in this

Page 5

1 process generally support the outcome.  
 2 There are some comments that we received on  
 3 the proposed rules. Those are in the form of a matrix  
 4 that the Commission Staff filed last week on Wednesday.  
 5 Copies should be available if people don't have them.  
 6 So they are summarizing the comments we received and  
 7 Staff's recommendations and responses to those comments.  
 8 The rules, in addition to clarifying and  
 9 reorganizing, we've made some substantial changes,  
 10 probably the biggest of which is that the Commission --  
 11 once these rules are adopted, if they are, the  
 12 Commission will only serve documents electronically, no  
 13 longer serving copies in paper, and submissions for most  
 14 filings will also be electronic rather than in paper,  
 15 and there will be no more fax filings with the  
 16 Commission, and we're trying to reflect current  
 17 technology and our --  
 18 CHAIR DANNER: Does anybody file by fax  
 19 anymore?  
 20 MR. KOPTA: Surprisingly, yeah, some people  
 21 do. Sometimes we get applications for licenses, you  
 22 know, common carrier type things, and occasionally, the  
 23 annual report will come in by fax.  
 24 But we intend to issue a notice, probably  
 25 the last notice that we do by paper, informing everyone

Page 6

1 that the Commission regulates that there are changes and  
 2 that these are some of them, so that they will be better  
 3 prepared. But in this day and age, when 75 percent of  
 4 people have smartphones, it just seems to make a lot  
 5 more sense to file things either through the web portal  
 6 or via e-mail.  
 7 We also have new rules for electronic  
 8 signatures, which kind of goes along with the electronic  
 9 filing, and for Commission requests for information  
 10 outside of communications.  
 11 I won't repeat the comments and responses in  
 12 the matrix unless there are specific questions that the  
 13 commissioners have. I am available to respond to any  
 14 further comments that people that are here to comment  
 15 have.  
 16 The two most significant issues have to do  
 17 with confidentiality, which is in WAC 480-07-160, and  
 18 there are two issues that multiple parties commented on.  
 19 One of them is the change that we've  
 20 proposed to the definition of confidential information.  
 21 Right now, the rule includes both confidential  
 22 information as designated by companies pursuant to  
 23 WAC -- I mean, pursuant to RCW 80.04.095 and 81.77.210.  
 24 And in addition to that information, other information  
 25 that may be exempt from disclosure under the Public

Page 7

1 Records Act.  
 2 We've proposed to eliminate the other  
 3 exemptions because they are covered under a different  
 4 process. And the rule is specifically designed to cover  
 5 the process for the confidential information designated  
 6 under 80.04.095.  
 7 The other controversial issue is a change in  
 8 procedure in an adjudication. If a party challenges  
 9 another party's designation of confidential information,  
 10 the rule presently would have the Commission resolve  
 11 that dispute. We have recommended that the Commission  
 12 change that so that it's consistent with requests for  
 13 public records.  
 14 And under both of the statutes, there's a  
 15 ten-day period in which a party has to respond or to  
 16 seek a court order compelling the Commission to withhold  
 17 that information. And in the absence of such an order,  
 18 then the Commission releases that information.  
 19 Our concern is that the Public Records Act  
 20 is very broad and the exemptions are very narrow, and in  
 21 the absence of a specific exemption that allows the  
 22 Commission to do something other than the ten-day hold  
 23 and wait for a court order, then the Commission risks  
 24 being in violation of the Public Records Act.  
 25 We will discuss that a little bit more in

Page 8

1 depth when we come into the confidentiality issues, but  
 2 for now, that's a broad overview of the issues that have  
 3 been raised by the commenting parties, and I'm available  
 4 for any questions that you have.  
 5 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very  
 6 much.  
 7 Are there any questions for Judge Kopta  
 8 before we begin?  
 9 MR. JONES: No.  
 10 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So let's do this.  
 11 Again, I don't have a sign-up sheet, so I'm just going  
 12 to basically go through and call on people that I think  
 13 are here, and if there's others who want to come up, I  
 14 will invite them to do so, or people who are on the  
 15 bridge line.  
 16 So we're going to talk first about the  
 17 procedural rules that -- the general procedural rules,  
 18 the rulemakings and the adjudications. We'll start  
 19 first, but we will -- let's keep confidentiality off to  
 20 the side. Let's talk about everything else first, and  
 21 then we'll have a second round, and everybody will come  
 22 up a second time who wants to speak on that.  
 23 So even though that may not be as efficient  
 24 as you like, it helps us compartmentalize and it is,  
 25 after all, for all of us.

Page 9

1 So that said, why don't we start with Public  
 2 Counsel. Do you have anything you want talk about on  
 3 the general?  
 4 MS. GAFKEN: I don't actually -- I don't  
 5 actually have much more to add to the record other than  
 6 my filed comments that have been added to the record  
 7 along the way. I will say that Public Counsel has  
 8 appreciated the opportunity --  
 9 CHAIR DANNER: There's a seat for you there.  
 10 MS. GAFKEN: Okay.  
 11 CHAIR DANNER: And, actually, could you  
 12 identify yourself for the court reporter?  
 13 MS. GAFKEN: Of course. My name is Lisa  
 14 Gafken. I'm with Public Counsel.  
 15 CHAIR DANNER: That's G-A-F-K-E-N.  
 16 MS. GAFKEN: We have appreciated the efforts  
 17 to modernize the rules. It has been a long time since  
 18 they've been updated, but there's been reasons for that.  
 19 We are quite excited to move into the  
 20 electronic age. When this rulemaking first started, we  
 21 were really pushing for an ability to still receive  
 22 paper, and I think paper will still have a place in our  
 23 practice, because, you know, an active case is just  
 24 easier on paper.  
 25 But an update in terms of how Public Counsel

Page 10

1 has been operating, we have been moving to digitize our  
 2 office, and that's due in large part to losing our file  
 3 space. So, you know, when you're forced to move into a  
 4 new world, then you do that. And so we've been given  
 5 the opportunity. It's something that I've been looking  
 6 at, and our legal assistant has been looking at doing.  
 7 And so once that became a reality, then we really moved  
 8 quickly to make that happen. So I'm looking forward to  
 9 a bright new world of being in a digital era.  
 10 And so I guess I really don't have much more  
 11 to say about the other bucket, but thank you.  
 12 CHAIR DANNER: So we will see you shortly  
 13 with regard to the confidentiality?  
 14 MS. GAFKEN: Yes.  
 15 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.  
 16 Puget Sound Energy?  
 17 MS. BARNETT: Good afternoon, Commissioners.  
 18 Donna Barnett with Perkins Coie. I represent Puget  
 19 Sound Energy. And that's Barnett, B-A-R-N-E-T-T.  
 20 And I'd like to echo Ms. Gafken's comments  
 21 in that we appreciate the work, the hard work that's  
 22 been done over the past three years now on this, and we  
 23 think these are significant improvements over the  
 24 current rules and we appreciate all the work that has  
 25 been put in.

Page 11

1 Our -- most of our comments today are going  
 2 to be centered on the confidentiality issue, but that  
 3 doesn't mean -- we filed six comment letters over the  
 4 few years, so I would like you to please to read those.  
 5 Just because we didn't put in -- put every comment in  
 6 every letter doesn't mean we've just decided that it's  
 7 not an issue anymore.  
 8 Specifically, just a couple things to note.  
 9 Flexibility with regard to work papers and hidden cells,  
 10 and I think work papers which are not submitted or filed  
 11 with the -- they're not filed with the Commission,  
 12 maintaining as much flexibility around work papers as  
 13 possible, to be able to use them as they're intended to  
 14 be, in electronic format, as a working, living document,  
 15 to be able to use them, understanding that that is  
 16 important for the parties.  
 17 Also, I think Union Pacific filed comments  
 18 most recently about the notice to -- well, the  
 19 Commissioners' and the Staff's ability to review records  
 20 at any time, and that is -- I think their comment was to  
 21 include a reasonable -- a reasonability language in  
 22 there, or within reason. And we support that, but  
 23 understand that it's gone -- it's worked very well so  
 24 far with staff and with our -- PSE's and other parties'  
 25 books, I'm sure, has been open all the time, so they

Page 12

1 have -- Staff has been very good at providing notice and  
 2 working with us, but -- so we support Union Pacific's  
 3 language there, though.  
 4 And I think that is it except for the  
 5 confidentiality issue.  
 6 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Are there any  
 7 questions for Ms. Barnett?  
 8 COMMISSIONER JONES: No.  
 9 CHAIR DANNER: All right.  
 10 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No.  
 11 CHAIR DANNER: So thank you. We'll see you  
 12 again shortly.  
 13 MS. BARNETT: Yes.  
 14 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, I guess rather  
 15 than have me call up people without knowing, why don't  
 16 just somebody else come up.  
 17 Anyone else looking to speak on this issue?  
 18 Good afternoon.  
 19 MR. KRAVITZ: Hi, Chairman, Commissioners.  
 20 Zach Kravitz from NW Natural. My comments on the other  
 21 portions of the rulemaking, non-confidential issues is  
 22 really, we just want to extend our thanks to Staff. We  
 23 think this will do a very nice job streamlining some of  
 24 the process involved at the Commission. I know our  
 25 regulatory team and our staff are thrilled to see more

Page 13

1 electronic filing, so we're really happy to see those  
 2 changes.  
 3 This docket, it predates my time at NW  
 4 Natural, so I understand all the hard work that has gone  
 5 into it, and so I'm just kind of jumping in here at the  
 6 end. And so I appreciate everyone's work on this, and I  
 7 have a few more comments when we get to the second phase  
 8 of this.  
 9 CHAIR DANNER: Okay.  
 10 MR. KRAVITZ: Thanks.  
 11 CHAIR DANNER: I think I'm catching a theme  
 12 here.  
 13 All right. Anyone else who wants to comment  
 14 on the other category?  
 15 Good afternoon.  
 16 MR. TILL: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and  
 17 Commissioner Rendahl and Commissioner Jones. I'm Dustin  
 18 Till appearing on behalf of PacifiCorp. That's T-I  
 19 double L.  
 20 And I would like to echo NW Natural and  
 21 Puget Sound Energy's commendations of the Staff. I  
 22 think -- I'm also relatively new to this docket, but I  
 23 know what's involved, a similarly robust public process  
 24 that's been a pleasantly collaborated process.  
 25 And we're in agreement with Staff that, in

Page 14

1 general, the rules are much improved. They improved the  
 2 efficacy and the clarity of the Commission's procedural  
 3 rules, so we'd like to commend Staff on all of their  
 4 diligent and hard work.  
 5 We do some have some rather nuance points  
 6 of, I guess, disagreement on some of the  
 7 non-confidentiality rules. Those are summarized in the  
 8 written comments that we've submitted throughout this  
 9 proceeding, and we'd ask that the Commission take those  
 10 into consideration as it's deliberating these proposed  
 11 rules.  
 12 Just a couple of quick points on that. We  
 13 echo Puget Sound Energy's comment around the ability to  
 14 some discretion around the formatting of electronic  
 15 spreadsheets, particularly hidden cells in large  
 16 filings, rate case filings with significant work papers.  
 17 The administrative burden of going through, you know,  
 18 hundreds and hundreds of separate workbooks to identify  
 19 hidden cells is rather onerous, and it really  
 20 outweighs -- the burden far outweighs the kind of the  
 21 transparency piece. Because hidden -- it's kind of a  
 22 misnomer. Hidden cells within an Excel spreadsheet  
 23 aren't -- they're not hidden, they're readily  
 24 ascertainable and viewable by individuals with, what I  
 25 would call, you know, fairly rudimentary spreadsheet

Page 15

1 skills, so parties that are reviewing these, I think,  
 2 are generally, you know, familiar with the workings of  
 3 Excel and other spreadsheet programs.  
 4 And so -- and that's where I dislike that  
 5 term "hidden," because it suggests that utilities or  
 6 other parties are trying to hide information, but it's  
 7 really a formatting issue to put the most pertinent  
 8 information up front to facilitate printing.  
 9 CHAIR DANNER: So I understand what you're  
 10 saying and I also have a little practical experience  
 11 here where, you know, in an adjudication, the narrative  
 12 is all going in one direction, and so that's kind of  
 13 where we're going with our decision, and then we hear  
 14 afterwards, yeah, but you didn't look at this cell that  
 15 we never mentioned to you and is, in fact, a hidden  
 16 cell, but if you had ascertained rudimentary Quicken  
 17 skills, you would have found it, but we didn't because  
 18 the narrative never told us to do that.  
 19 And so when we're trying to get to an end  
 20 that is a practical end, we want to be flexible, but we  
 21 also don't want to provide kind of a pretext for  
 22 misleading the Commission, whether it's intentionally or  
 23 not, to where we aren't looking for that information.  
 24 If you understand what I'm trying to say.  
 25 MR. TILL: And I very much do, Chair, and

Page 16

1 PacifiCorp's intent in all regulatory proceedings is  
 2 transparency and providing for a full vetting of our  
 3 decisions based on the merits of those decisions. And  
 4 so while I appreciate the concerns about sensitivity,  
 5 you know, where we're coming from isn't kind of a hide  
 6 the ball game, but it's really -- kind of the  
 7 administrative burden of going through literally  
 8 hundreds and hundreds of work pages before they're  
 9 submitted to ensure that there's -- because now we have  
 10 a compliance obligation if this rule is adopted.  
 11 And so I'm just asking that the Commission  
 12 take that into consideration, kind of the compliance  
 13 regulatory burden with, you know, maybe what we're kind  
 14 of hoping to get out of it, and in no way want to be --  
 15 have my comments construed as we want to hide  
 16 information, because that's not at all --  
 17 CHAIR DANNER: No, and it's not -- it's not  
 18 taken that way. It's just that sometimes, you know, if  
 19 it's -- if it's there, it's now officially in the  
 20 record, but it's a needle in a haystack unless there's  
 21 something else that's pointing to it. And that's what  
 22 we don't want, to have a situation like that.  
 23 MR. TILL: And I appreciate that, so I  
 24 just -- I submit that to the Commission for  
 25 consideration.

Page 17

1 CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.

2 MR. TILL: And, you know, other than that,

3 like I said, we rely on the comments that we've

4 submitted. And again, we appreciate Staff's diligent

5 work on this. So thank you.

6 CHAIR DANNER: Thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I would also echo the

8 Chair's comments. Having been involved in rate cases

9 for a number of years before the Commission, this has

10 been an issue for the Commission for a very long time.

11 And those who were perhaps before the Commission in

12 these cases are aware of that.

13 Our -- you know, our staff is somewhat less

14 than your staff, and a lot of people go into a company's

15 presentation of a case.

16 CHAIR DANNER: In number, not in skills or

17 abilities.

18 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I absolutely echo

19 that, and we have one accounting advisor --

20 CHAIR DANNER: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- and they're not

22 able to talk with all of you the way you all can talk

23 with one another.

24 So this is really -- it's not so much -- it

25 is for Commission Staff, but this is a really critical

Page 18

1 issue for the commissioners and their advisors in

2 evaluating cases, and this applies not just to the

3 companies, it applies to the staff when they're making

4 their presentations to the Commission. It's so we can

5 figure out what you're asking for.

6 And as my colleague mentioned, you can

7 mention so many things in your narrative, but there

8 might be something in these spreadsheets, and if they're

9 hidden in a way that's not easily discernible, then it

10 makes it difficult for us to really have all the

11 information to come up with the right answer and really

12 work with all of you in coming up with the right answer.

13 So it's in everybody's interest.

14 I understand hiding columns so that you can

15 shorten up the spreadsheet, but there are ways to hide

16 things and there are ways to hide things. So maybe

17 there's a different way of saying this, as you said,

18 but, you know, the rule talks about, you know, making

19 sure that things are not password protected, not hidden.

20 We need to see them. We need to see this information

21 and our staff need to see it, so we can figure out the

22 right answer to what you're asking for.

23 So that's the whole intent of this rule.

24 It's not to come down on you for hiding a cell and we're

25 going to fine you. That's not -- the purpose is so we

Page 19

1 can get the information we need to come up with the

2 right answer. So that's --

3 MR. TILL: I appreciate those comments.

4 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very

5 much. Appreciate it.

6 Good afternoon.

7 MS. RUSSELL: Good afternoon. My name is

8 Lauren Russell. I'm here on behalf of Union Pacific

9 Railroad Company. We have some comments we'd like to

10 can make on the proposed confidentiality --

11 MS. RENDAHL: I'm not sure your mic is on.

12 If you press the button, the light comes on.

13 MS. RUSSELL: Is that better?

14 CHAIR DANNER: So, Ms. Russell, we're going

15 to bifurcate this, so we'll do -- we're going to do --

16 MS. RUSSELL: Understood, Commissioner. I

17 just wanted to make a brief comment about 480-07-175 --

18 CHAIR DANNER: Okay.

19 MS. RUSSELL: -- if that would be

20 appropriate at this time.

21 CHAIR DANNER: Sure.

22 MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Union Pacific

23 incorporates its comments that it has submitted in the

24 form of two draft letters previously. They would just

25 like to reiterate that they oppose what is seemingly

Page 20

1 very broad language that the Commission has the ability

2 to access and inspect accounts, papers and other

3 documents at any and all times.

4 I recognize that this language echoes

5 statutory language, but as it stands, there are some

6 concerns about protection for privileged information

7 under attorney-client privilege, the work product

8 doctrine, commercially sensitive information, security

9 sensitive information or other information protected

10 under federal law.

11 UP has some additional concerns about the

12 process of whether -- if they need to object to a

13 request for some of this information it believes should

14 be privileged. They recognize that the Staff --

15 Commission Staff is required to respond within just five

16 days to any legal objections that the company would set

17 forth.

18 It's also seemingly unclear what recourse,

19 if any, the company may have if it disagrees with the

20 Commission's ultimate determination of the objection.

21 Other concerns include the speed of this

22 process and what appears to be a lack of a hearing on

23 these proposed legal objections.

24 And just to follow up on the reasons that UP

25 has concerns with this rule, they are a private company

Page 21

1 operating in a competitive marketplace, so they have  
 2 concerns about a lack of protection for commercially  
 3 sensitive and proprietary information.  
 4 And we'd just like to note that Union  
 5 Pacific and the Commission of the State of Washington  
 6 share a common interest in preventing certain  
 7 individuals with malicious intentions getting access to  
 8 security sensitive information. So there's information  
 9 such as the transport of hazardous materials, where  
 10 those trains will be heading at what times. UP would  
 11 just like to ensure that that information would remain  
 12 protected, and it's unclear whether those protections  
 13 are in place under the proposed law.  
 14 And then finally, there's -- UP would just  
 15 like to point out that the current proposed rule doesn't  
 16 make mention of other preemptive laws, such as federal  
 17 law which requires railroads to withhold some -- or  
 18 prohibits them from disclosing such information, such as  
 19 customer routes and other customer information.  
 20 So just for the record, UP would like to  
 21 state objections to that rule. Thank you.  
 22 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you.  
 23 I think we're going to have that discussion  
 24 later on as part of the confidentiality portion. I also  
 25 seem to recall that we did address the federal -- the

Page 22

1 federal legal issues in that conversation, but we'll  
 2 have that conversation.  
 3 MR. KOPTA: Yeah. Yes. This is WAC  
 4 480-07-175, which is a new rule, so it's not precisely  
 5 within the issues having to do with confidentiality,  
 6 although Union Pacific, obviously, has raised some of  
 7 those in connection with that particular rule.  
 8 CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, yeah. Okay. Well, I  
 9 think -- I was actually hoping to put 175 issues aside  
 10 into the second phase, but I understand why you raised  
 11 them there.  
 12 MR. KOPTA: And that's -- we can certainly  
 13 address them as --  
 14 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Why don't we do that.  
 15 MR. KOPTA: Okay.  
 16 CHAIR DANNER: All right. So, Ms. Russell,  
 17 we may actually have you up again and -- when we get  
 18 into that discussion.  
 19 MS. RUSSELL: Okay.  
 20 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Great.  
 21 Anyone else in the room want to come  
 22 forward?  
 23 MR. COWELL: Good afternoon. Thank you,  
 24 Commissioners. Jesse Cowell on behalf of the Industrial  
 25 Customers of Northwest Utilities, C-O-W-E-L-L.

Page 23

1 And I wanted to just briefly -- well, to  
 2 start off with, again, I also am very appreciative of  
 3 staff's efforts, particularly the last couple rounds.  
 4 There was a matrix provided with Staff's explanation on  
 5 why certain changes were made or not made, and I found  
 6 throughout the process that Staff was very thoughtful  
 7 and considerate in listening to -- I know particularly  
 8 for ICNU's position, some changes were made, some  
 9 changes were not made, but very appreciate of that.  
 10 And particularly in the sense of, we focused  
 11 a lot on the rule provisions for intervenors. And I'd  
 12 support a lot of the changes that Staff is recommending,  
 13 which I think will streamline the process for us from  
 14 the intervenor's perspective.  
 15 And then lastly, some commentators have said  
 16 that we encourage the Commission to look at some prior  
 17 comments. We've spent a lot of time on it, and I have  
 18 not wanted to just regurgitate the same arguments over  
 19 and over, but on some of the points that we may have  
 20 disagreed with Staff, we hope that the Commission will  
 21 look at those comments and consider the flip side.  
 22 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Great. Thank you very  
 23 much.  
 24 All right. Anyone else in the room or on  
 25 the bridge line who wants to discuss the issues other

Page 24

1 than confidentiality?  
 2 All right. Then let's go into  
 3 confidentiality. Okay. Is there anything you want to  
 4 start off with in your discussion?  
 5 MR. KOPTA: I tried to give you a high level  
 6 summary of the two issues. I did not discuss 175  
 7 issues. I can provide you with a little insight into  
 8 that particular rule.  
 9 CHAIR DANNER: That might be useful for the  
 10 record.  
 11 MR. KOPTA: That is a new rule that the --  
 12 essentially establishes a procedure for the Commission  
 13 requesting information outside of the context of an  
 14 adjudication. We've always had the statutory authority  
 15 to be able to do that, but our consumer affairs and  
 16 investigative staffs have found that there are sometimes  
 17 issues that arise with respect to companies being  
 18 responsive to requests for information. So this merely  
 19 provides a vehicle for Staff to send out what are  
 20 essentially data requests to companies outside of an  
 21 adjudication to obtain information.  
 22 The timelines are very similar in terms of  
 23 responses or objections, and certainly confidentiality  
 24 would be one objection that a company could make to  
 25 providing information. We require in the rule that

Page 25

1 Staff give a prompt response to whatever objection we  
 2 receive, and then the Commission would rule on that  
 3 objection and either overrule it and require the company  
 4 to provide the information, or sustain it and -- and no  
 5 longer require them to provide the information.  
 6 It is essentially, like I say, a data  
 7 request or a bench request. And depending on who issues  
 8 the order, if it's an administrative law judge or even  
 9 the executive director, then there are other rules that  
 10 provide for Commission review of those decisions. If  
 11 the commissioners were to make that determination, which  
 12 I would not anticipate, but if that were the case, then  
 13 that would be a final determination by the  
 14 commissioners, which would then be appealable to the  
 15 Superior Court if a company disagrees.  
 16 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So let's say there are  
 17 rail safety staff, again, and he's doing an  
 18 investigation and wants information from Union Pacific.  
 19 Union Pacific says, well, wait a minute, there's a  
 20 federal law that says this information is not to be  
 21 disclosed, so we're not going to disclose it.  
 22 If we agree with them, then that's the end  
 23 of the matter. If we disagree with them, then what is  
 24 the -- how does it unfold?  
 25 MR. KOPTA: Well, if an administrative law

Page 26

1 judge enters the decision, it would be -- it could be  
 2 reviewed to the full Commission just like any other  
 3 initial order. And if the commissioners were to agree  
 4 and to require that information to be provided, then the  
 5 recourse that the company would have is the same  
 6 recourse that they would have with any final order from  
 7 the Commission, which would be to go to Superior Court.  
 8 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay.  
 9 Are there any questions for Mr. Kopta before  
 10 we ask for more?  
 11 MR. KOPTA: Yeah. I will just note, with  
 12 respect to the other confidentiality issues that Staff  
 13 did -- or more specifically, I prepared a memo on those  
 14 two issues, a copy of which are on the back table as  
 15 well as something that was filed in the docket last  
 16 Wednesday, so I don't feel the need to necessarily  
 17 repeat that. Hopefully, folks have read that and  
 18 understand the reasoning behind the proposals, and I'm  
 19 certainly willing to engage in further discussion.  
 20 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Any of my colleagues  
 21 want him to read that into the record word by word?  
 22 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Absolutely not.  
 23 Thank you.  
 24 COMMISSIONER JONES: No, thank you.  
 25 CHAIR DANNER: All right.

Page 27

1 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I enjoy the sound of  
 2 your voice, but I think we --  
 3 MR. KOPTA: Thank you.  
 4 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So let's -- let's ask  
 5 for comment, but first, Ms. Russell, do you want to --  
 6 is there anything that you've heard that you want to  
 7 respond to so far?  
 8 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you. Thanks for the --  
 9 it's off again.  
 10 Thanks for the clarification on the rule.  
 11 One comment I think I'd make in response is, at least  
 12 from our reading, it doesn't appear that the  
 13 confidential designation would apply to UP, so they  
 14 would not be able to use the confidential objection as a  
 15 way to object to some of these requests.  
 16 MR. KOPTA: Not the confidentiality under  
 17 80.04.095 or 80.177.210, but certainly, if there's a  
 18 provision in federal law or some other exemption under  
 19 the Public Records Act, then --  
 20 MS. RUSSELL: Such as attorney-client  
 21 privilege as well as other --  
 22 MR. KOPTA: Absolutely.  
 23 MS. RUSSELL: Okay. It just doesn't get to  
 24 take advantage of the confidentiality designation.  
 25 MR. KOPTA: Correct.

Page 28

1 CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, this is -- this has  
 2 been in our state -- it seems a very strange and a bit  
 3 artificial designation, but our state law says that  
 4 Title 80 companies are entitled to confidentiality and  
 5 Title 81, not so much.  
 6 MS. RUSSELL: It does seem strange when it  
 7 accepts solid waste companies, but everyone else so --  
 8 all right. Thank you.  
 9 MR. KOPTA: Well, yeah, there's a specific  
 10 statute that the solid waste companies were able to have  
 11 the legislation enact, so --  
 12 CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. We don't do statutes,  
 13 so you'd have to take that one up on the other side of  
 14 the lake.  
 15 Okay. So ready to do a deeper dive into  
 16 confidentiality. So, Ms. Barnett, do you want to --  
 17 MS. BARNETT: Sure. Thank you, Chairman  
 18 Danner, Commissioners.  
 19 First, let me dispose of one that -- minor,  
 20 but it does fall under confidentiality. The marking  
 21 designation, I think that the staff has recommended  
 22 changing the designation marking to require, quote,  
 23 designated information is confidential per protective  
 24 order in docket blank or per WAC.  
 25 That's the little label that you've seen on



Page 29

1 pages that are confidential that go on every -- the  
 2 front page of a confidential document and then every  
 3 page that contains confidential information. I  
 4 understand this clarifies that it may not just be  
 5 highlighted material, or it's just designated any way  
 6 that the party has deemed makes it's clear what is  
 7 confidential and what's highly confidential. But these  
 8 are little just -- just -- just practically, little  
 9 labels that we're trying to cram in.  
 10 It's really wordy, and to put quotes that  
 11 say, we must say, "Designated information is  
 12 confidential pursuant to the protective order in Docket  
 13 UE-11111/UG-11112" on every page in the middle, the way  
 14 right now, it just says, "Confidential per" or "Highly  
 15 confidential per." Throw the "highly confidential" out,  
 16 and it's just crazy. So we think if we could keep that  
 17 the same -- I think I'm done.  
 18 Okay. Now, to the --  
 19 CHAIR DANNER: So basically what you're  
 20 saying is if you can do -- if you can do a notification  
 21 that somehow is clear to us that this -- all right, this  
 22 stack of documents is confidential per WAC blah, blah,  
 23 blah, you know, and you don't need to stamp it on every  
 24 single page --  
 25 MS. BARNETT: No. I think we do need to

Page 30

1 stamp it on every single page. I'm saying the stamp  
 2 that we use, I want it -- I want to be able to say,  
 3 "confidential" or "highly confidential" per WAC or per  
 4 protective order. I don't want to have to say  
 5 Designated information is highly confidential per  
 6 protective order in Docket blah, blah, blah in a tiny  
 7 little label, when we're just trying to say this one row  
 8 of this one table that is taking up this entire page, so  
 9 the -- just --  
 10 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Because --  
 11 CHAIR DANNER: In other words, why use  
 12 twenty words when three will do.  
 13 MS. BARNETT: Yeah. So right now, it's  
 14 quoted the words we have to use in the label. I'd like  
 15 a little more flexibility to be able to just -- even the  
 16 label, I understand that -- if we can label it in any  
 17 way that clearly designates which is confidential and  
 18 which isn't, I'd like that.  
 19 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So because of  
 20 formatting and --  
 21 MS. BARNETT: Yes.  
 22 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: You might lose a row  
 23 because you had to have more words.  
 24 MS. BARNETT: Yeah. More words, right.  
 25 CHAIR DANNER: So do you think that any of

Page 31

1 those words is -- the deletion of any of those words is  
 2 going to confuse us?  
 3 MS. BARNETT: I don't. Because I know from  
 4 past working with you, I think it's worked out very well  
 5 so far. I don't think there's been any significant --  
 6 but again, if there is significant confusion, we've  
 7 also -- we're open and willing to work that out on a  
 8 case-by-case basis.  
 9 CHAIR DANNER: All right.  
 10 MS. BARNETT: Now to the good stuff.  
 11 CHAIR DANNER: Yes.  
 12 MS. BARNETT: Okay.  
 13 CHAIR DANNER: That was good stuff, but --  
 14 MS. BARNETT: The first one I also think  
 15 is -- the first issue I want to take is the definition  
 16 of confidential material. And I appreciate Judge  
 17 Kopta's memo. It was very helpful and able to -- in  
 18 identifying the specific issues and being able to  
 19 respond to that more efficiently today. So thank you so  
 20 much for that.  
 21 I would like to first, the designated -- the  
 22 definition of confidential information does remove the  
 23 reference to exempt material under the Public Records  
 24 Act for information that is personally identifying  
 25 information such as names, phone numbers, Social

Page 32

1 Security numbers, things like that.  
 2 We recommend keeping that in there, because  
 3 as we've said before, the Public Records Act and the  
 4 discovery rules are different, distinct, and just for an  
 5 example, I just want to -- just something that actually  
 6 has come up, or either something very similar to it has  
 7 come up where, if we're in a consumer rules enforcement  
 8 action and a data request comes for all bills, or even  
 9 in a rate case, a data request comes in to see all  
 10 employee information for something that happens to  
 11 have -- or a screenshot of a particular database that  
 12 happens to have personally identifying information on  
 13 it, would be credit card numbers or which -- more like  
 14 Social Security numbers maybe for an employee, that is  
 15 not -- we could flag that by saying it's confidential  
 16 pursuant to the WAC, either redact it or provide it  
 17 under a confidential seal.  
 18 Right now, with the -- with the proposed  
 19 rules, we wouldn't be able to call that confidential.  
 20 So I understand that if there is a challenge to the  
 21 confidentiality, we would be able to raise that and  
 22 not -- and to deal with that in Superior Court, but I'm  
 23 worried that it would get lost. Since we couldn't put  
 24 it on yellow paper, we wouldn't be able to put it on --  
 25 designated confidential per WAC, or unless it

Page 33

1 specifically said a protective order, there's just no  
 2 way to identify it before there's a challenge.  
 3       So if a Kroger or another party that's not  
 4 Staff or Public Counsel requests a "me too" data request  
 5 and get all the -- I see that easily getting lost in the  
 6 shuffle, because we wouldn't -- weren't able to  
 7 designate that particular information as confidential.  
 8       I think that's -- the legislature says  
 9 that's very important information and very -- you know,  
 10 you want to keep that out. So I'm afraid that taking it  
 11 out of the WAC is actually going to cause bigger  
 12 problems than streamlining is to benefit.  
 13       CHAIR DANNER: So in other words, we've been  
 14 talking internally here that confidential information is  
 15 different than exempt information. You have information  
 16 that simply is exempt under the Public Records Act and  
 17 you have information that you're submitting as  
 18 confidential. And if somebody wants to have that  
 19 confidential information disclosed, they go through the  
 20 ten-day process and so forth.  
 21       But if something is exempt but you decide  
 22 that even though it's exempt you're going to put it in  
 23 the record, it's have -- and seek confidential  
 24 protection for that, it needs to be treated the same way  
 25 just for the -- because it's going to go under the same

Page 34

1 process; is that -- am I getting that right?  
 2       MS. BARNETT: Well, yeah, I don't get  
 3 that -- so if -- if Public Counsel asks PSE for a  
 4 screenshot of a bill and it's got a name and a phone  
 5 number and an address on there, right now, that doesn't  
 6 fall under confident- -- or at least proposed rules, it  
 7 doesn't fall under confidential definition. I see it  
 8 falls under the Public Records Act, but it hasn't been a  
 9 Public Records Act. It hasn't been -- I mean, it hasn't  
 10 been a request for public record.  
 11       CHAIR DANNER: Um-hmm.  
 12       MS. BARNETT: It's not a public record  
 13 because PSE -- it's in PSE's -- they're asking it from  
 14 PSE. It hasn't been submitted to the Commission, it  
 15 hasn't been submitted to any staff, and it's not in  
 16 front of the Commission at all.  
 17       Now, what -- I'm sorry to use Public  
 18 Counsel, but so what Public Counsel could do if they --  
 19 if there was information on there they wanted to use as  
 20 an exhibit in an adjudicative proceeding, they would  
 21 file that and then it would be put up on the website.  
 22 So -- but there would be no -- we wouldn't be able to  
 23 designate that or flag it as confidential because it  
 24 isn't a public record. It was simply -- and it doesn't  
 25 have to be Public Counsel. It could be any other party.

Page 35

1 It could be a consumer.  
 2       COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if we were to  
 3 somehow -- if we were to decide to distinguish between  
 4 confidentiality and other documents, you would want some  
 5 way to distinguish them so it was clear that they were  
 6 exempt or not disclosable for some other reason? I'm  
 7 just trying to --  
 8       MS. BARNETT: Yeah, yeah. Some way to flag  
 9 them --  
 10       COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Or I don't -- I love  
 11 all these colors, but -- you know what I mean?  
 12       MS. BARNETT: Yeah.  
 13       COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But some way to  
 14 distinguish that this is a document that may not fit  
 15 under confidentiality, but is exempt from disclosure, so  
 16 that the parties understand there's some special  
 17 treatment involved, it's subject to a protective order,  
 18 in the --  
 19       MS. BARNETT: There might not be a  
 20 protective order in the case, right, but yes, I think  
 21 you're right. We need some way to identify it as -- as  
 22 don't put it on the website.  
 23       COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Right. So if it's --  
 24 if we proceed along these lines of defining confidential  
 25 information in this way, you would want some way to

Page 36

1 treat that exempt -- public records exempt information,  
 2 or otherwise HIPAA protected information --  
 3       MS. BARNETT: Yeah.  
 4       COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- that kind of  
 5 information --  
 6       MS. BARNETT: Yeah.  
 7       COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- in a separate way.  
 8       MS. BARNETT: Right. And the existing  
 9 rules, they just incorporate anything that's under the  
 10 Public Records Act is confidential.  
 11       CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. So if it's exempt  
 12 information, you submit it as confidential.  
 13       MS. BARNETT: Exactly. And then it's  
 14 flagged and we -- yeah, and so they know that if it's --  
 15 they do want to turn it into an exhibit, if it's a just  
 16 a data request right now, or a response to a data  
 17 request, that it's on yellow paper or blue paper. They  
 18 know to do something to it before it's submitted.  
 19       CHAIR DANNER: Okay.  
 20       MS. BARNETT: And the -- my final point on  
 21 the confidentiality issue is the treating Public Records  
 22 Act material the same as confidential material -- or a  
 23 challenge for confidentiality, treating it the same as a  
 24 Public Records Act request. I think -- I understand the  
 25 streamlining, and I understand Judge Kopta wrote about

Page 37

1 the liability issue in the memo, and I appreciate that.  
 2 I think, however, that the Commission  
 3 resolution of conflicts pursuant to a protective order  
 4 is an important function of the Commission, and it works  
 5 very well, I think, right now. I think Judge Kopta  
 6 wrote in his memo that it doesn't happen very often, but  
 7 when it does, I think the system we've got right now is  
 8 really working.  
 9 And there's a lot of informal resolution in  
 10 the course behind the scenes before it ever gets to a  
 11 formal challenge. But we do think that eliminating  
 12 review from the Commission of its own protective order  
 13 is a big deal, and would simply shift the dispute to  
 14 Superior Court where it's a much lengthier, much more  
 15 involved, and much more -- much more expensive ordeal  
 16 than it is in front of the Commission in an adjudicative  
 17 proceeding.  
 18 Right now, for the Commission to rule, it's  
 19 a one-time -- like you described, if they're going to  
 20 maintain the confidentiality, they'll maintain it.  
 21 That's it. If they're not, then they say no. And then  
 22 the next step is a Superior Court if they want to.  
 23 But the Superior Court, it's, you know,  
 24 three hearings, a nine-month process, and tens of  
 25 thousands of dollars. And I'm afraid that eliminating

Page 38

1 the Commission review of that will simply create more --  
 2 more challenges, frankly, if everyone knows that the  
 3 utility has to go defend this in front of Superior  
 4 Court.  
 5 There are more -- there are going to be more  
 6 challenges, they're going to be more contentious, and,  
 7 frankly, I'm afraid that right now the data requests and  
 8 discovery process is -- is very broad. We're very open,  
 9 at least for PSE and other parties I represent, and I  
 10 think Staff and Public Counsel know and appreciate that,  
 11 and there's -- and part of that is PSE knowing that, if  
 12 there's confidential information, it's going to be  
 13 protected.  
 14 In response to a data request, we can be  
 15 broad in our response and let them figure out what they  
 16 need out of this instead of parsing out every word of  
 17 the request to say, is this really responsive? Do they  
 18 really need this? And what is going to happen to the  
 19 information?  
 20 So I sense -- I'm afraid this is going to  
 21 create more burden than the streamline is going to  
 22 create efficiency.  
 23 CHAIR DANNER: So the other side of the  
 24 argument would be that, what force and effect would it  
 25 have for us to say that we're going to take information

Page 39

1 that's disclosable under the Public Records Act and  
 2 we're going to put it under a protective order even  
 3 though there's a statute that says that you can't  
 4 protect that.  
 5 And so it would seem to me the duplication  
 6 is going to be if -- we used Public Counsel last time,  
 7 we'll use ICNU this time -- that they -- you've put  
 8 something -- you submitted something under a protective  
 9 order, but it's not information that should be deemed  
 10 confidential under the Public Records Act.  
 11 So if somebody's going to say, well, even  
 12 though it's under a protective order, that should be  
 13 public information, so we're going to go to Court  
 14 anyway, and so what has the protective order  
 15 accomplished?  
 16 MS. BARNETT: Well, I think the protective  
 17 order does -- first of all, that information is  
 18 protected under the Public Records Act request, too,  
 19 because it does recognize -- it does protect it as  
 20 exempt information that's provided pursuant to a  
 21 protective order.  
 22 So there is that overlap, but I do think  
 23 that it may be -- and I don't have any examples at the  
 24 top of my head, but there may be examples that the  
 25 Commission may understand that something needs to be

Page 40

1 kept confidential because the party has made the case  
 2 and got a protective order under it, but it doesn't fall  
 3 under one of the exemptions of the Public Records Act.  
 4 And I, honestly, don't have an example, but  
 5 I think that's part of the expertise of the Commission  
 6 to be able to have that flexibility to say, yeah, this  
 7 is the stuff that we govern. We understand this and we  
 8 understand it's not covered under the rule, under the  
 9 Public Records Act statute, but nonetheless, it needs to  
 10 be protected --  
 11 CHAIR DANNER: And so --  
 12 MS. BARNETT: -- pursuant to the order.  
 13 CHAIR DANNER: -- are you confident the  
 14 Superior Court would say, yeah, this is not covered by  
 15 the Public Records Act, but it is about covered by a  
 16 protective order, so we're going to keep it protected?  
 17 MS. BARNETT: I think that that would be one  
 18 party's position. But again, the staff is there to say  
 19 that. If it's a Public Records Act challenge, Staff is  
 20 represented in the Superior Court, and they're able to  
 21 say why that protective order should be -- why that is  
 22 exempt --  
 23 CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.  
 24 MS. BARNETT: -- or maybe why it shouldn't.  
 25 But they're represented and I think that's -- that's the

Page 41

1 second level set of protection for it. But the first  
 2 level should be -- definitely, I think the first level  
 3 should be before the Commission to enforce its own  
 4 protective order. It shouldn't be for Superior Court.  
 5 I think we'd be down there every day.  
 6 CHAIR DANNER: Mr. Jones?  
 7 COMMISSIONER JONES: So go over that again,  
 8 Ms. Barnett.  
 9 MS. BARNETT: All of it?  
 10 COMMISSIONER JONES: Superior Court -- just  
 11 bring it down to specifics. So Superior Court takes  
 12 about nine months, three hearings?  
 13 MS. BARNETT: Yeah.  
 14 COMMISSIONER JONES: And do you have a rough  
 15 idea of how much that costs?  
 16 MS. BARNETT: \$35,000 would be the  
 17 last-ish-ish [sic].  
 18 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.  
 19 CHAIR DANNER: Peanuts.  
 20 COMMISSIONER JONES: I don't know if it's  
 21 peanuts, Mr. Chairman.  
 22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Not on my budget.  
 23 COMMISSIONER JONES: And then those costs go  
 24 into rates --  
 25 MS. BARNETT: Yes.

Page 42

1 COMMISSIONER JONES: -- in the next rate  
 2 case, right?  
 3 MS. BARNETT: That's right. And that's -- I  
 4 have to say the 35,000 is off the top of my head. That  
 5 was before the actual trial, so that was only two  
 6 hearings. We did not get to the third hearing.  
 7 COMMISSIONER JONES: When was the last time  
 8 that PSE had to do this?  
 9 MS. BARNETT: It -- probably a couple.  
 10 COMMISSIONER JONES: Couple of years.  
 11 MS. BARNETT: Yeah.  
 12 COMMISSIONER JONES: Because I remember the  
 13 proceeding during the merger case --  
 14 MS. BARNETT: Yeah.  
 15 COMMISSIONER JONES: -- where we had some --  
 16 MS. BARNETT: I think there's been one since  
 17 the merger case, but I can't remember what it is.  
 18 COMMISSIONER JONES: And then so your  
 19 arguments are basically the informal process tends to  
 20 work okay. Use the expertise of the Commission Staff,  
 21 or the ALJs, the attorneys, the Staff, try to -- if  
 22 things can be resolved that way, it's more streamlined,  
 23 it takes less time, less cost, and it generally works  
 24 okay?  
 25 MS. BARNETT: That's right.

Page 43

1 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.  
 2 MS. BARNETT: Thank you.  
 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Ms. Barnett, can you  
 4 address the issue raised in Staff's memo about the  
 5 concern about the last sentence of 84.05 [sic] -- well,  
 6 the last section of -- I think it's 84.05 -- I'm not --  
 7 MS. BARNETT: 80.04.095?  
 8 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: 80.04.095 -- it's  
 9 been a long day already -- that speaks to the protective  
 10 orders and -- and how you read that language.  
 11 MS. BARNETT: Yes. I think that -- to  
 12 paraphrase, I think it's -- [as read] the Public Records  
 13 Act is a legislative recognition that the Commission and  
 14 the Public Records Act is a separate and distinct [sic]  
 15 from the information exchanged between parties in  
 16 adjudicative proceeding, and I'm -- this is paraphrasing  
 17 from NW Natural's comments on this, and that it --  
 18 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: This is the -- the  
 19 sentence I'm talking about is: Nothing in the section  
 20 shall prevent the use of protective orders by the  
 21 Commission governing disclosure of proprietary or  
 22 confidential information in contested proceedings.  
 23 So in reading the comments and reading the  
 24 memo --  
 25 MS. BARNETT: Um-hmm.

Page 44

1 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- and thinking about  
 2 this, I think it would be helpful if you can give me  
 3 your thoughts on whether -- what that means --  
 4 MS. BARNETT: I think I --  
 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- and whether you've  
 6 had any, you know, legislative history into the meaning  
 7 of that sentence.  
 8 Do you have anything to share with us that  
 9 would help us -- does that create an exception from the  
 10 Public Records Act, the application of the Public  
 11 Records Act? Does it mean we do something different for  
 12 protective orders, or does it mean what the Staff memo  
 13 says, which is it's not -- it's subsumed under the  
 14 Public Records Act?  
 15 MS. BARNETT: No, I think that -- and I  
 16 don't have a legislative dictionary to look into that,  
 17 and I didn't find any -- just very quickly, because I  
 18 did just review this memo very recently, but I didn't  
 19 find any -- any -- anything specific.  
 20 But I do think that's an acknowledgement  
 21 from the legislature that the Public Records Act does  
 22 not necessarily cover everything that a protective order  
 23 is going to cover. And it recognizes the agency's role  
 24 in -- in protecting information that may not be  
 25 protected under the Public Records Act.

Page 45

1 I think it's -- I think it supports PSE's  
 2 position and the utilities' position, and if I can speak  
 3 for them, that it recognizes that we know that the  
 4 agency has authority and expertise to do protective  
 5 orders, too, and nothing in the Public Records Act is  
 6 going to step on those. So I think it's a recognition  
 7 that they shouldn't be streamlined, shouldn't be  
 8 subsumed, that they're separate and distinct.  
 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.  
 10 CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. So this is -- it's  
 11 really an interesting question of statutory construction  
 12 because you -- it's really an interesting question of  
 13 statutory construction because you need to give every  
 14 word -- the assumption that every word means something.  
 15 At the same time, you need to read this in a way so all  
 16 these pieces fit together.  
 17 And so, you know, I can look at this  
 18 language about protective orders is -- is by itself, it  
 19 has to have -- it needs to mean something in addition to  
 20 the other provisions we're looking at. At the same  
 21 time, we want to try and read them in a way that  
 22 reconciles all these various pieces of the Public  
 23 Records Act.  
 24 MS. BARNETT: Yeah.  
 25 CHAIR DANNER: I mean, do you think that

Page 46

1 your interpretation does that?  
 2 MS. BARNETT: Yeah, I do. I think it -- and  
 3 I think that the legislature could have just said  
 4 that -- I mean, that -- that the protective orders are  
 5 subsumed under here. They could have clearly said that,  
 6 but recognizing the distinct role that they play  
 7 acknowledges that the agency's going to have its own  
 8 process, and they should have their own process. And  
 9 then if a public records request is made, then we have  
 10 our process over here.  
 11 I think that -- that having separate  
 12 processes does not necessarily mean they're redundant,  
 13 and they don't have to be. And I also think that, like  
 14 I said earlier, just -- just eliminating completely the  
 15 Commission's process is going to burden the Court  
 16 process for sure, but also hurt ratepayers in additional  
 17 costs and time.  
 18 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. Thank you.  
 19 Any other questions for, Ms. Barnett?  
 20 COMMISSIONER JONES: No.  
 21 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you very much.  
 22 I think we're off to an interesting start.  
 23 So I don't know, who should we go to next?  
 24 Mr. Kravitz, why don't you come forward since you were  
 25 mentioned by Ms. Barnett.

Page 47

1 MR. KRAVITZ: Thank you, Chairman Danner.  
 2 It's Zach Kravitz, K-R-A-V-I-T-Z, for NW Natural.  
 3 So I'm going to pick on -- pick up where we  
 4 just left off, because I think that's a good place to  
 5 start, which is RCW 80.04.095. And the last sentence of  
 6 that section states that, Nothing in this section shall  
 7 prevent the use of protective orders by the Commission  
 8 governing disclosure of proprietary or confidential  
 9 information in contested proceedings.  
 10 I do think that creates the exception that  
 11 we're talking about here. I do think that gives the  
 12 Commission the authority to adjudicate discovery  
 13 disputes under a protective order that would include  
 14 disputes regarding confidential information.  
 15 That is -- to take a step back a little bit,  
 16 I think it would fall under the broad authority given to  
 17 the Commission to hold hearings and adjudicate these  
 18 proceedings and have discovery disputes, and this  
 19 particular provision states that there -- there's --  
 20 within those proceedings, the Commission can issue  
 21 protective orders.  
 22 And as I understand how that process would  
 23 work is, I'm familiar with it, the parties to a docket  
 24 will have a -- what really becomes a contract in terms  
 25 of how they're going to resolve discovery disputes. And

Page 48

1 usually, the first step in that is an informal process  
 2 followed by a potentially more formal process, if it  
 3 comes to that, if the parties can't resolve that  
 4 dispute. I think usually those disputes do end up  
 5 getting resolved informally, and -- but if not, of  
 6 course, you can go to the Commission and have the  
 7 Commission answer that question.  
 8 One -- one of the nice things about these --  
 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Let me ask you a  
 10 question.  
 11 MR. KRAVITZ: Sure.  
 12 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So -- so if you have  
 13 a dispute about documents and a discovery request,  
 14 ordinarily, we would handle that in a motion to compel  
 15 before an administrative law judge.  
 16 Would this rule have the effect of turning  
 17 that motion to compel, if one of the companies or one --  
 18 if the Staff or the companies -- if somebody wanted  
 19 information and another party says, well, it's  
 20 confidential or whatever, we don't want to disclose it,  
 21 would it turn that -- what would ordinarily be a motion  
 22 to compel process before the Commission into this  
 23 ten-day procedure in court? Is that the concern you're  
 24 talking about?  
 25 MR. KRAVITZ: Yes, it is. And that was --

Page 49

1 that's -- in my reading of the proposed rules, would  
 2 state that any dispute of confidentiality in a contested  
 3 proceeding at the Commission would have to be resolved  
 4 by a Superior Court.  
 5 Now, if I'm reading that wrong, then a lot  
 6 of my arguments I'll back away from.  
 7 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Well, that's the way  
 8 I understand it. So the contrary view, or the view of  
 9 the proposed rule here, I think we're all aware of how  
 10 rigidly courts interpret Public Records Act cases, and  
 11 the potential that that places -- the liability that  
 12 places on the Commission if somebody were to raise this  
 13 issue in a proceeding. That -- you know, it hasn't  
 14 happened yet, but it doesn't mean it won't happen, and  
 15 these Public Records Act cases are happening more and  
 16 more.  
 17 MR. KRAVITZ: Right.  
 18 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So there is an issue.  
 19 I don't think it's been resolved yet. If you all are  
 20 aware of any of these cases before any other agencies or  
 21 any other situation, that might be helpful for us. This  
 22 really is a new issue that I'm not sure has been decided  
 23 yet, and so that's I think what we're grappling with.  
 24 MR. KRAVITZ: I definitely understand that  
 25 tension with the severity of the Public Records Act. I

Page 50

1 would say, when you have parties to a contested case at  
 2 the Commission that sign a protective order, what they  
 3 are doing is entering into a contract with all of the  
 4 parties that state that this is how we're going to  
 5 resolve these disputes, and we're going to resolve these  
 6 disputes through informal resolution, followed by  
 7 resolution seeking an order from the Commission.  
 8 So I am not aware of any party going outside  
 9 of a protective order and filing a Public Records Act  
 10 request in that type of situation. I -- and I'm not  
 11 sure if -- well -- I not aware of --  
 12 CHAIR DANNER: And it's unlikely that third  
 13 parties would do that because they haven't seen anything  
 14 that's under a protective order --  
 15 MR. KRAVITZ: A third --  
 16 CHAIR DANNER: -- people who aren't under  
 17 the protective order. So a member of the public  
 18 wouldn't know that there's -- they might suspect, but  
 19 they wouldn't know that there's anything that they could  
 20 do a public records request for.  
 21 MR. KRAVITZ: I would -- well, they would  
 22 know that there's a protective order, they will know  
 23 that the information provided to the Commission was  
 24 either provided in full publicly or it was redacted and  
 25 provided confidentially. I think that would be in -- in

Page 51

1 the form of testimony or briefs or whatever filings were  
 2 made at the Commission. So in that case, if there was  
 3 an outside party -- I shouldn't call them a party --  
 4 CHAIR DANNER: An outside interest -- an  
 5 interested person who says, I want to know what's under  
 6 that redaction.  
 7 MR. KRAVITZ: Right. And I think there  
 8 would be two options -- well, off the top of my head,  
 9 two options that would be available to them.  
 10 One, if it wasn't too late, and they wanted  
 11 to be a party to the case, that would be something that  
 12 they could do and they could sign a protective order.  
 13 Two, I do think that --  
 14 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So it's a journalist,  
 15 and the journalist doesn't have standing.  
 16 MR. KRAVITZ: And two, I would say that what  
 17 would be absolutely appropriate for them is to file a  
 18 public records request, and at that point in time, that  
 19 would be adjudicated under the public records law, but  
 20 that would be outside of what's happening at the  
 21 contested case between the parties to the docket.  
 22 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So it would be,  
 23 behavior of the parties is covered by the protective  
 24 order. The behavior of parties outside of the case --  
 25 MR. KRAVITZ: Yes.

Page 52

1 CHAIR DANNER: -- is covered by the Public  
 2 Records Act is how you suggest it be.  
 3 MR. KRAVITZ: Yes. And I believe that is  
 4 how it has -- it would be currently handled, yes. I  
 5 would say that it should remain that way.  
 6 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. Any other  
 7 questions for Mr. Kravitz?  
 8 MR. KRAVITZ: Um --  
 9 CHAIR DANNER: Oh, you have more?  
 10 MR. KRAVITZ: And if I may.  
 11 CHAIR DANNER: Yes, you may.  
 12 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Take a little bit  
 13 more.  
 14 MR. KRAVITZ: And I just would say that  
 15 there would be places that I'm -- certain circumstances  
 16 that I'd be really concerned that a court -- let's say  
 17 that these proposed rules were approved, and there was a  
 18 situation where there were two parties that were  
 19 exchanging information, be it through discovery, and  
 20 it's Public Counsel, it's ICNU, it's anyone, they  
 21 request information from NW Natural and I provide them  
 22 confidential information under protective order, it's  
 23 been redacted, and that discovery is only between these  
 24 two parties.  
 25 At that point in time, if they challenged

Page 53

1 that document and they say, we think this document is  
 2 not confidential, the question is, where -- where do we  
 3 go from there? Because at this point, it's a document  
 4 exchanged between two entities that are not the  
 5 government.

6 And so if we were to move forward under this  
 7 proposed rule, I would have ten days to go to a Superior  
 8 Court, and I'd be very afraid that the Court would say,  
 9 we don't have standing to resolve this dispute and this  
 10 isn't a public records issue because there's no public  
 11 record in the dispute.

12 And so maybe there is a way to go to that  
 13 court and have them resolve that dispute, but I would  
 14 think either they would say, no, you don't have  
 15 standing, or it could be a really, really long process.  
 16 And I don't think that would help anybody here in having  
 17 some efficient administration of these cases.

18 So with that, I will -- I will say, if it's  
 19 the position of Staff that this is -- if, I guess, the  
 20 current process is maybe a little outside the bounds of  
 21 what the statutes contemplate, I think that maybe we  
 22 should all look into whether, you know, what we're  
 23 doing -- or what we're proposing to do is legal or not  
 24 legal, and maybe have some more robust discussion on  
 25 some of the nuances of the law.

Page 54

1 If the position is that there is just a  
 2 better process to go forward, I would say that also this  
 3 has raised a lot of interest and maybe it would deserve  
 4 some more time for the parties to talk a little bit  
 5 about this more in, I don't know, a workshop setting or  
 6 some sort of meeting to really understand everyone's  
 7 interests and come up with potentially a process that  
 8 everyone could be comfortable with.

9 So that's just two thoughts going forward,  
 10 but, I guess, as my comments say, and I would recommend  
 11 to the Commission respectfully that the current process,  
 12 including the definition for how we handle confidential  
 13 information here, would be something that works and it  
 14 should not be changed. Thank you.

15 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Any other  
 16 questions? All right. Thank you very much.

17 Okay. PacifiCorp should come forward.

18 MR. TILL: Thank you, Chair Danner. Again,  
 19 this is Dustin Till with PacifiCorp. That's T-I double  
 20 L.

21 I don't want to -- I'll kind of pile onto  
 22 some of the comments made by Puget Sound Energy and NW  
 23 Natural. We're generally in agreement.

24 I would like to kind of move the  
 25 conversation up just a level of abstraction to make sure

Page 55

1 we're all talking about the same thing here, and what  
 2 we're talking about are confidentiality rules that  
 3 govern interparty disclosures. Okay?

4 We're not talking about public --  
 5 disclosures by an agency that are subject to the Public  
 6 Records Act. Okay?

7 So I think it's very important to separate  
 8 those, because I feel that this -- in this discussion,  
 9 we're really conflating those two things, and it's  
 10 caused some confusion.

11 And so what we're trying to do here is to  
 12 define what's confidential for the purposes of  
 13 interparty disclosures, and the rules as they're --  
 14 they're proposed right now, they cross-reference the  
 15 Public Record Act, in that they cross-reference the  
 16 definitions in the PRA. And I think that that, in many  
 17 ways, is the appropriate thing to do, because it creates  
 18 definitional symmetry between, you know, what's  
 19 considered confidential in this silo, the interparty  
 20 disclosure silo, what's considered confidential for the  
 21 agency, so you don't have kind of conflicting  
 22 obligations.

23 But what's happening here is, it's giving  
 24 rise to these concerns as Commissioner -- Chair -- or  
 25 Commissioner Rendahl said, you know, about the

Page 56

1 Commission's liability under the PRA. I think one way  
 2 to maybe address this is, instead of cross-referencing  
 3 the definitions from the PRA, in the definition of, hey,  
 4 this is what the Commission considers to be confidential  
 5 in the context of interparty disclosures, of just  
 6 spelling that out. You know, you can copy the words,  
 7 but you eliminate that reference to the Public Record  
 8 Act that everybody seems to be getting hung up on right  
 9 now. And so you really -- you really draw a distinction  
 10 between those two mechanisms of disclosure.

11 And --

12 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm sorry. So you  
 13 heard Ms. Barnett's discussion about the need to be able  
 14 to designate, though, those documents that are exempt  
 15 under the Public Records Act. And so are you saying  
 16 that you would not reference those in the definition, to  
 17 have some way of separately designating them?

18 I guess I was a bit confused about whether  
 19 you agree or disagree with Ms. Barnett on the  
 20 designations under the definitional --

21 MR. TILL: Right. So when I -- when  
 22 PacifiCorp is being asked to turn over a document, it's  
 23 not a public record and we're not seeking to protect it  
 24 or to avoid disclosure under the PRA, we're ideally  
 25 doing it under a protective order and we're trying to

Page 57

1 get to a definition within a protective order of what  
 2 can be considered confidential, what's non-confidential,  
 3 and this confliction.  
 4 And so once that record is given to Staff,  
 5 it becomes a public record that's subject to the PRA,  
 6 but not until then. If Staff doesn't get that, it's not  
 7 a public record, and so I'm suggesting that we draw a  
 8 distinction, and that's a really separate analysis that  
 9 Staff has to make. Once it has that record, it has to  
 10 make the decision, as a threshold matter, right, about  
 11 its status. Because Staff is the one -- or the  
 12 Commission is the entity that's getting the public  
 13 record request, right? It's not the utility itself.  
 14 Now, there's circumstances where it provides  
 15 notice to the original party that propounded that  
 16 information, and there are all sorts of different  
 17 mechanisms that trigger to determine whether it's exempt  
 18 or not under the PRA.  
 19 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. But when you turn a  
 20 document over to ICNU, that's not -- there's no public  
 21 record, but when you submit that same document to Staff,  
 22 it becomes a public record as soon as that's time  
 23 stamped by our records center or my staff.  
 24 MR. TILL: Correct. And at that point, it's  
 25 subject to all of the protections and the -- kind of the

Page 58

1 adjudicatory mechanisms of the Public Record Act. But  
 2 I'm talking -- this is why I think it's important to  
 3 separate these kind of silos of information, because  
 4 what we're trying to do here is say, you know, how do we  
 5 best protect, in my case, PacifiCorp's confidential --  
 6 whether it's business information, customer information,  
 7 and prevent another party from disclosing that  
 8 information in another proceeding, in another forum  
 9 where it's not protected.  
 10 And so I do -- I maintain that I think some  
 11 of this confusion that we're wrestling with here is  
 12 driven by the cross -- the definitional cross-reference  
 13 to the PRA, when that confusion can be really, I think,  
 14 fairly simply perhaps resolved by just dropping the  
 15 definitions themselves for the Commission to promulgate  
 16 a rule that says, this is what's confidential for  
 17 purposes of a -- you know, for a protective order, or  
 18 for discovery in a Commission adjudication. And that  
 19 way, you're not trying to conflate -- you're not somehow  
 20 suggesting that the public record applies to a record  
 21 that it just simply doesn't apply to. So that's just a  
 22 suggestion.  
 23 And in any event, I just don't feel that the  
 24 rules the way they're drafted really draw that  
 25 distinction between what we're doing, and I feel our

Page 59

1 conversation is getting confused about what we're  
 2 talking about here.  
 3 Similarly, when we talk to -- when we're  
 4 talking about the process for challenging claims of  
 5 confidentiality, under the rules as proposed, I have to  
 6 go to court, I have -- and it's not a public record,  
 7 it's a utility record, so it's not subject at all to the  
 8 judicial review or resolution provisions of the Public  
 9 Record Act, and so, frankly, and this is kind of the  
 10 question. I have no idea what my jurisdictional hook is  
 11 to go to court. I don't know how I have standing. I  
 12 don't have a final appealable order of the Commission  
 13 making a determination about anything. I have maybe a  
 14 protective order, I might not have a protective order.  
 15 So I don't understand, as a matter of law,  
 16 how I go before a court and make any sort of argument,  
 17 and I feel it's well within the Commission's discretion  
 18 to develop -- and in its broad authority to develop  
 19 rules that govern these interparty exchanges that allow  
 20 the Commission to make determinations about whether  
 21 parties or information is consistent with that, and,  
 22 frankly, that allows the Commission to determine  
 23 compliance with its own protective order.  
 24 Because as drafted here, it says the  
 25 Commission isn't responsible in the first instance in

Page 60

1 determining whether information complies with its own  
 2 protective orders issued in the docket, and, you know,  
 3 as Puget Sound Energy said, it really increases the cost  
 4 and the burden of having these resolutions, you can  
 5 imagine, in the context of a hearing where there's a  
 6 dispute about confidential information, and the hearing  
 7 has to stop, the parties have to go to court, and who  
 8 knows how long that court -- and then when -- instead  
 9 what you can have is a simple determination by the  
 10 Commission interpreting its own -- its own rules, which  
 11 I think is, you know, well within the Commission's  
 12 jurisdiction to do so.  
 13 Those are really, you know, my big comments  
 14 on the two topics that we're talking about here, and I'd  
 15 implore you to really kind of make sure that, as we're  
 16 thinking about this analytically, that we keep these two  
 17 obligations separate and consider -- and then I  
 18 would just -- this is an idea that came up listening to  
 19 the other speakers, you know, there may be some other  
 20 options to prevent this kind of conflation that's  
 21 causing confusion. And I would agree with NW Natural  
 22 that perhaps some more process and some further  
 23 collaboration with Staff and with stakeholders on this  
 24 issue would be warranted. So --  
 25 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.



Page 61

1 COMMISSIONER JONES: I have a question.  
 2 CHAIR DANNER: Hang on.  
 3 Commissioner Jones.  
 4 COMMISSIONER JONES: So you seem to be  
 5 asking two things, and I don't have the statutes in  
 6 front of me. And we'll deliberate on this, of course,  
 7 afterwards, but you seem to be saying, don't conflate  
 8 the PRA with -- take those references of the PRA out of  
 9 the part of the statute that deals with interparty  
 10 discovery in the adjudication.  
 11 MR. TILL: Correct, that's a suggestion.  
 12 COMMISSIONER JONES: And then you want us to  
 13 be fairly prescriptive instead of -- I heard Ms. Barnett  
 14 saying that a lot of this is done informally with Staff,  
 15 that you're able to resolve things in a streamlined way  
 16 informally, but you appear to be asking for the  
 17 interparty discovery issues in an adjudication; you want  
 18 perhaps, as an idea, to list out and be a little more  
 19 prescriptive. That's the way I heard you anyway.  
 20 MR. TILL: Right. And I think that  
 21 that's -- that's correct, Commissioner Jones. I'd like  
 22 to have clear rules about what constitutes confidential  
 23 information and what doesn't constitute confidential,  
 24 and so we have clear sideboards on that.  
 25 Now, I -- to be completely candid, most of

Page 62

1 my regulatory practice is in Oregon. We have a very  
 2 contentious kind of -- we deal with a lot of motions to  
 3 compel and issues around confidentiality, so this is an  
 4 issue I'm quite familiar with, and there's quite a bit  
 5 of collaborative process despite the Oregon Commission  
 6 adopting, you know, clear definitions of what  
 7 constitutes confidential information.  
 8 So I don't think a clear definition  
 9 precludes parties from working informally. I think it  
 10 actually facilitates more expeditious and effective  
 11 conversations because we understand what the  
 12 regulatory def- -- we understand what the game is,  
 13 right? So I don't think we want to have amorphous  
 14 definitions, and I think that they -- they want to be  
 15 clear. And --  
 16 COMMISSIONER JONES: Sure.  
 17 MR. TILL: -- one point I did forget to  
 18 bring up is just, as we're looking at these definitions,  
 19 I do feel it's important that we make sure that our  
 20 customers' personal financial private information --  
 21 COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes.  
 22 MR. TILL: -- is specifically subsumed into  
 23 the definition of confidential --  
 24 COMMISSIONER JONES: Right.  
 25 MR. TILL: -- for purposes of interparty

Page 63

1 disclosures.  
 2 COMMISSIONER JONES: And on that point,  
 3 that's a pretty common definition. You all agree -- I  
 4 think all parties agree on what is called PII,  
 5 personally identifiable information, PII.  
 6 Is there any disagreement among the parties  
 7 on that? No. Good. Okay.  
 8 MR. TILL: Thank you.  
 9 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very  
 10 much. Okay. Let's see.  
 11 Mr. Cowell, did you have anything you want  
 12 to add?  
 13 MR. COWELL: Yes. Thank you, Commissioners.  
 14 In listening to this discussion, I'm wishing  
 15 that I'd spent more time reviewing this issue, and so,  
 16 to that point, I'd also support the recommendations that  
 17 maybe, as a discrete issue, that we spend some more time  
 18 on this, maybe in a workshop and maybe with some further  
 19 comment filings.  
 20 The little bit that we did address this, we  
 21 had mentioned our understanding of maybe Staff's intent  
 22 with the changes to how adjudication would work over  
 23 confidentiality disputes would be that it could create  
 24 an incentive for utilities to avoid improper and overly  
 25 expansive confidentiality designations.

Page 64

1 And I don't know -- I was just -- we were  
 2 talking it over, and neither one of us -- with  
 3 Ms. Gafken, Public Counsel, about -- because thankfully,  
 4 I've not had to go to Superior Court and figure out,  
 5 would attorney fees be involved?  
 6 And then assuming that the Court says that,  
 7 no, Utility, you are actually trying to improperly  
 8 restrict information, could attorney fees be given to  
 9 the challenging party? And then could we come back to  
 10 the Commission, and the Commission says, and actually,  
 11 Utility, you can't recoup your attorney costs and the  
 12 payment you had to make in rates.  
 13 So these are the kind of questions I'd like  
 14 to look at. And I would say that, from the ratepayer  
 15 perspective behind the scenes, as Mr. Till had mentioned  
 16 also, having similar things happen in Oregon, that I've  
 17 never had to go beyond DEFCON-2, but we've kind of  
 18 had -- there's been some brinksmanship saying, okay, I'm  
 19 ready to hit the button and we're going with this.  
 20 And we've been able to shy away from it, but  
 21 again, that maybe goes to my point of -- at least  
 22 something that I thought worthy to explore of a  
 23 disincentive, because it would be so costly and  
 24 burdensome to try to get parties to agree so that they  
 25 don't have to go to Superior Court.

Page 65

1 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Questions for  
 2 Mr. Cowell? All right. Thank you very much.  
 3 Ms. Gafken?  
 4 MS. GAFKEN: I'm going to start briefly with  
 5 175 and then move onto the other issues. So -- and  
 6 Public Counsel didn't file any comments on either one of  
 7 these issues, but with 175, I believe that that codifies  
 8 the current practice.  
 9 Being able -- Staff's ability to ask a  
 10 company informal DRs during an investigation, for  
 11 example, that's statutorily authorized, and I believe  
 12 that just happens kind of under the normal course of  
 13 things. It's a normal regulatory function. And so  
 14 Public Counsel does support Section 175 as it's written.  
 15 Now, for the other piece, again, we didn't  
 16 file any comments on that proposed section. We did find  
 17 the proposal interesting and provocative. We see it as  
 18 placing a burden on the companies, and so one reason  
 19 that we didn't file any comment on that was we thought,  
 20 well, it's really the company's battle to bring before  
 21 the Commission, if there is a battle to bring.  
 22 But one thing that we do see a positive  
 23 there, it does place a burden on the company to not  
 24 over-designate, and that is kind of a perennial issue  
 25 of, are companies over-designating things confidential.

Page 66

1 Now, we don't see a lot of motions along those lines,  
 2 but they could be brought.  
 3 I don't agree with Puget Sound Energy's  
 4 characterization that we would now see more challenges  
 5 if this rule were to be adopted. I don't think that  
 6 would be the case. I think challenges would be brought  
 7 when needed. And I don't see an increased frequency  
 8 there.  
 9 One thing -- excuse me. One thing I would  
 10 also note in terms of, you know, when things become a  
 11 public record, so when the AG's office also receives the  
 12 documents from the companies, they also become public  
 13 records. And so if my office were to receive a public  
 14 records request, we would follow the same procedures.  
 15 And that's provided for under RCW 80.04.090, and that's  
 16 one of the reasons why we are able to receive some of  
 17 the documents even when there's not a protective order.  
 18 Some companies -- most companies are willing  
 19 to work with us in that regard. Some companies that  
 20 aren't as familiar with that provision are a little bit  
 21 more nervous about it, but we're usually able to talk  
 22 through those things. That usually happens in  
 23 situations where we're before the Commission in an open  
 24 meeting setting versus an adjudication. But we've been  
 25 able to work through a lot of those issues.

Page 67

1 Talking about that last sentence in  
 2 80.04.095, I think the distinction there, at least the  
 3 way that I've interpreted it, all the language before  
 4 that last sentence I think talks about the  
 5 non-adjudication situation, and then that last sentence  
 6 says, you can still do a protective order when you're in  
 7 an adjudicative proceeding. At least that's how I've  
 8 looked at that language.  
 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you're reading is  
 10 that it is different from the process of going to court?  
 11 MS. GAFKEN: Right. I'm not sure that it  
 12 has anything to do with the going to court piece. I  
 13 think it's along the lines of what I was talking about  
 14 earlier, about being able to receive information from  
 15 companies either through an investigation, or maybe some  
 16 things before an opening meeting, on the open meeting  
 17 agenda.  
 18 So the Commission is able to receive  
 19 information from companies outside of an adjudication,  
 20 and so companies are still able to designate things  
 21 confidential outside of an adjudication under that  
 22 statute, and so -- but the statute doesn't limit the  
 23 Commission's ability to then, in an adjudication, adopt  
 24 a protective order.  
 25 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.

Page 68

1 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Questions for  
 2 Ms. Gafken?  
 3 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Is she done?  
 4 MS. GAFKEN: I'm looking to make sure I'm  
 5 done. I think I'm done. Thank you.  
 6 COMMISSIONER JONES: No questions.  
 7 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very  
 8 much.  
 9 So we have -- before we go further, anyone  
 10 else in the room that has -- Ms. Anderl.  
 11 MS. ANDERL: Hi. Good afternoon. This is  
 12 Lisa Anderl. My last name is spelled A-N-D-E-R-L, and  
 13 I'm in-house counsel with CenturyLink.  
 14 We filed very brief comments kind of  
 15 generally concurring with the "if it's not broken, don't  
 16 fix it" sort of approach that I think the industry's  
 17 taken to the confidentiality rule, and I just wanted to  
 18 come up here and reiterate that.  
 19 And honestly, the more I listen to the  
 20 discussion, and the more I read the rule carefully and  
 21 read now Staff's interpretation of what's going to  
 22 happen here, kind of the more confused I am about how  
 23 it's going to work.  
 24 So I also think that we could benefit from  
 25 some additional time and some additional stakeholder

Page 69

1 work, maybe even a workshop. I'm not usually one to  
 2 raise my hand for that, but I think it could be useful.  
 3 I personally believe that the last sentence  
 4 of 80.04.095 confers upon the Commission additional  
 5 authority, a broad administrative adjudicative authority  
 6 to determine what appropriate information and  
 7 protections may -- what information is necessary and  
 8 what protections are appropriate for that information in  
 9 an adjudicative proceeding.  
 10 I mean, adjudicative proceedings are  
 11 different from rulemakings in that it's not  
 12 one-size-fits-all. You're going to have different  
 13 facts, you're going to have information that people  
 14 think is confidential that we can't even brainstorm  
 15 right now to determine what that is.  
 16 And I think that the statute and the APA --  
 17 the confidentiality provision in Title 80 and the APA  
 18 read together, when the Commission's exercising its  
 19 adjudicative authority, gives you broad authority to  
 20 create these designations of confidential and highly  
 21 confidential to reasonably determine what the scope of  
 22 those is.  
 23 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But there's no  
 24 exemption in the Public Records Act for adjudications,  
 25 as I read it, and so that's where I think the rub is.

Page 70

1 And so how do we -- how do we make the APA  
 2 work with the Public Records Act in this particular  
 3 situation? That's where my mind is trying to wrap  
 4 around, how we marry those together in a way to avoid  
 5 violating the Public Records Act.  
 6 MS. ANDERL: Well, right. Okay. But then  
 7 are you just saying, we don't need a rule, we don't need  
 8 a protective order, all we need is 80.04.095, and that  
 9 governs all disclosures?  
 10 With all due respect, because I don't do  
 11 adjudications all that much, I'm not talking about  
 12 within the interparty discovery process, but I'm talking  
 13 about requests from externals.  
 14 I don't think that's right either, because  
 15 that gives you nothing. And really what this new rule  
 16 is saying is, if it's not exempt, it's not confidential.  
 17 And I don't -- that doesn't strike me as right unless  
 18 you read the statute, giving the exemption very broadly,  
 19 you know, to encompass valuable commercial information,  
 20 including trade secrets or confidential, you know,  
 21 marketing information. I mean, we can start putting  
 22 "Trade Secret" on our documents, because we feel like  
 23 everything that we haven't voluntarily released to the  
 24 public is, by some measure, valuable commercial or trade  
 25 secret type information. But I have a hard time, you

Page 71

1 know, agreeing that that's the right answer either.  
 2 The other thing I wanted to point out is, I  
 3 don't necessarily agree that having the Commission not  
 4 decide protects you. So I'm sure that's news you wanted  
 5 to hear.  
 6 CHAIR DANNER: When you say "protects you,"  
 7 meaning protects us?  
 8 MS. ANDERL: The Commission, yeah. Yeah.  
 9 Because if, in fact -- if the Commission withholds  
 10 exempt information from disclosure, which the memo says  
 11 you should do, who has decided that it is exempt? Have  
 12 you just taken the designating party's word for it, or  
 13 have you done your own analysis? If you have done your  
 14 own analysis, well, then you've decided it's either  
 15 exempt or it's not. If you haven't done your own  
 16 analysis, boy, you're at the mercy of whether the party  
 17 has, you know, properly designated and can subsequently  
 18 prove that it was exempt.  
 19 So I don't think that you not deciding these  
 20 things and you not enforcing your protective orders --  
 21 which I think should be more than procedural, I think  
 22 they are substantive orders -- I don't think it -- it  
 23 lets you out of the admittedly difficult, icky place of  
 24 the liability associated with getting it wrong on a  
 25 Public Records Act request. I'm not turning a blind eye

Page 72

1 to that.  
 2 CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Of course, that's --  
 3 you know, that's the risk every time we get a public  
 4 records request. We have to make those kinds of  
 5 determinations.  
 6 MS. ANDERL: Right. Right. And so why not  
 7 save me the \$35,000, and at least, you know, make a  
 8 ruling on the confidentiality -- the merits of the  
 9 confidentiality of a challenged piece of information,  
 10 which I think you're uniquely situated to do, and not  
 11 make us go to court every time, because that is a big  
 12 burden.  
 13 And this last one that Ms. Barnett talked  
 14 about, Perkins Coie actually represented CenturyLink and  
 15 it was to protect some information that we had submitted  
 16 to the military department in connection with our 911  
 17 response to the request for proposals, and so it wasn't  
 18 your agency. But she's -- that is the exact amount, and  
 19 that was just a TRO and preliminary injunction. That  
 20 didn't even get us to the trial.  
 21 CHAIR DANNER: Okay.  
 22 MS. ANDERL: So that's -- that's my plea.  
 23 COMMISSIONER JONES: I had hoped that you  
 24 were going to give us more clarity, Ms. Anderl.  
 25 MS. ANDERL: If I had thought I was going

Page 73

1 to, I wouldn't have waited to be the last one.

2 CHAIR DANNER: But just -- yeah, okay. I

3 keep hearing \$35,000. I'm trying to figure out how I

4 can turn this into a revenue stream.

5 COMMISSIONER JONES: Just put a one percent

6 fee on top of that.

7 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. WRA, did you have

8 anything that you wanted to add today? Okay.

9 Is there anyone else who's in the room who

10 wants to speak this afternoon?

11 Is there anyone else who is on the bridge

12 line who wishes to participate this afternoon? Okay.

13 Hearing nothing, is -- Judge Kopta, is there

14 anything you want to add this afternoon before we

15 adjourn?

16 MR. KOPTA: Oh, as a lawyer, I can't leave

17 things unresponded to.

18 CHAIR DANNER: That's why I asked you.

19 MR. KOPTA: The easy thing first, the

20 definition of "confidential information."

21 I share the concern that we make sure that

22 information that is exempt under the Public Record Act

23 is not something that the Commission discloses. But

24 I'm -- my concern is, with the definition right now,

25 that we are more likely to do that under the existing

Page 74

1 definition than if we were to change it to exclude that

2 information.

3 Right now that information would need to be

4 designated exactly the same as information that's

5 designated as confidential under 80.04.095, which raises

6 the possibility that if a company -- if somebody

7 requests that information, and the company decides, eh,

8 we don't need to go to court to get that protected, and

9 after ten days the Commission releases that information,

10 believing it is 80.04.095 information, when in fact it

11 is exempt -- and I can't say that our records center

12 staff is going to be able to know the difference between

13 exempt information and 80.04.095 information unless they

14 have some reason to believe that there's a

15 distinction -- so I think what makes the most sense is

16 to set up a procedure that's consistent with 80.04.095,

17 and to deal separately with information that is exempt,

18 because they are two different things.

19 And as mentioned in the memo, I'm certainly

20 open to looking at developing a rule that would

21 specifically talk about exempt information and how that

22 could be separately designated and flagged, if that

23 would be of benefit, and I think it might very well be

24 both for the Commission and the industry that is

25 providing that information. But I think it's more

Page 75

1 confusing and more potentially problematic to conflate

2 those two things than to keep them separate.

3 With respect to subsection 5 of WAC

4 480-07-160, which has to do with challenges, I think the

5 situation in which information is strictly disclosed

6 between private parties in a Commission adjudication is

7 very, very small. I mean, you're talking about data

8 request responses that perhaps ICNU propounds to Puget

9 Sound Energy, and no other party has asked for other

10 data requests.

11 And in my experience, in 20 years of

12 litigating cases before the Commission, and six years as

13 an administrative law judge, it's almost universal that

14 the first data request that parties send out is, give me

15 all your responses to everybody else's data requests.

16 And once you provide it to Staff or Public Counsel, it

17 becomes a public record.

18 So there really are not going to be many, if

19 any, circumstances in which you're talking about

20 information that's provided solely under protective

21 order between parties that are not either the Commission

22 or the Attorney General.

23 I think there's been a lot of discussion

24 about the last sentence in 80.04.095. And I looked at

25 the first few words of that sentence: Nothing in this

Page 76

1 section shall prevent the use of protective orders. I

2 do not read that as conferring any authority on the

3 Commission, but instead preserving other authority.

4 That doesn't create its own authority; it just says,

5 this section doesn't prevent from you doing something

6 that you have authority to do under another statute.

7 That statute happens to be the APA -- and

8 let me get the right citation -- RCW 34.05.446, sub (1),

9 simply says that Presiding officers shall have the

10 authority to enter protective orders. That's all it

11 says.

12 So we are, again, as Commissioner Rendahl

13 mentioned, in a bit of a quandary in terms of how that

14 relates to the Public Records Act. My concern, reading

15 cases that have been decided recently by the Court of

16 Appeals and the Supreme Court, is that the courts look

17 at Public Records Act requests and challenges, they

18 review the act very broadly and exemptions very

19 narrowly. And unless there is a specific exemption in

20 the act, or in another statute that deals with the

21 particular type of information, then the courts are not

22 going to authorize agencies to withhold information.

23 What the proponents are -- those who believe

24 that the Commission's protective order would have its

25 own authority I think are essentially predicting that a

Page 77

1 Superior Court, when presented with the issue, would  
 2 say, you're right, we are going to allow agencies, in  
 3 the course of adjudications, to create their own  
 4 exemptions to the Public Records Act. And I don't see a  
 5 court saying that, not based on the decisions that I've  
 6 read.  
 7 So my concern is that, if we're put in that  
 8 position, we risk substantial liability, which likely  
 9 would exceed \$35,000, based on the one experience that  
 10 we've had recently about being sued for violating the  
 11 Public Records Act.  
 12 And therefore, I think, in my view, the  
 13 Public Records Act trumps the -- any authority that the  
 14 Commission has under a protective order, and that's the  
 15 reason that Staff has proposed the change to the rule.  
 16 I certainly have no problem, and I believe  
 17 it would be a good idea to talk with parties about how  
 18 we can address that. One possibility -- I know this is  
 19 purely talking -- you know, talking off the top of my  
 20 head, would be -- and this is dangerous -- but to  
 21 include in the protective order an agreement that  
 22 everyone who signs it agrees to waive the ten-day rule  
 23 until the Commission decides on any challenge.  
 24 That I could live with, because then we'd  
 25 have whoever's making the challenge agreeing that they

Page 78

1 won't go to court and charge us with a violation of the  
 2 Public Records Act because we didn't provide the  
 3 information after ten days, or require the company to go  
 4 and obtain an order from the Court.  
 5 But I think, barring that kind of express  
 6 agreement that a party is not going to go to court, then  
 7 we are certainly open to the possibility that they will.  
 8 CHAIR DANNER: All right. So I understand  
 9 where you're coming from, and I'm still -- I mean, what  
 10 I heard from Ms. Barnett and Ms. Anderl and others is  
 11 basically the -- how big a problem is this? If it ain't  
 12 broke, don't fix it. Why are we setting up a system  
 13 that might encourage people to go to court when right  
 14 now we can handle these things here and get them out of  
 15 here and not make a mountain out of a molehill.  
 16 MR. KOPTA: Well, because it's been my  
 17 experience, again, reading the Public Records Act cases,  
 18 that often agencies will go along with a particular  
 19 procedure only to find out later, when it's been  
 20 challenged for the first time, that that's not  
 21 consistent with the Public Records Act, and they owe  
 22 fines and attorney's fees.  
 23 So the fact that it hasn't been an issue  
 24 before doesn't mean that it won't be an issue in the  
 25 future. And if it arises in that context, then the

Page 79

1 Commission faces substantial liability even though, as a  
 2 matter of practice, we may have been doing the same  
 3 thing for 20 years.  
 4 CHAIR DANNER: Right. So I mean, it almost  
 5 comes down to a cost benefit. I mean, if it's going to  
 6 be \$30,000 a pop, where actually that's only before it  
 7 gets to trial, so it could be \$100,000 a pop, and we can  
 8 save the company three of those, and then if we find  
 9 ourselves at risk at some point, you know, it might be  
 10 less and --  
 11 COMMISSIONER JONES: Now you're talking.  
 12 CHAIR DANNER: I mean, this is difficult.  
 13 It's not -- it's not easy. I think I would like to go  
 14 back and rewrite the Public Records Act, but that's not  
 15 something that's going to happen.  
 16 MR. KOPTA: Well, and I agree with you. You  
 17 know, what's interesting to me is that courts don't look  
 18 at what makes sense; they look at what the act says.  
 19 There was a recent decision entered at the  
 20 end of last year, Hikel vs. City of Lynnwood. There are  
 21 four things that the statute -- the Public Records Act  
 22 requires an agency to do in response to a public records  
 23 request within five days.  
 24 And in this case, the City of Lynnwood, when  
 25 it received a request, asked the requester for

Page 80

1 clarification of what the requester was asking for. And  
 2 the requester filed a lawsuit, and the Court of Appeals  
 3 said, asking for clarification is not among the four  
 4 things that you have to do within five days, and  
 5 therefore, you are liable for violation of the Public  
 6 Records Act.  
 7 Does that make sense? I don't think so. Is  
 8 that what the statute says? Literally, yes.  
 9 And so in this circumstance, the exemption  
 10 under the Public Records Act is information designated  
 11 under 80.04.095 that a court has determined is  
 12 confidential under that statute, not that the Commission  
 13 has determined is confidential. So the way the statute  
 14 is set up, both 80.04.095 and the Public Records Act,  
 15 the Commission is taken out of that decision.  
 16 I will answer Ms. Anderl's question, when  
 17 she said the Commission has no authority to decide  
 18 whether information is confidential under that statute.  
 19 The statute clearly says that the company whose  
 20 information it is designates it as confidential, and we  
 21 treat it that way unless and until somebody requests it,  
 22 and ten days passes without a Court agreeing that it is,  
 23 in fact, confidential. But the Court makes that  
 24 determination, not the Commission.  
 25 Do I like that? Does it make sense? No.

Page 81

1 Is that what the statute says? Yes.

2 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So we gave you the

3 last word, but if anybody wants to give a brief response

4 to what Mr. Kopta has said, you're welcome to do so.

5 Ms. Barnett, I see you jumped up, so we'll

6 give you that opportunity, and then we are actually

7 going to break for the afternoon.

8 MS. BARNETT: Yes, thank you. I appreciate

9 that and I will be quick.

10 I do just want to -- I think the delineation

11 that -- between the Public Records Act and challenges of

12 confidentiality under adjudications, keep in mind the

13 third-party challenges, it really has been working well.

14 We go to Superior Court. We deal with it. The

15 in-party -- or in adjudicative proceedings, challenges

16 under the public -- protective order, they are things

17 like -- ICNU, I'm going to pick on you this time -- ICNU

18 saying, this is not highly confidential; this is

19 confidential. I want my consultant to be able to see

20 this, and he's not going to sign a highly confidential.

21 That's this [sic].

22 What is highly confidential? What is

23 confidential? It's saying, this entire table is not

24 confidential. I at least need to be able to see the

25 headings so we can put that on our -- in the middle of

Page 82

1 an evidentiary hearing, and use that as a demonstrative

2 exhibit. Get rid of that.

3 These are the challenges that we're dealing

4 with under the protective order in an adjudicative

5 proceeding. Yes, they're much more than that, but

6 that's the kind of stuff -- it may not -- we usually

7 resolve it before it gets to the Commission, but those

8 do not need to go in front of a Superior Court and have

9 a nine-month, three-hearing issue over every one of

10 those.

11 And I'm not saying that there's going to be

12 a ton more, but I do think there would be more if the

13 utility or the industry is worried that this open

14 exchange -- and we know this stuff isn't going to be

15 challenged. We know it's confidential under the WAC and

16 under the protective order and we can deal with it in

17 here.

18 If that goes away, it reduces the

19 flexibility, I think increases the risk and the

20 liability to the Commission, because now they're just

21 passing it down to somebody else to make the decision

22 and making a Superior Court rule on what's highly

23 confidential and what's confidential under a protective

24 order. I think that's -- anyway --

25 CHAIR DANNER: So if something gets

Page 83

1 submitted as confidential and the Commission doesn't

2 think it should be confidential at all, we just simply

3 say we --

4 MS. BARNETT: Yeah.

5 CHAIR DANNER: I mean, we leave it to you to

6 go to court.

7 MS. BARNETT: That we would have a hearing.

8 I would understand -- ability to be able to be heard on

9 that. But yes, absolutely. It shouldn't go in front of

10 a Superior Court to say that.

11 CHAIR DANNER: All right. What do you think

12 of the idea of having a provision in the protective

13 order that says that this is -- you know, we're going to

14 limit you to these, you agree not to go to court.

15 MS. BARNETT: That's an interesting concept.

16 I haven't even given it any thought. And so you're

17 saying that Judge Kopta's take-away-the-ten-day option,

18 we'll deal with it here, I'd be open to that. I haven't

19 talked to my client about it, but --

20 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. Well, he just

21 threw it out there, so --

22 MS. BARNETT: Yeah, it should be --

23 CHAIR DANNER: All right. We have a lot to

24 think about and a lot to discuss, so I thank everybody

25 for participation this afternoon.

Page 84

1 Did I miss anybody -- is there anybody in

2 the room or on the bridge line who wants to make a

3 comment who hasn't had the opportunity yet? Okay.

4 Then we will take this under advisement, and

5 we're adjourned for the afternoon. Thank you very much.

6 (Hearing concluded at 3:20 p.m.)

7

8 -o0o-

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF WASHINGTON )

4 ) ss.  
COUNTY OF KING )

5

6

7 I, ANITA W. SELF, a Certified Shorthand Reporter

8 in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify

9 that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to

10 the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand

12 and seal this 14th day of February, 2017.

13

14

15

16

\_\_\_\_\_  
ANITA W. SELF, RPR, CCR #3032

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25